

**This document was generated by AI and is not an official meeting record. It may contain errors.**

## Transcript

March 5, 2025, 5:31PM

**PC Public Safety Cluster 0:05**

Really. Just.

No, it's OK.

I know what she said.

I was.

Oh geez.

Before I'm supposed to be 123.

All right.

Hello. Good morning. Good morning.

We're gonna get started.

Alright so.

We're just starting out.

I see you talking.

All right. Well, welcome.

Welcome to public safety cluster general review order.

First, we'll start with the round of self introductions for the justice departments First District.

Were you putting those opinions?

Is there anyone?

Are there any health cluster folks? If you are here or online, please speak up for your district.

I guess if not, we'll move to 2nd district.

Good morning, everyone.

Italiano Superintendent, Stephanie. And then I have melody of Billy. Who's our assistant justice deputy. And then I have Victoria Gomez, who's our health deputy.

She just raised her hand. Thank you.

And our third district morning, everyone.

Steve Adler, Senior deputy Supervisor Horvath and with me is my colleague Nick

Whiteville, 78 suppliers in my bath and I don't know if our health team is online but. Oh oh, Sophie is online as well. Yes, sure.

OK.

Fine, alright, move to the 4th district.

Hi Kyla. Chloe and Ally are the justice team here for Supervisor Han and we have our health deputy here.

Hi, Esther Lim health deputy for Supervisor Han 4th district.

Yeah. And our chair, 5th district.

Good morning.

Sandra crossing this is Debbie for supervisor Katherine Barker, office of my colleagues introduce themselves. Hi everyone.

Leslie Aminos in the garden's office. This is to be. Hi, my name is Rosie.

I'm a fellow.

OK. Are there anyone online that wants to introduce themselves?

Is there the?

CA

**Chow, Aoife** 2:32

Hi, this is Eve from the 5th District for the health side.

PC

**Public Safety Cluster** 2:36

Great. Thank you very much.

All right. We'll move to real quickly to information items. There are none.

So again, we'll we'll jump that and go straight to the motion item and we will be going with the first motion which is since we have the health companies here, we'll go with the increasing public awareness on the California Good Samaritan laws and excellent access from SD1.

Colleagues, is there a preference if I could go here or there you can do it from your?

So, colleagues, thank you so much for the opportunity to present to you an SD4 motion that Chloe and I will actually be discussing and presenting the title of the motion is increasing public awareness on California Good Samaritan laws and naloxon access.

And this is for the March 18th 2025 board meeting.

So I'm just going to share a little bit about kind of background, just some context and then Chloe will also add as well.

As a preamble kind of goes through. There's been obviously changes in Proposition

36, increasing penalties, things that were once maybe misdemeanors going to felonies.

So we believe that LA County has a role in terms of informing and engaging with providers and community to ensure that we can decrease, continue to decrease the risk associated with overdose and unnecessary arrests.

We also want to, through the motion and through the support of the county departments listed in the motion, increase public awareness around AB 472, which is also known as a Good Samaritan law, and this is to encourage people to seek medical care for an overdose victim.

While protecting them from arrest charge and a prosecution for low level drug violations go to Chloe to see if she is there.

Sure, I can just kind of go in a little bit more depth.

So as we all know, Prop 36.

Reclassified certain drug crimes drug related crimes from misdemeanors to felonies.

And as Esther mentioned, we we have this protection of the Good Samaritan law which was passed in California in 2012 and implemented 2013.

And this is there's two different laws.

This one we're talking about is the 911 Good Samaritan law.

So under this law, someone who seeks medical help for certain drug for a drug related overdose will not be criminally charged for being under the influence or possessing drugs or possessing drug paraphernalia.

So we we feel it's important that first of all, the general public knows about this law, that there's greater awareness around the Good Samaritan law and especially for people who use drugs that they know that they're protected under this law. This will also, you know, of course, help.

Save lives. If people are aware that they're not going to get arrested for calling for help during an overdose, lives will inevitably be saved.

And now that there are changes in criminal classification, as I mentioned, due to Prop 36, it's even more important that people who use drugs know that they're still protected under the Good Samaritan law.

