**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, JUNE 15, 2015, AT 9:30 A.M.**

**Present: Steve Robles and Patrick Wu**
**Absent: Chair John Naimo**

**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. Claim of City of Glendora**

This claim seeks compensation from the Department of Public Works, Sewer Maintenance Division for real property damage allegedly caused from a backflow of sewage due to a sewer mainline blockage.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $23,988.89.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Steve Robles and Patrick Wu
Absent: Chair John Naimo

See Supporting Document

**b. Claim of RTZ Associates, Inc.**

This claim seeks compensation for software maintenance services provided to the Department of Community and Senior Services.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $87,500.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Steve Robles and Patrick Wu
Absent: Chair John Naimo

See Supporting Documents

**c. Claim of Mercury Insurance Group**

This claim seeks compensation from the Sheriff's Department for property damage paid to its insured following an automobile accident with a Sheriff's vehicle.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $23,584.12.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Steve Robles and Patrick Wu
Absent: Chair John Naimo

**d. Frank Martinez v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
**United States District Court Case No. CV 13-03825**

This lawsuit concerns allegations of excessive force by Sheriff's Deputies.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $190,000.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Steve Robles and Patrick Wu
Absent: Chair John Naimo

See Supporting Documents

**e. Maria Esther Cuevas, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 506 867**

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee of the Department of Public Health.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $250,000.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Steve Robles and Patrick Wu
Absent: Chair John Naimo

See Supporting Documents

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

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

**5. Approval of the minutes of the June 1, 2015, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Steve Robles and Patrick Wu
Absent: Chair John Naimo

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 | | Non-litigated Claim of City of Glendora |
| CASE NUMBER | | n/a |
| COURT | | n/a |
| DATE FILED | | n/a |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | | Public Works |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | $ | 23,988.89 (includes pre-payment of $20,000) |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | | None |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | | Jenny P. Tam |
| NATURE OF CASE | | This non-litigated claim arises from a blocked County main sewer line that caused a sewage backflow into claimant's home and damaged the structure. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full settlement of the claim is warranted. |
| PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE | $ | 0 |
| PAID COSTS, TO DATE | $ | 0 |

## CASE SUMMARY

## INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CASE NAME | | Claim of RTZ Associates Inc. |
| CASE NUMBER | | Claim No. 14-3438 |
| COURT | | N/A |
| DATE FILED | | November 14, 2014 |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | | Community and Senior Services |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | $ | 87,500 |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | | David C. Lee, Esq.<br>Michelman & Robinson, LLP |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | | Victoria Mansourian<br>Principal Deputy County Counsel |
| NATURE OF CASE | | Claimant seeks compensation for software maintenance services provided to the County for its Area Agency for Aging Program between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014. Due to the costs, risks and uncertainties of litigation, a settlement of the claim is warranted. |
| PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE | $ | 75,043 (payments for 7/1/2014 - 5/5/2015) |
| PAID COSTS, TO DATE | $ | 0 |

Case Name: RTZ Associates Inc. Claim for Damage # 14-3438

# 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: | 07/01/13 – 06/30/14 |
| Briefly provide a description of the incident/event: | RTZ Associates Inc. asserts that they are entitled to maintenance fees for the period of July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014.<br><br>The County contracted with RTZ to deliver a software system by July 1, 2013 to handle client data management as required by our external funding sources. The contract allows for payment of maintenance fees after "Final Acceptance" by CSS of the complete software solution delivered by RTZ in compliance with the contract terms.<br><br>RTZ did not deliver a complete software system by July 1, 2013 that could enable transition from the legacy system. RTZ did provide a partially functional system that enabled continued compliance with funding source requirements.<br><br>There are no provisions within the Board-approved contract that either authorize the request for the partial solution or enable payment for use or maintenance of the partially functional system. The Agreement does not allow for payment of maintenance fees until after "Final Acceptance" of the completed system which was approved on 09/08/14. |

