

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY
CITIZENS ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMITTEE**

ROOM 372, HALL OF ADMINISTRATION / 500 WEST TEMPLE / LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 / 625-3611 Ext 64605

September 13, 1967

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California

Raymond Arbuthnot
John C. Bollens
Max Candiotty
Myron I. Carr, Jr.
P.S. Magruder
Mrs. Wayne Licher
Kiyoshi Maruyama
Edward J. Macke
Irvin Mazzei
Maurice McAlister
Harold C. McClellan
Ferdinand Mendenhall
Ruben Mitchell
A. C. Rubel
Mrs. Benjamin Eric Smith
J. B. Roche,
Executive Secretary

Gentlemen:

CONSOLIDATION OF SHERIFF-MARSHAL
BAILIFF' AND CIVIL PROCESS FUNCTIONS

At the meeting of March 7, 1967, your Board requested the Citizens Economy and Efficiency Committee to study the feasibility of combining the bailiff and civil process functions of the Marshal and the Sheriff and report back to your Board. Our recommendations and findings are submitted herewith.

During the course of our study, we discussed the issues with the Chief Administrative Officer, the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, the Presiding Judge of the Los Angeles Municipal Court, the Chairman of the Municipal Court Judges Association, the Sheriff, and the Marshal, as requested by your Board order. All parties gave us their full cooperation and assistance. We should make clear, however, that the recommendations contained in this report are entirely those of the Economy and Efficiency Committee.

Our Committee wants to thank the firm of TRW Systems, who loaned us the services of two systems specialists, Mr. Royce McKinley and Mr. Carl Rosen, to assist us in this study. These two men have worked with us for four months and have provided us with excellent assistance in completing this report.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT MITCHELL
Acting Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
I. Summary and Recommendations	1
A. Synopsis of Proposal and Savings	2
B. Reasons for Recommending Consolidation of Bailiff and Civil Process Functions Under the Sheriff	3
C. Administration of Personnel Assignments and Transfers	7
D. Action to be Taken by the Board of Supervisors	8
II. Present Organizations	9
A. Marshal's Organization	9
B. Sheriff's Civil Division Organization	12
III. Alternate Consolidation Models	15
IV. Proposed Organization	17
A. Organizational Characteristics of the Combined Operations	17
B. Staffing and Work Load Characteristics of the Combined Operations	18
C. Personnel Reduction in the Sheriff's Transportation Division	26
D. Facility and Equipment Needs of the Combined Operations	27
V. Implementation Plan	31
Appendix A - Bailiff and Civil Process Operations in Other California Counties	33
Appendix B - Survey Procedure	35

I - SUMMARY AND RECONMENDATIONS

In the administration of bailiff and civil process functions in Los Angeles County, the responsibilities of the Sheriff's Civil Division and the Marshal's Department are clearly overlapping. The Sheriff provides bailiffs for the Superior Court - the Marshal for all Municipal Courts. The Sheriff serves writs and processes issued by any court - so does the Marshal. Together the two organizations employ 775 people to administer these functions at a total cost of over nine million dollars.

Our conclusion, after a careful study of the Sheriff's Civil Division and the Marshal's Department, is that there is absolutely no justification for continuing this costly and wasteful duplication. We estimate that consolidation of the two organizations will result in a net reduction of 110 positions and an annual savings of \$1,1433,616 in personnel costs in the affected functions. We should emphasize that we are certain that these savings can be achieved without deterioration of any sort in the present level of service.

Our study also indicates that additional savings may be realized in facilities and equipment. However, because a number of intangibles are involved, it is impossible to make a valid estimate of total savings in these areas.

RECOMMENDATION

As we explain later in this section, the full benefit of these savings can only be realized by consolidation under the

Sheriff. We therefore recommend that your Board take all necessary action to secure State legislation that will enable the County to consolidate the bailiff and civil process' functions under the Sheriff.

A. Synopsis of Proposal and Savings

The consolidated organization as recommended will operate as the Civil Division of the Sheriff's Office. In the proposed organization, the County is divided into three areas - Central, West, and East. Each area is further subdivided into districts and divisions. A chart of the proposed organization is shown in Figure 1.

The cost savings to be gained from the consolidation of the bailiff and civil process functions are outlined below. We should emphasize that throughout our study we have purposely adopted a conservative approach in estimating potential savings. Although we believe there is opportunity for increasing efficiency in the new organization, we have based our estimates strictly on current performance in the present organizations.

1. Consolidation and streamlining of functions will provide \$671,648 in personnel savings, direct and indirect. This will be accomplished through elimination of duplicated effort and revised allocations of field and office staffing which will result in a reduction of 49 positions.

