STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

FOR THE REGULAR MEETING

OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

HELD IN ROOM 648 OF THE KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION,

500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

ON

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2014, AT 9:30 AM

Present: Chair John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

1. Call to Order.

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

No members of the public addressed the Claims Board.

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

a. <u>Trinidad Frick v. County of Los Angeles</u>
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. TC 026 792

This dangerous condition lawsuit arises from an alleged trip and fall on a County-maintained sidewalk in the unincorporated area of the County.

<u>Action Taken</u>:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $60,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

<u>See Supporting Documents</u>

b. **H.K., a minor v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. CV 12-01600

This lawsuit concerns allegations of excessive force and federal civil rights violations when a minor was detained by an off duty Sheriff's Deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $35,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

See Supporting Document

c. **Mario Gollas v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. CV 12-08742

This lawsuit concerns alleged injuries sustained by Plaintiff when he was bitten by a Sheriff's Department canine.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $35,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

See Supporting Documents

d. **Gabriel Viramontes, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 505 207

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Sheriff's patrol car driven by a Sheriff's Deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $29,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

See Supporting Documents

e. **Maria Del Rocio Gudino Minchaca v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. MC 023 715

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Sheriff's patrol car driven by a Sheriff's Deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $35,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

See Supporting Documents

f. **M.W., by and through her Guardian Ad Litem, Michael S. Radcliff v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 483 165

This medical malpractice lawsuit concerns allegations that the care provided by LAC+USC Medical Center to Plaintiff's mother was negligent and resulted in injuries to Plaintiff.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $2,000,000, plus assumption of the Medi-Cal lien in the estimated amount of $350,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

See Supporting Document

4. **Report of actions taken in Closed Session.**

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

5. Approval of the minutes of the October 6, 2014, meeting of the Claims Board.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

See Supporting Document

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

No such matters were discussed.

7. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Trinidad Frick v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		TC026792
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		August 22, 2012
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Department of Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	60,000.00
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		David S. Brown, Esq. Brown, Brown & Brown
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Brian T. Chu Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This is a dangerous condition of public property lawsuit concerning a trip and fall that occurred during the daytime on December 19, 2011, on a sidewalk located on South Sesame Street, in the unincorporated County area near the City of Carson. The Plaintiff alleges that she tripped over an exposed street sign post anchor, for which she received soft tissue injuries. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $60,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	130,054
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	16,885

Case Name: TRINIDAD FRICK

Summary Corrective Action Plan

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

Date of incident/event:	December 19, 2011
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	On December 19, 2011, Plaintiff Trinidad Frick allegedly tripped over a sign post anchor set into the concrete sidewalk located at 23300 South Sesame Street (at the intersection of Sesame and Coriander) in the unicorporated area of Torrance, thereby allegedly sustaining injuries in the form of two torn rotator cuffs and unspecified injuries to her right ribs and left knee. Public Works records do not reflect any reports or complaints of any missing street name sign post at the incident location prior to December 19, 2011. On December 21, 2011, Ms. Frick did contact Public Works regarding a missing street name sign post. Staff responded to the site on December 21, 2011, (same day) and, after finding the post hidden from plain view behind the fence surrounding the adjacent condominium grounds, performed the repair work. Public Works maintenance records do indicate that staff had received a report of a missing street name sign placard at the location. Consequently, the street name sign was reviewed on October 21, 2011, and it was determined that one of the street name placards was indeed missing. However, the street name sign post was found to be intact and attached to the sleeve. Therefore, a work order for replacement of the placard at a later date was generated. Public Works staff performed the annual sidewalk inspection at this location on November 15, 2011. The inspection involved a walk-through of the sidewalk on both sides of Sesame Street and Coriander Drive in order to ascertain repair needs for any substandard conditions that may be

	present. On neither of these two occasions, which were prior to the incident date, was a missing sign post or substandard condition, which may create a tripping hazard observed at the location where Ms. Frick allegedly tripped.

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

The alleged missing sign post and/or exposed anchor was a dangerous condition.

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

On December 21, 2011, Public Works personnel reinstalled the street sign post to the anchor. On January 19, 2012, the street name sign post was relocated to its present location closer to the east property line boundary and away from the curb in order to provide additional clearance for vehicular traffic and a wider sidewalk for pedestrian convenience at the subject location.

Additionally, Public Works implemented the revised Annual Sidewalk Inspection and Repair Guidelines, which were signed and made effective on January 14, 2014. Although the focus of this sidewalk inspection is the identification of damage and displacement in the sidewalk, curb and gutter, driveway aprons, and wheelchair ramps, this guideline states that if other significant maintenance issues are found, a barricade shall be placed before the end of the day and noted on the Sidewalk Inspection "Other Significant Maintenance Discovery Form" (Attachment 4). This form will include the Road Division, date, inspector's name, location, deficiency found, appropriate action taken, and any recommended additional repairs.

3. Are the corrective actions addressing department-wide system issues?

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

☒ No - The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Michael J. Hays	
Signature: MJ Hays	Date: 8/27/14
Name: (Department Head) Gail Farber	
Signature: Gail Farber	Date: 9-08-14.