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

A. The County is required by its funding sources to have continuous and seamless IT capability to manage data regarding clients and service providers.
B. The County's legacy system provider's contract was set to expire on June 30, 2013 and the County contracted with RTZ to provide a replacement system to be fully operational on July 1, 2013.
C. RTZ failed to perform in accordance with contract requirements and did not deliver full implementation of the Solution. To remedy that non-delivery, RTZ implemented the usage of a work-around that consisted of Production Use of a substitute system and subsequent activities in support of that remedy. These actions by RTZ and CSS were outside of the scope of the contract.
D. RTZ is seeking payment for its activities in support of the work around that was implemented.
E. CSS did not have Board-approved contractual authority to request the partial solution nor terms within the contract requiring or enabling payment for any costs related to that partial solution. Authority for implementation of and subsequent payment for the partial solution to become part of the contract would have required a Board-approved amendment.
F. There is no contractual obligation for the County to pay any costs related to implementation of a partial solution. Payment for Maintenance Services was contractually required only after "Final Acceptance" of the completely functional software system.
G. CSS relied on RTZ delivering the completed new system prior to the expiration of the legacy

system provider's contract on June 30, 2013. CSS did not have a contingency plan in effect that would have enabled the extension of the legacy contract to safeguard a seamless transition to a completed replacement system.

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

A. By June 30, 2015, CSS will develop and implement new written IT contract management protocols, drafted with the assistance of County Counsel, for circulation to the Department's contracts staff, requiring the following:

1. Contingency planning that ensures the continued provision of required services when proposed to replace and/or transition from a legacy IT system, including consideration of extending legacy system provider contract(s), if necessary.
2. Establishing an IT project oversight/implementation team, which will include the County Counsel, prior to the execution of an IT contract, for each IT project in order to regularly assess contractor performance, identify issues impacting project implementation, and propose to CSS management appropriate corrective actions, if necessary.
3. Actively imposing and/or pursuing contractual remedies, including but not limited to suspension, termination, assessment of credits against the contractor and/or the imposition of measures as detailed in the contract's Performance Requirement Summary (PRS) for delayed or deficient performance, to the extent applicable and appropriate, and following consultation with County Counsel.
4. Ensuring CSS contract administrator/staff works with County Counsel to schedule and conduct a kick off meeting with the recommended or approved contactor to review and discuss the relevant statement of work and other contractual obligations of the parties prior to, or concurrent with, the execution of IT contracts.
5. Requiring appropriate CSS staff to regularly document issues identified by the IT project oversight/implementation team, and when appropriate, using the Contractor Alert Reporting Database (CARD), or other available County resources, as required by existing County policies to track and report poorly performing IT contractors.
6. Evaluating IT Contract administrators/staff during annual performance evaluations on compliance with contract monitoring and documentation as well as completion of any required contract monitoring training.
7. Requiring all IT contract administrators/staff to complete the County Contract Monitoring Certification class and thereafter annual refresher trainings on Contract Monitoring, conducted in conjunction with County Counsel, and focusing on the written IT contract management protocols, including the role of the project oversight/implementation team, and documentation of contractor performance, as well as standard County contract monitoring protocols.
8. Ensuring that CSS Human Resources tracks and documents all IT contract administrators/staff participation and completion of the required trainings.

B. CSS will work with County Counsel to incorporate these risk management features, when appropriate, into our Information Technology Agreement's standard format and process:

1. Language clarification within IT Agreements that would allow County latitude in payments to vendors within the contract sums and with County Counsel approval.
2. Specific language for contractors to implement County mandated workarounds whenever deliverables are not achieved at no additional cost to the County. This will include requiring County Counsel, CSS, and Contractor to document the workaround.

C. By May 15, 2015, CSS will coordinate with the Auditor-Controller (A-C) to establish a training schedule utilizing the first available openings so that all CSS IT contract administrators/staff participate in and complete the County's Contract Monitoring Certification Class no later than

| |
|---|
| the end of Fiscal Year 2015-16. CSS Human Resources will monitor IT staffing and training records annually to ensure that all new and continuing IT contract administrators/staff complete the training. All new staff will be targeted to complete the training within six months of beginning their assignment or at the earliest available training date. |

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

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)<br>Jhony M. Acosta | |
| Signature: Jhony M. Acosta | Date: 4-14-15 |
| Name: (Department Head)<br>Cynthia D. Banks | |
| Signature: Cynthia D. Banks | Date: 4/16/15 |

**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)<br>Destiny Castro | |
| Signature: Destiny Castro | Date: 4/20/2015 |