2. Absorption of administrative costs by the Sheriff will produce \$308,309 in personnel savings. Currently, the Marshal's Department requires its own administrative staff to carry out such duties as

personnel administration, training, payroll, budgetary control, communications, technical research, and administrative analysis. In the consolidated organization, these duties will be assumed by the Administrative and Technical Services Divisions of the Sheriff's Office with a small addition in clerical staffing. The net reduction in administrative personnel will be 24 positions.

3. Reduction in the number of Deputy Sheriffs required for custody of prisoners in Municipal Courtrooms will produce \$453,659 in savings. Because of restrictions in Section 4004 of the Penal Code, the Marshal cannot take over from the Sheriff custody of prisoners appearing before the Municipal Court, unless ordered to do so by the Court. This has required the presence of both Deputy Marshals (bailiffs) and Deputy Sheriffs (prisoner custody) in the same Municipal Courtroom. Consolidation will allow the Sheriff to reduce personnel in his Transportation Division by 37 deputies.

4. As we have indicated, additional savings may be realized through reduction of facility and equipment requirements. A full analysis of these savings is presented in Section IV.

B. Reasons for Recommending Consolidation of Bailiff and Civil Process Functions Under the Sheriff

1. The full benefit of personnel savings can only be realized by consolidation under the Sheriff.

While both the Marshal and Sheriff can achieve similar savings through consolidation of the civil process function, administrative savings amounting to over \$300,000 can only be achieved under the Sheriff. The reason is that the Sheriff's present Administrative and Technical Services Divisions will be able to assume the functions now performed by the Marshal's administrative staff. In contrast, consolidation under the Marshal would require the Marshal to maintain his present administrative staff, with perhaps some increase for additional work load. At the same time, the Sheriff would need to maintain his present administrative staff at close to its present level. No equivalent reduction in administrative personnel would be possible.

In addition, the savings of over \$450,000, attributable to the reduction in deputies required for prisoner custody, probably cannot be realized fully unless the consolidation is made under the Sheriff. Currently, Section 4004 of the Penal Code restricts the Sheriff from turning over to the Marshal custody of prisoners appearing before the Municipal Court. However, this Section could be amended to make the Marshal responsible for custody of prisoners in the Courtroom. The County Counsel

has advised us also that the Municipal Courts could, if they desired, establish a routine procedure for ordering the Sheriff to turn over custody of prisoners to the Marshal in the courtroom. In either case, the procedure would involve complexities in the shifting of responsibility for custody between the Sheriff and the Marshal. It is therefore doubtful that the Sheriff could reduce his Transportation Division by 37 deputies without consolidation under the Sheriff.

2. Consolidation under the Sheriff will establish one County-wide police agency. The present structure allows in effect two County-wide police agencies competing with each other in law enforcement activities and in the recruitment of new personnel. The Marshal's Department has constantly strived to attain police-agency status. Current efforts include requesting authority from the State Legislature to equip vehicles with red lights and sirens despite County opposition. The problem of recruiting Deputy Sheriffs has been aggravated by the Marshal's ability to offer applicants more favorable working hours and working conditions at the same pay. This undesirable competition will be eliminated through consolidation under the Sheriff.

Moreover, if the present divided operation continues, the degree of overlapping and duplicated effort can only increase. As each new Court facility

is opened, both the Sheriff and the Marshal will require office space, much of which will be used to perform the same functions. This has already occurred in the Long Beach, Van Nuys, and Torrance Court facilities. As long as the current organizational split exists, it will continue to occur.

3. Consolidation will add 305 uniformed personnel to the Sheriff's office who will be available for duty in emergency situations under the single command of the Sheriff. It should be made clear, of course, that the main duty of the bailiff and civil process personnel is to serve the Courts, not to put down riots or assist in other emergency situations. However, the advantage that this additional manpower will provide the Sheriff in meeting emergencies cannot be overlooked.

In addition, the consolidation will add 124 police automobiles to the Sheriff's present fleet of 368 patrol vehicles. Cost of these vehicles will be offset by the elimination of 136 vehicles now being used by the Marshal. The deterrent effect of 124 additional police automobiles on City and County streets is difficult to measure, but clearly it is one more positive factor favoring consolidation under the Sheriff.

4. The present awkward division of responsibility for County civil process and bailiff activities between the Board of Supervisors and the State Legislature will be eliminated. The number, classification, and pay schedule of positions in the Marshal's Department are now determined by the State Legislature. The Board of Supervisors, on the other hand, is responsible for setting the County-wide tax levy which supports the operations of the Marshal's Department. We believe that more effective budgetary control can be achieved by placing these activities directly under the control of the Board of Supervisors.

C. Administration of Personnel Assignments and Transfers

It should be possible to transfer all employees in both departments whose positions are being phased out to vacant positions in the Sheriff's Department or elsewhere in the County. In view of the current difficulty which the Sheriff and other County departments are experiencing in recruiting qualified personnel, there should be little difficulty in placing the affected employees in positions comparable to those they now hold. We can expect also that normal attrition will act as a factor in reducing placement requirements.

