

# ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION

Gunther W. Buerk, *Chairperson*  
Betty Trotter, *Vice Chairperson*

## MINUTES

### FULL COMMISSION MEETING

APRIL 3, 1991

HALL OF ADMINISTRATION, 864-A

Alfred P. Balderrama  
George E. Bodle  
Ann King Cooper  
Joe Crail  
Jack Drown  
Emma E. Fischbeck  
Louise Frankel  
Dr. Alfred J. Freitag  
Chun Y. Lee  
Robert J. Lowe  
Abraham M. Lurie  
Lauro J. Neri  
Arthur J. Peever  
Robert H. Philibosian  
Daniel M. Shapiro  
Randolph B. Stockwell  
Wally Thor  
Robert L. Williams  
Efrem Zimbalist, III

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Gunther W. Buerk opened the meeting at 9:40 a.m.. Introductions were made by John Campbell who introduced Robin Kincaid, as a new staff member assigned, by the Board of Supervisors to the Economy and Efficiency Commission as an Office Manager/Administrative Assistant.

Michael Thompson, from the City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office, Office of Criminal Justice and Planning was also introduced as a visitor. He is a member of the County's Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Commission.

William C. Waddell representing the Productivity Commission was also in attendance.

#### II. ATTENDANCE

Attendance list is on the last page. The absences of Commissioners Balderrama, Bodle, Cooper, Crail, Drown, Lowe, Lurie, Neri, Shapiro, and Stockwell were excused by vote of the Commissioners present.

#### III. OLD BUSINESS

Minutes of March 6, 1991 were approved, noting a correction on page five, that was requested by Mr. Edward Duncan under section "VIII. Comments and Suggestions from Visitors." The wording on line five was changed to: "...and the use of purchasing procedures for State automobiles involving potentially substantial savings." There were no further changes.

#### Task Force Status Reports:

ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION - Robert Williams reported that the Task Force felt that there is not enough expertise among the members in this area to proceed. He also cited the fact that there is a new administration at the ADA. The Task Force felt they should give the new administration more time, and see how they would function on their own. It was noted that the Commissions expertise is not in what kind of prevention or drug treatment is most effective, but that the report could concentrate on how the 65 million dollars should be spent, consolidation of the programs, and how the county could be more effective in encouraging the availability of services where they are most needed.

It was suggested that two Task Force meetings be organized. The first would be with the Chairman, and interested members of the Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Commission. The second meeting would be arranged with the Chief of the Alcohol and Drug Administration in order to get their perspectives on which direction to proceed in.

The primary issue has little to do with contracting, as the Alcohol and Drug Administration already does a considerable amount of contracting. However, it was felt that there are some items that should be further investigated. One is the county's methods for deciding the allocation of resources, also the potential for privatization of some of the functions. A second is the potential consolidation of the drug and treatment programs. A third it's relationship with the county to the providers and the community it serves.

John Campbell stated that the Board of Supervisors asked the Commission about contracting out the operations of the drug abuse program office. Approximately 90% of treatment production functions are already contracted. If the balance was contracted out, there would still have to be some kind of apparatus managing the county's expenditures of the state and county money, which means you would not be contracting out. However, there are some important questions that arise which deserve full and thorough debate. Such as, should we be spending a lot of money on treating alcohol and drug abusers? or should we be putting them in jail? or should we let them die in the streets? or should we instead be putting our resources into prevention, education, and care for the young? Maybe the Board should change the allocation of resources among treatment and various levels of prevention. There are substantial policy issues wrapped up on how the county spends the 65 million dollars in treatment in Los Angeles County.

Internal consolidation would be difficult because the alcohol and drug treatment programs are managed through state and federal channels that are distinct and separate. As a consequence a lot of the machinery is also distinct and separate, yet the majority of their clients are users and abusers of both alcohol and drugs. The county has a reputation for being destructive with regard to these types of programs. The greater need is in the minority communities, yet, some of the programs in those communities get shut down due to audit procedures, which raises some questions as well. Should they hire outside auditors? couldn't the county be doing something to enhance the programs in those community? couldn't people be trained to be more supportive? These are some of the questions that should dominate the debate.