## CASE SUMMARY

## INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CASE NAME | | Frank Martinez v. County of Los Angeles |
| CASE NUMBER | | CV 13-03825 |
| COURT | | United States District Court |
| DATE FILED | | May 29, 2013 |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | | Sheriff's Department |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | $ | 190,000 |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | | V. James DeSimone<br>Schonbrun, DeSimone, Seplow, Harris Hoffman & Harrison, LLP |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | | Millicent L. Rolon |
| NATURE OF CASE | | This is a recommendation to settle for $190,000, the lawsuit filed by Plaintiff Frank Martinez alleging excessive force by Los Angeles County Sheriff's Deputies. The Deputies contend that the force used was reasonable and in response to Mr. Martinez's resistance.<br><br>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. Therefore, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $190,000 is recommended. |
| PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE | $ | 197,086 |
| PAID COSTS, TO DATE | $ | 12,812 |

Case Name: **Frank Martinez 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: | Tuesday, June 7, 2011; approximately 5:50 p.m. |
| Briefly provide a description of the incident/event: | **Frank Martinez v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**<br>Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2015-004<br><br>On Tuesday, June 7, 2011, at approximately 5:50 p.m., a uniformed Los Angeles County deputy sheriff, assigned to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Temple Station, detained the plaintiff for a violation of California Vehicle Code Section 22108, Duration of signal.<br><br>In attempting to lawfully induce the plaintiff to step out of the vehicle, a violent confrontation ensued. The deputy sheriff requested backup, and another deputy sheriff assigned to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Temple Station arrived at the location. The two deputy sheriffs used physical force to overcome the resistance and assaultive behavior offered by the plaintiff.<br><br>The plaintiff was ultimately restrained, handcuffed, and subsequently taken into custody. |

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

In his lawsuit, the plaintiff alleged he was subjected to excessive physical force and federal civil rights violations committed by members of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

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.

This incident was investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Temple Sheriff's Station. The investigation concluded that the actions employed and the force used by the deputy sheriffs were necessary, reasonable, and within Department policy and guidelines.

The incident was also thoroughly reviewed by representatives of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Risk Management Bureau. The review revealed that even though the plaintiff's minor son was placed in the care of relatives at the time of the plaintiff's arrest, this was not documented.

No employee misconduct is suspected. Consequently, no personnel-related administrative action was taken, and no other corrective action measures are recommended nor contemplated.

On December 12, 2013, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department implemented Manual of Policy and Procedures Section 5-03/026.00, *Arrested Person's Children Form (SH-R-625)*, designed to document the measures taken to ensure the welfare of children in the care of arrested persons.

On January 21, 2015, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Risk Management Bureau revised and republished Field Operations Support Services Newsletter 12-03, *Supervisors Interviewing a Suspect in a Use of Force Incident*, designed to outline specific techniques to interview the participants, document the scene, and investigate the events of a use of force, to provide for a more thorough and objective examination of the incident in question.

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)<br><br>Scott E. Johnson, Captain<br>Risk Management Bureau | |
|---|---|
| Signature: | Date: 5-27-15 |

| Name: (Department Head)<br><br>Earl M. Shields, Chief<br>Professional Standards Division | |
|---|---|
| Signature: | Date: 6/2/15 |

**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: |
|---|---|
| Destiny Castro | 6/4/2015 |

## CASE SUMMARY

## INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CASE NAME | | Maria Cuevas, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. |
| CASE NUMBER | | BC 506867 |
| COURT | | Los Angeles Superior Court |
| DATE FILED | | April 24, 2013 |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | | Public Health |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | $ | 250,000 |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | | Philip J. Layfield, Esq. |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | | Brian T. Chu<br>Principal Deputy County Counsel |
| NATURE OF CASE | | This is a motor vehicle negligence lawsuit involving a Department of Public Health stakebed truck that rear-ended the Plaintiffs' vehicle on November 17, 2012, on Vernon Avenue, at its intersection with Avalon Boulevard, in the City of Los Angeles.<br><br>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $250,000 is recommended. |
| PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE | $ | 123,670 |
| PAID COSTS, TO DATE | $ | 43,051 |