We recognize that the reduction in the number and level of management and supervisory positions which we recommend will require a downward reclassification of duties and responsibilities in some cases. However, this action can be taken with

minimum salary disruption through the technique of special step placement. Recommendations for carrying out the implementation plan are outlined in Section V of this report.

D. Action to be taken by the Board of Supervisors

We urge your Board to use all of the County's resources to secure legislation enabling consolidation of the bailiff and civil process functions under the Sheriff. Your attention is called to the attached charts which illustrate graphically the savings to be realized by consolidation.

II - PRESENT ORGANIZATIONS

The Marshal's Department and the Sheriff's Civil Division are both responsible for Court bailiff functions. The Marshal is responsible for bailiffing Municipal Courts. The Sheriff is responsible for bailiffing Superior Courts. These two organizations also are responsible for the serving of writs and processes. Since any Court may direct either the Sheriff or the Marshal to serve papers, they both serve all Courts. Their responsibilities are thus clearly overlapping, although the larger proportion of processes are handled by the Marshal.

A. Marshal's Organization

The present County-wide Marshal's Department was created in 1951 by the State Legislature at the time of inferior court reorganization. Prior to that time, the then eight Municipal Courts of Los Angeles County were each served by its own Marshal. The present Marshal serves all twenty-four Municipal Courts. The Marshal's administrative offices are located in the County Courthouse.

The total 1967-68 budget for the Marshal amounts to \$4,586,232, including the funding for 488 positions. (This is an official budget figure reflecting only direct salary expense. For a complete analysis covering both direct and indirect costs, see Figure 5.) Of this total, 150 Deputy Marshals are allocated for the bailiff function and

Deputy Marshals for the process serving function. In addition to the basic functions, the Marshal handles jury summons for the Municipal Court and conducts inspections of vehicles cited for mechanical defects.

The Marshal's Department is characterized by a decentralized operation based on two major areas subdivided into four districts each. Twenty-eight division offices operate within the framework of the eight districts. The Marshal is required by State law to have an office at every location of the Municipal Court. The Los Angeles district is both a district and division within itself. The other seven districts have anywhere from three to five division offices. Inspectors supervise the two areas and Captains supervise the eight districts. For the most part, Lieutenants supervise the division offices. An organization chart of the Marshal's Department is shown in Figure 4. Figure 5 presents a summary of the 1967-68 manpower allocation and costs by district.

For 1966-67, the average number of processes served per Deputy Marshal was 4,309, and the average number of processes serviced per clerk was 5,518. The Marshal handled over of the total work load performed by both organizations. The 27 division offices outside of Los Angeles handled 82% of the Marshal's total work load. Figure 6 presents a summary of 1966-67 work load.

It is interesting to note in Figure 6 that some districts are experiencing a significantly lower average in the number of processes served per deputy than other districts. Also, there is a variance of 3,900 processes per clerk between the high and low averages for the districts, and there is a variance of 2,000 or more processes per clerk between five districts and the district with the highest average.

Our Committee did not analyze the reasons for these discrepancies, since such analysis was not within the scope of our study. Although these discrepancies may be justified because of differences in working situations, they do raise a question about the relative efficiency of the various offices. The 1966 Grand Jury has also questioned the efficiency of clerical performance in some areas of the Marshal's Department. Consequently, later in this report in our discussion of the proposed organization, we recommend that the Management Services Division of the Chief Administrative Office conduct a study to develop standard work procedures to improve clerical efficiency in the new organization.

The Marshal's Department is supported by the County-wide tax levy, but the number, classification, and pay schedule of positions, are determined by the State Legislature. The Marshal himself is appointed by a majority of Municipal Court Judges and not by the Board of Supervisors, which is

responsible for setting the County-wide tax levy. Because of cooperation between the Municipal Courts, the present Marshal, and the Board of Supervisors, the lack of control by the County has not been a serious problem. However, with such a division of responsibility, there is always the possibility of serious differences arising to hinder effective budgetary control.

B. Sheriff's Civil Division Organization

The Sheriff's civil operation is primarily a centralized operation. The main office, like that of the Marshal, is located in the County Courthouse. Branch offices are located in Long Beach, Torrance, and Van Nuys, and at the Malibu and Catalina Justice Courts. Processes are also served from nine Sheriff's stations; however, these processes are received and handled in the main office prior to field service. An organization chart of the Sheriff's Civil Division is shown in Figure 7.