It was also felt that the Commission should consider looking at the results of what happens once the money is spent. What the results are with various types of programs. The Commission should recommend how the money should be re-directed to the programs that seem to show results. Once treatment has been completed, there should be someone held accountable for tracking the results of the people treated. Another area worth looking into is the lack of treatment centers. There aren't enough centers to fill the need, and the ones that do exist have long waiting lists of people trying to get into the centers.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A new Task Force will review the charter under which the Commission has been set up, the way it functions, what has been accomplished, what hasn't been accomplished, funding, and staffing, are all items that should be targeted by the Task Force.

The first meeting of this Task Force will be held on April 15, 1991, at 4:00 p.m., in room 163. The Task Force members are Ann Cooper, Emma Fischbeck, Louise Frankel, Robert Philibosian and Efrem Zimbalist III.

It was also suggested that the Commission pay closer attention to the request given the Commission by the Board of Supervisor, and that enforcement and follow through are also needed by the Board once it has assigned the Commission tasks. It was suggested that the request be reviewed by the Executive Committee prior to being given to the Commission. It was also suggested that in order to get different view points on a request, that if not enough members volunteer for a Task Force assignment, the Chair would assign members to the Task Force. It was agreed that the Commission should continue its close working relationship with the CAO.

John Campbell's contract is up for renewal on April 30, 1991. It has been proposed that the Commission recommend that the county extend the existing contract, as is, from May 1 through September 30, 1991, until a Sunset Date is set. It was also suggested that if needed, a request for a thirty to forty five day extension be granted. On motion by Dr. Alfred J. Freitag, second by Arthur J. Peever and carried unanimously. The Commission directed the chairman to take the necessary steps to effect the contract extension.

In the absence of Randolph Stockwell, Charles Kaufmann spoke on the Task Force for Real Estate Management. On March 7, 1991, the Task Force had a meeting with the Community Development and Housing Authority. They are trying to come up with plans and programs for underdeveloped properties to generate revenue. Cathy Carr, who is doing research for the Task Force, is trying to organize real estate development in a new concept. So far, one text has been located called Managerial Real Estate Corporation/Real Estate Asset Management. The Task Force is currently in the process of locating more information. Randolph Stockwell believes an emphasis should be placed on efficient management of current properties, and how we can best handle them. The Task Force is planning to meet with additional counties, and county personnel by the end of April. At the next Commission meeting, an updated report will be given.

John Campbell reported that the Blue Ribbon Committee on Children's Services has announced its recommendations and will release its report shortly. The recommendations appear to be quite similar to those of the Economy and Efficiency Commission. Recent opposition has begun to surface. Once the report is available, the Economy and Efficiency Task Force should meet to comment.

V. PRESENTATION

Barry J. Nidorf, Chief Probation Officer for Los Angeles County.

Subject: Roles and Operations of the Probation function; Major Current Issues.

The Los Angeles County Probation Department is the largest operation in the country. There are 4,000 employees, who supervise over 90,000 adults, two-thirds of whom are felons. The department also supervises 18,000 juveniles, operates three juvenile halls, and runs nineteen forestry camps, which are treatment facilities for juveniles. The camps are their last stop before being sent to the Youth Authority. In the past, fifty percent of funds were paid by the State. Now, for all intent and purposes, one hundred percent is paid by the County.

The primary issue facing the Probation Department revolves around resources and dollars. When taxpayers passed proposition 13, it took its toll and reduced the department's budget by fifty percent, and all preventive services were stopped. The budget in 1984 was \$150 million dollars. This year, due to inflation, the opening of more beds, and the reduction in state subsidies, the gross budget is \$240 million. There has also been a tremendous shift in resources. Field services are declining to below forty percent. The least serious adult cases (low risk cases) have been put on computer (bank load) which saves the county money.