This motion also aims to make sure that law enforcement agencies and and the Sheriff's Department, but also police agencies are and continue to be aware of the Good Samaritan law and are not arresting people unnecessarily, as Esther mentioned. And I think Esther's gonna talk a little bit more about another aspect of this motion that has to do with law enforcement agencies not taking away kind of like essential

opioid antagonists as well.

So I'll pass it back to you, right.

Thank you, Chloe.

So the other piece of this is ensuring that when there are homeless suites, you know of encampments, that first responders, law enforcement are not removing opioid antagonists.

So folks, a lot of times are hearing around or have in their possession, you know, Narcan or other antagonists. And so we want to ensure that when a sweep is done or any sort of similar incident that those are not removed and discarded. We know how not only.

How expensive those items are, and a lot of times it's non profit providers or even county departments who are providing those antagonists. But also you know these are life saving devices.

And so we wanna make sure that you know folks who are high utilizers have this item with them.

And so you know, just to just to share, there's been actually a few articles as recent as October 29th, 2024 specifically in LA City, where these were a lot of complaints from frontline.

Providers who are engaging, or sort of saying people experiencing homelessness, talking about not only Narcan or opioid antagonists being discarded in a way, but also other PR and like asthma inhalers and so forth. And so given you know the media attention on LA City, we thought it was.

Incumbent on county to kind of get in front of this and sure that we're not obviously doing that 'cause that's not the type of media attention we would want.

So our office worked with County Council and DPH Staffs on not only the purpose of this motion, but also the directives.

And there's three directives in here.

I'm not going to go through them all, but really it's about just updating information materials so that our service providers who are working with high utilisers are aware.

Of not only you know the Samaritan law, but obviously just to ensure that there's the materials are relevant to overdose prevention and response 'cause we want to obviously increase safety and decrease fatal overdoses as this is still an ongoing issue in the county.

And the other piece of it is that any of the disseminated updated information.

Be provided also in highly utilized threshold languages.

And then there's a directive in here about CCJCCC working with not just the LA Sheriff's Department, but the LA County Police Youth Association to encourage their departments to provide information and training about not just Good Samaritan law, but also not confiscating opioid Ant.

And then the last directive is just report back in 60 days with the relevant departments, and that is the conclusion of our presentation on what this time taken questions.

Thank you.

There anyone?

There any questions from Mr. Jeffries on line?

Please raise your hand. Speak up.

Yeah, I had a question. Since the bills from my legislation anyway has. So has there been no work done at all recently or no. So there's been a lot of work done on consumer law.

I think the reason why our office wanted to bring it forward is because of Prop. 36 and how that how prop. 36 or the overturning of Prop 36 is how that's going to work with Good Samaritan law because we don't what we don't want is.

People not calling in 911 because they fear that if they do.

Right then.

They'll then they'll get arrested and get a bell in charge, right?

I had a question just clarification on your the role of CCJCC.

Like, how do you envision that rolling out?

Because both the sheriff and the police chief are members, so are you, like, envisioning like they have a discretion in their general meeting?

Like, what's the like? The plan, right?

And so I don't know if Mark.

Oh, Mark is here.

But what we had envisioned is what you're what you're sharing of Sandra is.

My favorite chair, Sandra, is that it would be a discussion.

Obviously, we can't impose right or direct, and the Sheriff's Department or any of members of the Police Chief Association, but our plan and vision was that mark do godde will kind of maybe agendize this on the CCGCC agenda and and discuss some of the.

Importance of it and again the language that we use in the directed was to encourage.

Thank you.

Other questions?

The next I don't just want to remind everyone since we are getting motion brief, this meeting is transferred.

So I just want to let you know, Doug, did they do?

Do you do public comment after each motion though?

Yeah. OK dear.

Thank you.

We do.

And this is there anyone here for public comments or anyone online for public comment please speak up or raise your hand.

No one here, so we'll go online.

First person is Caroline Goodman.

We'll start starting in 2 minutes.

Once you start speaking, go ahead.

**CG** **Carolina Goodman** 11:20

Hey, everyone. Karolina Goodman from District 3.

I chair the Committee on Criminal Justice reform for the League of Women Voters of Greater Los Angeles.

I'm speaking this morning in my individual capacity as a concerned resident.

Absolutely support Janice. Hahn's motion to advocate for SB1231, to offer diversion programs and services for low level nonviolent felonies.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 11:45

No.