The Sheriff's Civil Division 1967-68 budget for personnel amounts to \$2,591,941 for 286.5 funded positions. (This amount covers direct expense only. See Figure 8 for complete analysis of total personnel costs, both direct and indirect.) This budget figure includes funding for 190.5 Deputy Sheriffs for the bailiff function and 30 Deputy Sheriffs for the process serving function. The total budget figure, including services, supplies, and equipment for the Civil Division, is not available because total Civil Division costs are not isolated in the Sheriff's budget. A summary of the Civil Division's

1967-68 manpower allocation is shown in Figure 8. Figure 9 presents a summary of 1966-67 work load data.

As Figure 9 indicates, the relative averages for processes served per deputy are lower for the Sheriff than for the Marshal. This can be attributed in part to the higher average miles per process which the Sheriff travels because of the smaller number of division offices. Our analysis indicates that the Sheriff's deputies travel on the average over twice the distance of the Marshal for serving a process.

The much lower volume of processes served by the Sheriff also accounts, in part, for the lower averages since the higher the volume, the better the chance for efficient scheduling and routing of deputies serving processes. It is clear, then, that the Marshal is in a more favorable position than is the Sheriff, insofar as location of offices is concerned. We have observed no other differences in the Marshal's process serving methods which would account for his higher averages. Consequently, we have not considered the difference in averages to be a significant factor in evaluating consolidation either under the Marshal or the Sheriff.

On the other hand, we believe there is little justification for the lower clerical productivity of the Sheriff's Civil Division. This poor performance indicates a real need for work simplification and improved performance analysis in this Division. As we indicated in our discussion of the Marshal's Office, we are recommending that the Management Services

Division of the Chief Administrative Office conduct a study to develop standard work procedures to improve clerical efficiency in the new organization.

III - ALTERNATE CONSOLIDATION MODELS

After thorough analysis of the present organizations, we determined that there were three practical alternatives for consolidating the bailiff and civil process functions:

- (1) Consolidation under the Sheriff
- (2) Consolidation under the Marshal
- (3) Consolidation of bailiff functions under the Sheriff and civil process functions under the Marshal

We examined and evaluated staffing requirements, organizational relationships, and work load characteristics for each activity of the present organizations. Consequently, we were able to identify the basic features that must be built into each consolidation model. We then constructed the three consolidation models. We discussed the Sheriff's model with the Sheriff and Chiefs of the Sheriff's Civil and Administrative Divisions, and the Marshal's model with the Marshal and Assistant Marshal. In each case, they accepted our model as the criteria for the consolidated organization under their Jurisdiction.

Consolidation under the Marshal did not offer the same degree of streamlining that was available in consolidation under the Sheriff. While both models required the same number of line personnel, the Marshal could not achieve the administrative savings of \$308,309 that can be attained through consolidation under the Sheriff. This in addition to the potential reduction of 37 transportation deputies and the advantage

of one County-wide police agency, were the key factors which influenced our decision in favor of the Sheriff's consolidation model.

We rejected the third model because it too could not match the cost savings possible through consolidation under the Sheriff. Moreover, this type of consolidation could not provide the flexibility of interchanging personnel between bailiff and civil process activities.

IV - PROPOSED ORGANIZATION

Section I of this report summarized the framework of our recommended reorganization. As proposed, this organization would function as the Civil Division of the Sheriff's Office. Figure 1 illustrates the recommended organization.

A. Organizational Characteristics of the Combined Operations

As we indicated in Section I, our proposed organization calls for the County to be divided into three areas - Central, West, and East. The bailiff and civil process activities in each area will be directed by an Inspector reporting to the Chief of the Civil Division. The three areas are divided into districts under the direction of a Captain. The districts are further subdivided into divisions, each under the supervision of a Sergeant. This structure is designed to provide either the same or a superior level of service over that which now exists.

As Figure 1 indicates, each district and division will be responsible for both civil process and bailiff functions. Since the Los Angeles district will not contain division offices, it will be organized into separate civil process and bailiff functions under the area Inspector. Because of the high density of court activity, each of these operations will be directed by a Captain.

Each district will have a headquarters office for district supervision. Make-up and service return work, filing, and car inspections will be conducted at each office in the district. Serving of processes in the field will be routed out of each office in the district. However, levy crew work (attachment

of real or personal property) should be routed out of the headquarters office in each district, unless peculiar circumstances dictate that this work should also be routed from other offices in the district.

As in the present organizations, much less time will be required for supervision of bailiffs in the district and division offices than for supervision of the civil process deputies. Since each bailiff is assigned to a particular court, his working superior is actually the judge of that court. The supervisory responsibility in district and division offices will be limited chiefly to courtroom assignments and liaison with the judges to insure performance satisfactory to the court.

In cooperation with the judges, and insofar as no interference is created with the court operations, the open time of bailiffs should be utilized by division supervisors for helping with civil process activities.