Whereas it would normally cost \$20,000 a year to care for someone in jail, it would cost only \$8,000 to put that same person on intensive supervision to closely track their performance while on probation. The additional \$12,000 could be used to better existing programs or be used for implementing new programs.

The specialized programs which are excluded from "bank load", are gang cases, narcotics testing cases, domestic diversion cases, and intensive surveillances. These programs will continue regardless of budget changes.

Another issue facing the Department is prevention, which is critical in terms of long range savings to the County. Over a year ago, the Probation Department got back into gang prevention. One gang prevention unit was put in each supervisorial district, where deputies work on campus in elementary and junior high schools identifying siblings of hard core gang members, or those students who display gang behaviors, and talk with them. The program is being evaluated by the Criminal Justice Department in Long Beach, where researchers have found dramatic improvements in those students who took part in the program. The program has been extremely successful. The Probation Department also arranges various types of excursions where kids from various backgrounds, participate in events. More programs like these are needed, and every year proposals are made by the Probation Department to the Board to expand these types of programs.

The State is spending billions of dollars building new prisons. The budget for the Department of Probations will be approaching two billion dollars in operations a year. Out of the entire criminal justice budget in the State, less than eighteen percent goes to the Department of Probation, and yet they handle eighty percent of the people going through the court systems. We need to find a way to stop spiraling cost. The Sheriff's jail budget in the next three years will approach a billion dollars for jail cost alone. We are putting the wrong type of people in prison, and we are spending way to much money on building new prisons.

There is a national move, already acquired in many states, and the Probation Department has some legislation pending, to develop what is known as the Community Corrections Act for State of California. There are currently three versions of the Community Corrections Act pending, by three different senators. What the states who have the Community Correction Acts are doing is putting some of the low risk people (those with less than a year sentence) in other types of programs as an alternative to jail, and using some of the money that would go toward building new prisons, into the community. We have increased our prison population tremendously by locking up a lot of people, which cost \$20,000 a year in state prison, and \$30,000 a year in Youth Authority. We aren't doing anything with the people because there are no programs to assist them. The Los Angeles County Probation Department is actively pursuing the Community Corrections Act, because we need to restore a balance in funding between the state and our local communities. There has been a continual erosion of resources at the local level for both the Probation Department functions and the Sheriff Departments functions.

One of the Probation Departments most successful juvenile program is called JAWS, it's a juvenile work program, which is an alternative to juvenile hall for first time offenders. Contracts are signed with schools, airports, and other agencies to clean up the area. This is done on the weekends with groups of ten juveniles. Another alternative is community service work, which can also be assigned by a judge on an individual basis. Until last October, the Probation Department didn't have a drug rehabilitation program for juveniles. The first drug treatment boot camp opened, and is doing very well. It was found that sixty percent of the juveniles had illegal substance(s) in their body at the time of their arrest. The drug testing program for adults is budgeted for about 10,000 cases out of 90,000 cases.

The penal system has changed to where we deal with probation in a different way then in the past. Traditionally, until the 1980's, the Probation Department was a social work service, and rehabilitation treatment service. Today, the nature of the Probation Department has changed, by making sure that the courts orders are enforced, and to keep track of probationers.

Today, a one year sentence could mean six months actual time served. With time off for good behavior, and a credit of one day for every day served, a person serving seven years may actually serve two and a half to three years. So judges give them more sentences, which means they served more time. The more time they serve, the more crowded we get, the more crowded we get the sooner we let them out. The Sheriff, who determines the release dates of jail prisoners, can only have up to a total of 22,000 prisoners in a jail. We need to find some way to stop the growth of the number of people being sent to prison, and come up with other alternatives that will make an impact so new prisons won't have to be build.