Case Name: Maria E. Cuevas, et al. 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: | **November 17, 2012** |
| Briefly provide a description of the incident/event: | On 11/17/12, employee (D. Nguyen) driving a County truck at approximately 12:15 PM, making a left turn from East Vernon into Avalon Blvd. heard scraping sounds and found out that he pinned another vehicle between the truck and the curb, as the front bumper of the truck and the other vehicle's driver's door collided.<br><br>County driver did not report any injuries. Claimants, driver and passenger of the vehicle, claimed that County driver rear ended the car. They were treated for their injuries at White Memorial Hospital. The driver has had ongoing medical treatment and surgeries since the accident occurred.<br><br>According to the Los Angeles Police Department's report, County driver struck claimant's vehicle that was stopped waiting to make a left turn onto South Avalon Blvd. from West Vernon. |

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

Although the County driver, Mr. Nguyen, was negligent in causing the accident, process/system's weakness was one of the root causes by not providing behind the wheel training to employees required to drive larger vehicles, such as the truck County driver was driving to conduct sweeps of street vendors.

County driver, Mr. Nguyen, was negligent in not noticing the plaintiff's vehicle in front of him at the red light and rear ending the vehicle. He further proceeded to make a left turn and hit the vehicle again and pin it against the curb. The County truck's passenger indicated he heard two sounds; however, he did not bring this to the attention of the County driver.

The nature of this accident indicates County driver and his passenger may not have been paying attention to their surroundings while driving in the course of their duties.

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

The following actions are being taken by DPH:

1. Environmental Health had already begun developing a Driver Safety Program pilot project in September 2012. This project was expanded and implemented at the Departmental level on July 1, 2014. All DPH staff were notified by e-mail blast of implementation of DPH Policy 924 - Vehicle Accident Review Committee (VARC), which was approved on September 15, 2014, and required to sign an Acknowledgement of Receipt form. VARC officially began reviewing DPH vehicle accident reports on October 29, 2014.

2. By (June 30, 2015), all Environmental Health staff required to drive trucks and large vehicles to conduct sweeps and impound equipment and other items will complete on-line Motor Vehicle Safety and Defensive Driving Training.

   - Employee successfully completed this training on May 24, 2013.

3. By (June 30, 2015), all Environmental Health staff required to drive trucks and large vehicles to conduct sweeps and impound equipment and other items will complete behind-the-wheel training.

   Training includes the following topics:
   - Defensive driving.
   - Time-space management.
   - Lateral driving maneuvers.
   - Signs.
   - Signals.
   - Roadway markings.

   - Employee successfully completed training for driving a van on June 19, 2014. He will participate in the above mentioned training.

4. By (June 30, 2015), update existing and develop new Driver Safety Program Policy and Procedures for all the Environmental Health staff who drive trucks and large vehicles to conduct sweeps and impound equipment and other items.

5. By (June 30, 2015), DPH PM will complete re-assessment of appropriate administrative action for County driver and passenger. Administrative action was pending case settlement and/or closure. Administrative action will be taken, as recommended by DPH HR.

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

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

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

| Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Ferdows Rashidian | |
|---|---|
| Signature: Ferdows Rashidian | Date: 4/28/15 |

| Name: (Department Head) Cynthia A. Harding | |
|---|---|
| Signature: Cynthia A. Harding | Date: 5/4/15 |

**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: 4/28/2015 |

# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

## MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

## JUNE 1, 2015

**1. Call to Order.**

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:30 a.m. The meeting was held in the Executive Conference Room, 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

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

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Edward Hsu and Craig Hoetger; Sheriff's Department: Lt. Patrick Hunter and Sgt. Pauline Panis; Department of Children and Family Services: Karla Hernandez; and Outside Counsel: William Balderrama.

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

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

At 11:00 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

**a. <u>Simie Fang v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u>**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 500 376**

This lawsuit alleges that Plaintiff's civil rights were violated when she was falsely arrested by Sheriff Deputies and maliciously prosecuted.

<u>Action Taken</u>:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $77,500.

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

b. **Eduardo Saldana v. County of Los Angeles**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 390 605**

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services was wrongfully terminated based on retaliation and breach of contract.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $192,500.

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

5. **Approval of the minutes of the May 18, 2015, regular 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 11:05 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By Carol J. Slosson
Carol J. Slosson