B. Staffing and Work Load Characteristics of the Combined Operations

Our recommended staffing for the consolidated organization as compared with present staffing in both organizations is summarized in the following tabulation:

	<u>Present Combined</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Reduction</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Supervisory Positions	90	68	22	24%
Deputy-Bailiffs	340.5	340.5	--	--
Deputy-Civil Process & Administrative	178	145	33	19%
Clerical	<u>166</u>	<u>148*</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>11%</u>
Total	774.5	701.5	73**	9%

*This figure includes eight clerks assigned to the Administrative Division to provide support to the Civil Division. Total personnel in the Civil Division is therefore 693.5.

**As previously indicated, 37 fewer deputies will be required in the Transportation Division, but are not included in this tabulation.

1. Supervisory Positions

The reduction in supervisory positions will be accomplished through elimination of supervisory activities which will become excess once offices and personnel are consolidated. The new organization will require four top-management positions, whereas the combined present operations have seven such positions. Three Captains and three Sergeants will be eliminated in the absorption of the Marshal's staff services by the Sheriff's Administrative and Technical Services Divisions. One Captain, three Lieutenants, and nine Sergeants, will be eliminated through consolidation of other supervisory assignments. The result will be a net reduction of twenty-two supervisory positions.

In addition, fifteen Lieutenant positions and three Senior Deputy positions will be replaced in division offices with Sergeants. These eighteen new Sergeant positions added to twenty-eight Sergeant positions already allocated to the consolidated operation accounts for a total of 46 Sergeants in the new organization. Therefore, the net reduction in Sergeant positions will be the difference between 40 in the present organizations and 28 in the new organization, or 12 positions. Figure 10 presents a summary of these changes.

Although the replacement of Lieutenants will not reduce supervisory positions, it will produce approximately \$30,000 in direct salary savings each year. However, we believe the key factor in this recommendation is not the dollar savings involved but the improvement in supervisory structure which will result. In the present organizations, Lieutenants are typically assigned as supervisors of division offices. Sergeants are assigned either as assistants under the Lieutenants or as supervisors of smaller division offices.

In the proposed organization, Lieutenants will be assigned as deputy commanders under the Captain in each district. Sergeants will be assigned as the supervisor in all division offices. In effect, this shift will upgrade the supervisory responsibilities of each position. At the same time, it will provide a more logical and efficient use of supervisory personnel.

We believe that Sergeants can adequately handle the level of responsibility required for supervision of division offices. Since a Captain and a Lieutenant are assigned to each district

headquarters office and no district has more than five division offices, there should be no lack of higher level support for the Sergeants in handling any unique problem. The Sheriff agrees with this conclusion.

Although our observations indicate an excess of supervision in some areas of the present organizations, we have used current supervisory ratios in both organizations as the basis for allocation of supervision in our consolidated model. The typical supervisory ratio in the civil process function in both organizations is one supervisor to six employees. In the bailiff function the ratio varies from one supervisor to ten to as high as one supervisor to twenty or more employees.

As we have explained, the requirement for supervision of the bailiffs is relatively light. Consequently, the supervisory ratio in the bailiff function is much higher than in the civil process function. This difference in ratios explains why the average supervisory ratio in the Sheriff's Civil Division (one to eleven) is higher than that in the Marshal's Office (one to six). In the Marshalls Office, 150 Deputy Marshals, or 54% of all deputies in both functions, are assigned to the bailiff operation. In the Sheriff's Civil Division, 191 Deputy Sheriffs, or 86% of all deputies, are assigned to the bailiff function. The much higher percentage of bailiffs in the Sheriff's Civil Division consequently accounts for the higher overall supervisory ratio.

The supervisory ratio in the civil process function of the proposed organization - with the exception of District 1 - is one supervisor to six employees or less, the same ratio which now exists in the present organizations. In the bailiff operation, it is one to eighteen, again very close to that which prevails in the current organizations.

In District 1, the ratio in the civil process function is one supervisor to ten employees. In the bailiff function, it is one supervisor to 24 employees. Since District 1 is centralized in one office, we believe the higher ratio is entirely feasible. We should emphasize, however that our projection for all districts is not based upon a statistical assumption but rather upon our analysis of each district based upon current operations in both the Marshal and Sheriff's Offices. Because our analysis is based upon current performance, it should not be concluded that further streamlining may not be practical, once sufficient experience with the new organization is gained.

2. Bailiff Positions

As the tabulation indicates, no reduction in the number of bailiffs is recommended for the consolidated organization. Bailiffs are now assigned by the Marshal and the Sheriff on the request of the Municipal and Superior Court judges. By State law, neither the Marshal nor the Sheriff can refuse these requests. Since these circumstances will not change under the new organization, the number of bailiffs will remain the same, unless the judges themselves modify their requests.