The Probation Department is currently computerizing its department. They are also working with the County Productivity Investment Fund, and the Xerox Corporation on an exciting new project, where the Probation Department would probably be able do away with paper transmission of court reports. If the project is successful, there is a possibility that the program can be leased out to other counties and become a source of revenue for the Probation Department.

#### VI COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM VISITORS

Michael Thompson, with the Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Commission, agreed that contracting out the remaining ten percent of operations for the Alcohol and Drug Administration would not be feasible, since the ADA is already contracting out 90% of its operations. He suggested a meeting with the Commissions Task Force and his own Task Force, as the issues being discussed today, raised some of the same issues and questions, his Commission has discussed at their meetings in the past. Mr. Thompson will be attending the Commissions Task Force first meeting on the subject on April 12, 1991.

There is a requirement by the county funding process how money should be allocated to each county department, with money earmarked for law enforcement programs. There are also public hearings on the subject to get the publics opinion on how the money should be allotted.

#### VII ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by vote of the Commissioners present.

ATTENDANCE

April 3, 1991

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Gunther W. Buerk  
Emma E. Fischbeck  
Louise Frankel  
Dr. Alfred Freitag  
Chun Y. Lee  
Arthur J. Peever  
Robert Philibosian  
Wally Thor  
Betty Trotter  
Robert L. Williams  
Efrem Zimbalist III

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED

Alfred Balderrama  
George Bodle  
Ann King Cooper  
Joe Crail  
Jack Drown  
Robert J. Lowe  
Abraham M. Lurie  
Lauro J. Neri  
Daniel M. Shapiro  
Randolph Stockwell

GUEST

Barry J. Nidorf, Chief Probation Officer for the County of Los Angeles.

VISITORS

Michael Thompson, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office, Office of Criminal Justice and Planning.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
***ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION***

Gunther W. Buerk, *Chairperson*  
Betty Trotter, *Vice Chairperson*

- Alfred P. Balderrama
- George E. Bodle
- Ann King Cooper
- Joe Crail
- Jack Drown
- Emma E. Fischbeck
- Louise Frankel
- Dr. Alfred J. Freitag
- Chun Y. Lee
- Robert J. Lowe
- Abraham M. Lurie
- Lauro J. Neri
- Arthur J. Peever
- Robert H. Philibosian
- Daniel M. Shapiro
- Randolph B. Stockwell
- Wally Thor
- Robert L. Williams
- Ethem Zimbalist, III

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET  
COMMISSION MEETING: APRIL 3, 1991

	<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
1.	<i>Michael Thompson</i>	<i>Narcotics Dangerous Drug Commission</i>
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
***ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION***

APRIL 3, 1991

Arthur J. Peever, *Chairperson*  
Ehren Zimballat, III, *Vice Chairperson*

ROOM 864-A, HALL OF ADMINISTRATION

9:30 A.M.

COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Alfred P. Balderrama  
George E. Bodle  
Gunther W. Buerk  
Ann King Cooper  
Joe Crall  
Jack Drown  
Emma E. Flachbeck  
Louise Frankel  
Dr. Alfred J. Freitag  
Chun Y. Lee  
Robert J. Lowe  
Abraham M. Lurie  
Lauro J. Neri  
Robert H. Philboasian  
Daniel M. Shapiro  
Randolph B. Stockwell  
Wally Thor  
Betty Trotter  
Robert L. Williams

- I. Introductions and Announcements
- II. Approval of Commissioners absences
- III. Approval of Minutes of March 6, 1991
- IV. Old Business
  - Task Force Status Reports
    - Task Force on Alcohol and Drug Program Administration
    - Task Force on Real Estate Management
  - Additional Task Force Business
- V. Presentation 11:00 A.M.
  - Barry J. Nidorf, Chief Probation Officer
    - Subject: Roles and Operations of the Probation function; Major Current Issues
- VI. New Business
  - Resolution regarding request for extension of John Campbell's contract.
  - Executive Committee Report, New task forces
- VII. Comments and Suggestions from Visitors
- VIII. Adjournment