**CG** **Carolina Goodman** 11:49

Based on.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 11:50

Sorry, I'm sorry.

**CG** **Carolina Goodman** 11:52

OK.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 11:52

Oh, you were talking about the the increasing awareness, public awareness. If you want, we can hold you for the next after the next motion.

**CG Carolina Goodman** 11:59

Oh. Oh, so sorry, so sorry.

Let me jump to that one.

I do support Janice Hans motion to encourage people to seek medical care for an overdose victim and to prevent confiscation of Narcan and other medical necessities during encampment sweeps.

We must do all that we can to reduce unnecessary arrests and overdoses and increase the well-being of vulnerable residents.

Thank you.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 12:27

Thank you very much. All right.

Any other comments?

Or forget anything else.

All right. So we'll move to the next item.

This also would nest before the Commission is to support the Assembly bill 12.1 to offer diversion programs and services for low level non violence.

All right.

Thanks everyone. So I'm here to present a motion called supporting assembly Bill 12:31 to offer diversion programs and services for low level nonviolent felonies.

This motion supports a bill and a budget request that have been submitted by state assembly members. Sade Alwari, who represents the 57th district in California.

I'm going to start off by describing the bill first.

So the bill 801231 would authorize courts the ability to have the discretion to grant pre trial diversion for certain non violent felony offenses.

So right now when we talk about pretrial diversion program that exists there for misdemeanors or they're for felony is where the crime is tied to mental illness or drug use, but there isn't really any pretrial diversion program available or option available for judges when it's someone who doesn't.

Have an insecticon is more necessarily as a part of the drug Court, but has been

charged with a non violent, non serious felony events.

There's many people who face low level felonies who could greatly benefit from diversion programs, but they don't have the opportunity to right now.

So the bill authorizes pretrial diversion for specific non violent felonies. If a diversion plan is established and administered either by a treatment agency or a treatment agency and the probation department, the diversion plan would be individually tailored and will include connection to job skills, training, employment services, and. Or community based behavioral healthcare services. And so since this is pre trial diversion, if the program is successfully completed by the individual then the court has the ability to dismiss all charges against them and at anytime the court could reinstate criminal proceedings if the diversion program is not.

Successful or they participate in is not actively participating and the bill also states that that special consideration for participation in this program will be given to defendants who are over the age of 55, given the crisis of older adults in our jails right now and to people.

**CG** **Carolina Goodman** 14:38  
OK.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 14:42

Who have had a history of surviving human trafficking, domestic violence or sexual assault.

So that is my overview of the bill and then assembly member Elwari also introduced a budget request for the state to fund a three-year employment training and case management program in LA County. That's called jails to jobs.

So this budget request would support 801231 because it will provide dedicated funding to employee case managers and healthcare workers to provide job training and behavioral health services to people who are participating in these pretrial diversion programs.

But it is important to note that this funding request is not necessary for AB 12/31. So they've both been introduced by assembly members ELWARI, but they've been introduced separately, so one could pass and not the other.

The jail to jobs pilot program would focus on providing job training skills to people participating in diversion.



It'll focus specifically on jobs and healthcare and disaster relief, both areas that LA County needs as we recover from the devastating wildfires.

**CG** **Carolina Goodman** 15:44

Uh huh.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 15:46

And we continue to face healthcare and specifically mental healthcare worker shortages.

So the budget request asks for 36.6 million / 3 years, but it also states that there are options for reduced amounts of 20 million and 10 million if the state is unable or unwilling to fund all 36.6 million.

And this will be over the course of three years, so.

12.2 million per year if we get if it's a full funding amount.

This motion specifically directs our LA.

County advocates support both AB 12/31 and the jails to jobs budget request.

It does not ask for A5 signature letter and it does not ask LA County to sponsor the bill.

It simply ask that our advocates, when they're in the course of their duties up in Sacramento, that they support the bill and the budget request the bill was created in collaboration with the Vera Institute of Justice, the Drug Policy Alliance, LARP, and SEIU. And today we have repres.

From Vera J Cod, the Department of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Aging and Disabilities, who've all been involved in the crafting of the bill, and they can help me answer any questions.

The end of my presentation.

Thank you.