3. Administrative and Civil Process Positions

In the administrative and civil process area, we estimate a reduction of 33 deputies. Ten of these deputies will be eliminated through the absorption of the Marshal's staff services by the Sheriff's Administrative and Technical Services Divisions. In addition, we propose to eliminate 12 deputies from the present process serving operations as a result of our analysis of current performance in each district. This analysis is presented in Figures 11, 12, and 13.

Figures 11 and 12 present an estimate of the 1967-68~ work load in the Marshal and Sheriff's Departments, including processes served in the field (col. 2). The charts indicate the number of deputies budgeted for 1967-68 for serving processes (col. 3) and the average number of processes served per deputy (col. 4). Figure 13 presents the same data projected for the consolidated organization. In this chart, the number of processes served in the field (col. 2) represents the combined work load estimates of the Marshal and Sheriff's Departments.

The number of deputies allocated for each district (col. 3) was then established on the performance standards in the Marshal's Department shown in Figure 11. Since the estimated volume in the Marshal's Department is closest to that of the consolidated organization, we have used the Marshal's performance as the basis for our standards. To these standards established for each district, we have added a small percentage increase (2%) which we believe can be expected as a result of the higher volume of processes served

in the consolidated organization.

We believe that the substantial variation in performance averages within both the Marshal and the Sheriff's offices indicates an opportunity for increased efficiency, particularly in those districts with low averages. Here, as in the clerical area, we recommend that the Management Services Division conduct a study to develop uniform administrative controls and procedures for application to all divisions of the new organization. However, we have incorporated no assumption in our allocation of manpower that the new organization would increase efficiency by improving administrative controls except for improved routing and scheduling due to higher volume. Thus, our estimate of savings is based entirely upon the elimination of duplicated effort and the economies in assignment of personnel which consolidation enables.

In addition to the above twenty-two deputies, we have eliminated eleven other deputy positions which are currently assigned to counter service in both organizations. Both the Marshal and the Sheriff now use deputies at the counter in some offices and clerks in other offices. We feel that uniformed personnel should be used for functions more appropriate to their training. In this area their proper place is in the field serving processes.

4. Clerical Positions

The elimination of these deputies is closely associated with the reduction of eighteen positions in the clerical

category. As Figures 11 and 12 indicate, the counter deputies have been included in the column of ' clerical positions (col. 6), and therefore have figured in the measurement of ' current clerical averages (col. 7). These averages, again, are based on estimated 1967-68 work loads. Figure 13 presents the same data projected for the consolidated organization. The averages, again, are based on performance standards in the Marshal's Department with the addition of a small improvement factor (2%) attributable to increased volume. Clerical personnel (col. 6) were then allocated to each district on the basis of these standards (col. 7).

We also suggest that bookkeeping activities should be centralized in the headquarters office of each district. Additional savings in clerical personnel should be realized if such centralization is effected. We recommend that this possibility be included as part of the study of work procedures in the present organization which we are recommending be conducted by the Management Services Division.

5. Jury Summons and Car Inspections

The jury summons and car inspection work would continue to be assigned in the new organization as it is now in each district of the Marshal's Department (Figures 11 and 13, cols 8 and 9). For the most part, Jury summons work is performed by bailiffs who are merely assisting the Clerk of the Municipal Court in this area. In District 5 of the Marshalls Department, all of this work is performed by the Clerk of the Municipal Court. Recently, a State law was

enacted which permits the Superior Court Jury Commissioner to impanel juries for both the Municipal and Superior Courts, provided that a majority of the judges in each Municipal Court District approve. Wherever such consolidations are effected, the jury summons work could be performed by the Superior Court Jury Commissioner.

Since car inspections are limited in number and occur in a sporadic fashion during the course of a day, they are performed by whatever uniformed personnel is available in each division office at that time. Car inspections, therefore, will be assigned in the new organization, as in the old, as part of the general office routine.

Figure 14 gives a complete summary of all manpower costs by district in the proposed organization.

C. Personnel Reduction in the Sheriff's Transportation Division

Consolidation of the bailiff functions under the Sheriff will enable his Transportation Division to reduce its manpower by 37 deputies. As we previously indicated, Section 4004 of the Penal Code requires the presence of a Deputy Marshal and a Deputy Sheriff in a Municipal Courtroom at the same time. The Deputy Marshal is required as bailiff for the Court and the Deputy Sheriff is required for prisoner custody. If the bailiffs for the Municipal Court were Deputy Sheriffs, only one deputy would be required in the Courtroom for both the functions of bailiff and prisoner custody, except in those cases where more than one deputy is now required for prisoner custody.

The assumption by Deputy Sheriffs of dual responsibilities in the courtroom is now done in Superior Court cases. There is nothing to prohibit this same procedure in Municipal Court cases. In those courts where a jailer is required, the Sheriff would still allocate one deputy as jailer. The savings in manpower results from bailiffs assuming custody of prisoners while they are in the courtroom.