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY

Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?

☐ Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability.

☒ No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.

Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) Destiny Castro	
Signature: Destiny Castro	Date: 8/28/2014

ML:psr
P4:\FRICK SCAP2 (REV)

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		H.K., a minor v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		CV 12-01600
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		September 24, 2012
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	35,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Michael Sutton, Esq. Law Offices of Sutton & Murphy
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Joseph A. Langton
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $35,000, the lawsuit filed by Plaintiff H.K., a Minor alleging that her federal civil rights were violated when she was detained by a Sheriff's Deputy. The Sheriff's Department contends that reasonable suspicion existed to detain H.K. and that no excessive force was used. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $35,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	68,503
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	12,594

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Mario Gollas v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		CV12-08742
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		Complaint filed: October 12, 2012
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	35,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Justin Strassburg Strassburg, Gilmore & Wei
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Jonathan McCaverty
NATURE OF CASE		Plaintiff Mario Gollas alleges he was improperly detained and bitten by a Sheriff's Department Canine on September 3, 2011. Due to the risks and uncertainties of the litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigations costs. Therefore, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $35,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	38,582
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	2,257

Case Name: **Mario Gollas v. County of Los Angeles**

Summary Corrective Action Plan

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

Date of incident/event:	Saturday, September 3, 2011; approximately 12:16 a.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	**Mario Gollas v. County of Los Angeles** Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2014-024 On Friday, September 2, 2011, at approximately 11:33 p.m., a Los Angeles County deputy sheriff, assigned to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Carson Station, saw what he believed to be four men committing a vehicle burglary. When the deputy sheriff confronted the four men, three fled on foot while one was successfully detained. As one of the three men fled, he discarded a loaded handgun at the scene. Responding deputy sheriffs immediately established a containment area in an attempt to identify and capture the fleeing suspects. They were assisted by a helicopter and two deputy sheriffs assigned to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Canine Services Detail. The helicopter alerted the deputy sheriffs on the ground to a potential suspect running within the established containment area. A supervisor responded to the location and attempted to detain the individual. The individual was uncooperative. Despite repeated instructions to reveal his hands, he kept them concealed from the supervisor's view. The two deputy sheriffs assigned to the Canine Services Detail arrived to assist the supervisor. While attempting to detain the individual, a violent struggle ensued between the supervisor and the individual he was trying to detain. During the struggle, the individual attempted to disarm the supervisor by removing his duty weapon from his holster. Because the individual continued to fight, coupled with the supervisor's belief the individual was attempting to arm himself with a firearm, the supervisor directed one of the deputy sheriffs assigned to the Canine Services Detail to deploy his canine partner. The canine bit the individual on the left arm. The individual subsequently complied with the deputy sheriffs' instructions. He was ultimately handcuffed and taken into custody.

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

The root cause in this incident is the plaintiff's allegation that members of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department used excessive force to detain him.

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

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

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

The incident was thoroughly investigated by representatives of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Special Enforcement Bureau. On May 29, 2012, the results of their investigation were presented to the members of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Executive Force Review Committee. The members of the committee determined the force used in this case was objectively reasonable and in compliance with Department policy. The committee also determined the tactics used by the deputy sheriffs involved in this incident were consistent with Department training standards. No systemic issues were identified. As a result, no personnel-related administrative action was taken, and no other corrective action measures are recommended nor contemplated.

3. Are the corrective actions addressing department-wide system issues?

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

☒ No – The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Scott E. Johnson, Acting Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature: 158622	Date: 9-25-14

Name: (Department Head) Earl M. Shields, Chief Professional Standards Division	
Signature:	Date: 09/29/14

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY	
Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County? ☐ Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability. ☒ No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.	
Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) Destiny Castro	
Signature: Destiny Castro	Date: 10/6/2014

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Gabriel Viramontes et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		BC505207
COURT		Los Angeles County Superior Court
DATE FILED		May 10, 2013
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	29,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Michael V. Jehdian Law Offices of Michael V. Jehdian, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Melissa A. McCaverty Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This lawsuit arises from a motor vehicle collision that occurred on April 7, 2011, at the intersection of Verona Street and McBride Avenue in unincorporated East Los Angeles when a Sheriff's patrol car driven by a Sheriff's Deputy collided with a mini-van driven by Gabriel Viramontes. Mr. Viramontes and passengers Isabel Rios and Leslie Gasca claim injuries as a result of the accident. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	36,047
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	1,183

Case Name: **Gabriel Viramontes et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**

Summary Corrective Action Plan

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

Date of incident/event:	Thursday, April 7, 2011; approximately 9:35 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	**Gabriel Viramontes, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.** Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2014-031 On Thursday, April 7, 2011, at approximately 9:35 p.m., a Los Angeles County deputy sheriff, assigned to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's East Los Angeles Station, was driving a standard black and white, County of Los Angeles-owned patrol vehicle when the vehicle he was driving collided with the plaintiff's vehicle in the intersection of McBride Avenue and Verona Street, Unincorporated Los Angeles County.

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

This traffic collision was thoroughly investigated by representatives from the California Highway Patrol and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's East Los Angeles Station. The investigation concluded the deputy sheriff caused the traffic collision by violating California Vehicle Code section 21802(a), Approaching Entrance to Intersection.