Any questions?

All right, good.

All right, so.

How long supported?

I don't know if I could say that, but how supportive.

Of a assembly bill and what it's expanding for judges and allowing them to do. I think my questions are around Dave Budget request and what that looks like so.

What does that include?

Oh, I I guess for me and I don't care.

You all wanna sit up here?

But I've seen some of the documents that they've shared of a breakdown of the funding going towards correctional health workers and PS WS.

I guess I'm just trying to understand like what the actual jails to job program would be and how that would be budgeted out for the three years.

And then I have some follow up.

Yeah. Thank you.

Good morning, everyone. Getting this mjb list.

I'm a senior program associate with the Vara California team.

Hi. Nice to see you.

I don't think I ever seen any of you all together, so that's nice. So to your question, Natalia, what the pilot entails is funding for psychiatric social workers to be able to hire them within the public defender's office and also for community based organizations to be able.

To hire community health workers that can connect people to the job training opportunities that would prepare them to be other community health workers and also relief workers.

So the funding wouldn't go directly towards like job training, it goes towards the individuals who would assist them into the job, OK.

And then the and I don't know if this is a question or just a larger question.

**CG** **Carolina Goodman** 18:44  
Call from unfavourable.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 18:45  
But it was long. Oh, I.

So for the budget, it says it's a pilot for three years.

After the three years then I think after the three years, the idea is that we will see how successful the program is and that we will develop from mechanism together or you all as the experts on the implementing entity to decide what is next for that program. But.

Also fold it into the already very successful programs that you already have in the county that already serve people who have been impacted by the criminal legal system but that are currently faced towards people who are re entering their

communities after incarceration.

So what we see right now is that the programs that we have are mostly focused on re entry and or like post plea diversion, not necessarily pretrial diversion.

Got it. And I can add to that that answer.

That you know, specifically the psychiatric social workers and the Public Defenders office, right?

We've seen our public defender's office ask for these positions two years in a row.

They asked again this year this, you know, committee.

I don't know what we call resolve the Justice League like we.

Budget and see if we're more healthy and we're able to add more psychiatric social workers in our budget.

You know, I think that would really help our public defender's office in this pilot, but also in general.

And I'm Claire Simone, associate director of here at California. Good to see you all in person. And I shared my colleague sentiment, so it's nice to be in person with everyone.

I'll just add here is committed to to assisting in those efforts to continue to ask for whatever sources of funding are needed. If it's at state level, we're happy to commit to working on extending the pilot after the three years course, it'll be subject to showing that it.

Works and that the funds are needed and that everybody still wants the funds, but we're committed to continuing to advocate for that funding at the state level.

And then for the, I heard you all say that implementing agency policy.

May.

And I don't again don't know if this is a fair question and I don't know who in the room would answer this, but who would be the department that would be?

Implementing this job to job program. Is it the public defenders? Is it jaycod?

I'm looking at hand go up.

Like me, I don't know it.

Hi, I'm Stephanie Hall and I'm with the Department of Economic Opportunity.

Yes. And so we currently work very closely with the with JPG on on a multitude of different programs, but we manage the workforce development programs for the entire county.

We are one of seven workforce development boards and so we received what is called the Workforce Innovation Opportunity grant from the federal government to

manage our 18 American job centers throughout LA County.

We are also the main recipient for our prison to employment program, and so we administer those funds to all the seven workforce development boards, and we also work very closely with probation on our 8109 invest program.

Which to your point, Claire, since a lot of the programs that.

Are you know re entry.

Diverse, not necessarily. Diversion pretrial. And so I think that there is a great opportunity for us to be able to build the infrastructure within the county to be able to.

Create the training program.

That then creates a workforce that is needed within the county, but also to create a more understanding workforce that goes back into service provider roles. We have similar programs through our careers for our cost program where we're training individuals with lived experience to go back into service. Prov.

Ropes. And so I think we can definitely do something very similar in this work with probation, with the District Attorney's Office, I think more so it's a little bit disconnected right now where sometimes often an afterthought in terms of workforce development and we'd be happy to kind.

Of lean into this with all of the resources that we can bring to the table.

Got it.

So let's just, you know, put out there. We're gonna get this funding.

It's gonna be amazing.