Under the present conditions 106 Municipal Courts require 106 Deputy Marshals as bailiffs and 88 Deputy Sheriffs for prisoner custody. The proposal calls for 106 Deputy Sheriffs assuming dual responsibilities of bailiffing and prisoner custody. Fifty-one other Deputy Sheriffs would be required for court lockups, provided as jailers, and to assist in the custody of prisoners in those courtrooms where additional coverage is necessary. Thus, the 88 deputies now used for prisoner custody would be reduced to 51 for a net reduction of 37 deputies. Complete details of this proposal are contained in a report by the Sheriff's Office) dated May 1, 1967.

D. Facility and Equipment Needs of the Combined Operations

In the Los Angeles County Courthouse, 1700 square feet now used by the Marshal for administrative services, and 5000 square feet in the Hall of Justice Annex, now used by the Marshal for communications and storage facilities, will no longer be required in the consolidated organization. In addition, the new organization will not require 8792 square feet in the Los Angeles County Courthouse now used by the

Sheriff's Civil Division. Offices now used by the Marshal and Sheriff in Long Beach, Torrance, and Van Nuys can also be combined, resulting in savings of approximately 1800 square feet in Long Beach, 1600 square feet in Torrance, and 1700 square feet in Van Nuys. Thus, the consolidation should result in immediate space savings of 20, 592 square feet.

By moving other functions, now using leased space, into these areas, there is an indicated annual savings of approximately \$41,000 based on the County's average cost for leasing space. However, this figure should be looked upon with caution. These savings depend upon the ability of the County to reduce its lease expense by moving activities which otherwise would require leased space into these facilities. We suspect that in some cases, County departments using these buildings will place strong demands on this additional space for their own present and future needs. Thus, while a reduction of 20,000 square feet in space requirements should produce some savings, it is difficult to place a reliable dollar figure on the amount.

The equipment needs of the consolidated organization will certainly be less than what is now required for the split operations. With respect to automobiles, the Marshal now uses 136 County-owned vehicles. The Sheriff uses 16 vehicles in his Civil Division. Although both Departments also use privately-owned automobiles, the Sheriff makes

greater use of private automobiles than does the Marshal. The consolidated organization should require approximately 140 County-owned vehicles with limited use of privately-owned vehicles. These reductions in transportation requirements result from the consolidation of work forces and the elimination of automobiles assigned to positions no longer required in the consolidated organization.

Currently, the Sheriff uses fully-equipped police-type vehicles for process serving, whereas the Marshal uses compact vehicles that are equipped only with two-way radios. We feel that fully-equipped police vehicles should be used by the Sheriff in the process serving function. This means that an additional 124 police cars will be placed on City and County streets. As we stated in Section I, it is difficult to measure the deterrent effect of these additional vehicles, but it is an advantage of the proposed organization which should not be ignored.

According to the Sheriff's office, the Sheriff's existing communication system can absorb the entire radio communication traffic requirements of the consolidated organization. However, the Sheriff's office has estimated that it will cost approximately \$99,960 to replace the existing one and two frequency communication equipment used in the Marshal's vehicles with four channel eight frequency equipment as presently used in the Sheriff's vehicles.

It is not possible to modify the Marshal's equipment to meet the Sheriff's frequency requirements. However, some part of the \$99,960 would be offset if the County is able to sell the Marshal's radio system. Savings in the future will also be realized through a reduction in equipment purchases, since the Marshal's equipment requirements will be eliminated.

Our conclusion, with respect to automobiles and communication equipment, is that while some savings will be realized in the reduction of overall equipment requirements, these savings are largely offset by the more sophisticated equipment needs of the Sheriff.

Finally, the consolidation of offices and reduction in personnel will release approximately forty desks and chairs and associated office equipment for use by other County departments. We estimate that the resulting reduction in purchase of new equipment will amount to a savings of approximately \$10,000 spread over the next few years.

V - IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

A well-defined and coordinated implementation plan is essential to any reorganization. Problems of employee morale must be eased, continuity of personnel must be maintained, and resistance to change must be minimized. Employees at all levels of both the Sheriff and Marshal's present organizations should be assured of fairness in the implementation of the consolidated organization.

If your Board supports our recommendations and obtains the necessary enabling legislation, we recommend that you request the Sheriff, Marshal, Chief Administrative Officer, and Personnel Director to appoint a team of qualified persons to put the new organization into effect. This team should be held responsible for taking action necessary to:

- (1) Assign personnel to meet all new or changed organizational requirements. Special care should be taken to assure that the most effective use of existing personnel is realized, that all jobs are properly classified, that salary disruption is minimized and that no layoff is necessary.