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

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

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

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's administrative review revealed employee misconduct. As a result, appropriate administrative action was imposed upon one member of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

This section intentionally left blank.

3. Are the corrective actions addressing department-wide system issues?

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

☒ No – The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Scott E. Johnson, Acting Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature:	Date: 9.25.14

Name: (Department Head) Earl M. Shields, Chief Professional Standards Division	
Signature:	Date: 09/29/14

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County? ☒ Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability. ☐ No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.	
Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) Destiny Castro	
Signature:	Date: 10/6/2014

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Maria Del Rocio Gudino Minchaca v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		MC023715
COURT		Los Angeles County Superior Court
DATE FILED		September 10, 2012
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	35,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Moon Kim
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Richard K. Kudo Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on May 11, 2011, on eastbound East Avenue I at the intersection of 10th Street East in Lancaster when a vehicle driven by a Sheriff's Deputy collided with a vehicle driven by Maria Minchaca. Ms. Minchaca claims injuries as a result of the accident. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	26,785
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	16,587

Case Name: **Maria Del Rocio Gudino Minchaca v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**

Summary Corrective Action Plan

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

Date of incident/event:	Wednesday, May 11, 2011; approximately 9:08 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	**Maria Del Rocio Gudino Minchaca v. County of Los Angeles, et al.** Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2014-028 On Wednesday, May 11, 2011, at approximately 9:08 p.m., a Los Angeles County deputy sheriff, assigned to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Operation Safe Streets Bureau, was driving a standard black and white, County of Los Angeles-owned patrol vehicle when the vehicle he was driving collided with the plaintiff's vehicle in the intersection of Avenue I and 10th Street East, Lancaster.

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

This traffic collision was thoroughly investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Operation Safe Streets Bureau. The investigation concluded the deputy sheriff caused the traffic collision by violating California Vehicle Code section 21658(a), Laned Roadways.

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

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

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

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's administrative review revealed employee misconduct. As a result, appropriate administrative action was imposed upon one member of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

This section intentionally left blank.

3. Are the corrective actions addressing department-wide system issues?

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

☒ No – The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)	
Scott E. Johnson, Acting Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature: 153228	Date: 9-25-14

Name: (Department Head)	
Earl M. Shields, Chief Professional Standards Division	
Signature:	Date: 09/29/14

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY	
Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County? ☒ Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability. ☐ No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.	
Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) Destiny Castro	
Signature: Destiny Castro	Date: 10/6/2014

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	M.W., by and through her Guardian-Ad-Litem, Michael S. Radcliff v. County of Los Angeles
CASE NUMBER	BC 483165
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court - Central
DATE FILED	April 20, 2012
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Health Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$2,000,000, plus assumption of the Medi-Cal lien in the estimated amount of $350,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Levik Yarian, Esq. Law Office of Levik Yarian
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Narbeh Bagdasarian - Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	M.W., is a minor who was born on May 5, 2011, at a hospital not affiliated with the County of Los Angeles. Prior to her birth, her mother received medical care at LAC+USC Medical Center, a County facility. Plaintiff claims that the care provided by LAC+USC to her mother was negligent and contributed to her premature birth on May 5, 2011, resulting in injuries.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$165,165
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$61,530

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
October 6, 2014

1. Call to Order.

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:33 a.m. The meeting was held in the Executive Conference Room, 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

Claims Board Members present at the meeting were: John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu.

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Kent Sommer, Millicent Rolon and Rosemarie Belda; Department of Children and Family Services: Lynette Morgan Nichols; Sheriff's Department: Lt. Patrick Hunter and Sgt. Albert Schauberger; and the Department of Health Services: Karen White.

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

No members of the public addressed the Claims Board.

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

At 9:35 a.m., the Chairperson adjourned the meeting into Closed Session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(f) below.

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

At 10:39 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

a. <u>Jane Doe by Deborah Epperson v. County of Los Angeles</u>
Norwalk Superior Court Case No. VC 061 354

This lawsuit concerns allegations of sexual assault and battery by a Sheriff's Deputy.

<u>Action Taken</u>:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $675,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

b. **Claim of Monique McIntosh**

This claim concerns allegations of disability discrimination and failure to make a reasonable accommodation by a Department of Children and Family Services' employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $65,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

c. **Susan Asbury v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC 518 368

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Health Services was subjected to sexual harassment and that the Department failed to prevent the sexual harassment.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $500,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

d. **Stephany Lomeli v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 539 332

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Health Services was subjected to sexual harassment and that the Department failed to prevent the sexual harassment.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $125,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

e. **Ashley Hill v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 518 891

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Health Services was subjected to sexual harassment and that the Department failed to prevent the sexual harassment.

Action Taken:

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

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

f. **Cheri Nelson v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 519 653

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Health Services was subjected to sexual harassment and that the Department failed to prevent the sexual harassment.

Action Taken:

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

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

5. **Approval of the minutes of the September 22, 2014, special meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Patrick Wu

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

No such matters were discussed.

7. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By Carol J. Slosson
Carol J. Slosson