- (2) Develop training programs for indoctrinating employees in any new duties or functions to which they are assigned. The Sheriff's Training Section should determine the necessity of additional peace officer training for Deputy Marshals.

- (3) Effect uniform procedures for all offices in the consolidated organization.
- (4) Centralize bookkeeping operations in the headquarters office of each district, provided such centralization has been determined to be feasible by the Management Services Division in its study of the present organizations.
- (5) Merge automobiles, facilities, and equipment.
- (6) Maintain data processing continuity through the conversion of manual bookkeeping procedures to automated data processing.

The major requirement in the implementation effort should be to assure that all predicted economies are accomplished within a reasonable period. Once the consolidated organization is operational, the Chief Administrative Officer's Budget Division should review all operating and capital budgets affected by the merger and make the necessary adjustments, including the budget reduction proposed for the Sheriff's Transportation Division.

We have previously recommended that the Management Services Division study work procedures and clerical performance in the present organizations. We recommend that the Management Services Division continue these studies through the implementation phase of the consolidated organization in order to assure that uniform procedures and improved clerical performance are realized in the consolidated organization.

APPENDIX A

Bailiff and Civil Process Operations in Other California Counties

Of the fifty-eight Counties in California, fourteen have both a Marshal and a Sheriff, ten have consolidated offices under the Sheriff, and thirty-four do not have Municipal Courts and consequently do not have a Marshal. Of the fourteen Counties with both a Marshal and a Sheriff, six have considered or are considering consolidation; the other eight Counties have never formally considered consolidation of the two departments. In no case has any County ever consolidated the civil process and bailiff functions under the Marshal.

The duties and responsibilities of the Marshal's Office are established by State law. Consequently, any attempt to consolidate the civil process and bailiff functions under the Sheriff requires either specific legislation for that County, or general legislation covering all Counties. To date, the Legislature has passed only specific enabling legislation.

Kern County is the most recent County to secure such legislation. In this case, the enabling legislation provided for approval by the electorate. In the primary election of June, 1958, the voters approved, and the two functions were consolidated under the Sheriff.

Most recently, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties submitted proposals for consolidation to the 1967 State Legislature. Both proposals were rejected, principally because of

strong lobbying by the Marshals' Association. On the other hand, Solano County was successful in obtaining legislation this year that provides for the Sheriff to perform the bailiff and civil process functions in a newly created Municipal Court district. Solano County has one other Municipal Court district which is served by its own Marshal.

Also this year, the Grand Jury in Ventura County recommended consolidation of the Marshal's office under the Sheriff. The County Executive's office is now conducting a feasibility study scheduled for completion in November.

APPENDIX B

Survey Procedure

Our Committee conducted a complete management analysis of the Marshal's Department and the Sheriff's Civil Division. We interviewed County and Court officials, surveyed operating procedures, analyzed budget allocations and work load data, analyzed organizational structures, and carefully examined the alternatives available in consolidation of the bailiff and civil process functions.

A. Interviews with County and Court Officials

We conducted over fifty interviews with County and Court officials. These officials included:

1. Chief Administrative Officer, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, and personnel of the Budget and Management Services Divisions.
2. Presiding Judge of the Los Angeles Municipal Court.
3. Presiding Judge of the Superior Court and personnel of the Executive Office of the Superior Court.
4. Chairman of the Municipal Court Judges Association.
5. Clerk of the Municipal Court of Los Angeles and subordinate personnel.

6. Director of Personnel and Chief of the Classification Division, Department of Personnel.
7. County Clerk, Chief Deputy County Clerk, and subordinate personnel.
8. Marshal, Assistant Marshal, and subordinate personnel.
9. Sheriff, Assistant Sheriff, Division Chiefs, and subordinate personnel.

B. Survey of Operating Procedures

We visited the Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Torrance offices of the Sheriff's Civil Division, and the Los Angeles Long Beach, Pasadena, Downey, Beverly Hills, Van Nuys, Torrance, and West Covina offices of the Marshal's Department. In our visits to these offices, we discussed office and field operations with command personnel, checked for uniformity of work techniques, observed clerical procedures involved in the receipt and handling of processes, talked to various office and field personnel about their duties, and accompanied deputies serving processes in the field.

C. Analysis of Budget Allocations and Work Load Data

We analyzed budget allocations for the Marshal's Department and the Sheriff's Civil Division for the 1966-67 and 1967-68 fiscal years. The budgetary analysis was correlated to analysis of work load data for 1965-66, 1966-67, and

1967-68. On the basis of data supplied by the Marshal's Department and the Sheriff's Civil Division, we developed our estimate of work load data for 1967-68. As a result of these analyses, we determined the appropriate performance requirements and personnel allocations for the consolidated organization which are discussed in Section IV.