Would see from then 'cause. It seems to me like it's an increase in PS WSCHWS.

Like all these acronyms.

Ch WS right. When they then the you all would be facilitating the program.

Would you all Co facilitate a program that's part of our question too, in terms of how the funding is like coming down the pipeline?

Because I think right now it's not very clear that it's gonna come till it's a workforce Development Board or an economic development agency to do the workforce piece.

I understand that there are capacity building needs potentially in the funding that need to go to the other departments that are participating as well, but I do anticipate that we would want to be able to administer those funds.

To ensure that there is a, we're asking a wide net throughout the county.

To ensure that there are service providers about the county too, we meet the need of the diversion program and I can fill in some gaps in terms of how the sort of like

state funding advocacy works and how this might actually be implemented in practice. And I would.

Love to have that to my colleague from Jcod, but right now the budget request is written that the funding would come to DEO and the public defender's office.

But that doesn't preclude DEO from partnering with Jacob, for example, to do some of the work that they already partner.

In terms of support force development, that's what's written into the budget letter.

The budget letter is letter. That's like unofficial assembly member El Hawari letterhead. But it's our understanding that the state legislature would listen, of course, to what the county, where the county wants this funding that's going to be their primary consideration.

And so the county were to send a clarifying letter to say hello.

We would like this money to come to de O 75 percent, 25% to the public defender's office, and DEO would administer the funds in partnership with their colleagues over at JCOD. Something like that.

We think that the state would listen very carefully to that input from the county.

They're not going to want to give funding to the county unless the county wants it and where the county wants it.

I I think I would just like to add just add to what our colleagues have already, my colleagues have already indicated. I'm Gina Ekis from the Justice Karen Opportunities department.

Obviously, our department's focused on serving justice involved individuals, people who are navigating through the criminal legal system and need supportive services.

We do have workforce, workforce and education programs, including the sector program, which is skills and employment for the careers of tomorrow developing job training, especially in high growth sectors, is really trying to find ways to get people employed, especially after periods of incarceration. We also have LA County.

Training center program that primarily right now is focused on developing individuals and providing training for careers in wild land and forestry firefighting, but also kind of recognizing the need that that is just one piece of workforce that. Could be built up to support other individuals working with the Department of Economic Opportunity to make sure that but we are partnering to kind of meet the needs of the population and individuals who may be exiting custody.

So we're going to continue doing that work kind of regardless because that's, you know, Jacob's mission and you know happy to support this bill as it moves forward

wherever the board and or the legislature decide that, you know funding would come to the county.

But Jaycod is doing this work now.

And I do just to kind of Claire's point like this is a budget request, not from me, Council, right.

Is from an assembly member.

It has been submitted.

It's on her official letterhead.

Us offering our official support not only supports this budget request, as you know, it's talking about a pilot in LA County.

We are LA county.

We're saying we would like to do this pilot if the state will fund it, but it also allows us to be part of those conversations, right?

So if our advocates know that the board supports this, they then are going to be a party in the conversation to say we want, like you said, 75% of the funding to go to DEO, 25 to PD or whatever the logistics of how that money.

Would come down would look like we get to be a part of all those conversations because we're now officially advocating support of it.

Oh yeah, I just want. Since I'm hearing you're talking about the public defender. Just. You want more than 25% of the time.

Yeah, yeah.

So good morning.

Nice to see everyone.

Shalon Joseph, special counsel to Ricardo Garcia for the public defender's office.

And we have obviously reviewed this, this bill, the legislation and the budget passed and reported.

Obviously it is in line with our mission of supporting diversion.

We do believe that the prop.

36 passing the prop.

36 is going to result in more filings of low level felonies for which our clients can benefit from a diversion.

Program like this. And of course we already have a very established and robust social work network in our office that supports our clients and would love to partner with Vera and J cod and referring.

Eligible clients with the support services of social workers and to kyla's point with the

budget restraints right now on hiring social workers, that many would allow us to hire the resources that would be necessary to refer eligible clients appropriately to either the Department of Economic or develop.

Or and or JCOD.

So we do for that reason support the grant and with ask for a little bit more than. But but just wanted to go on record since I was sitting here about the public defender's support of both the ASK and the bill.

Thanks Sean.

Thank you.

I have a question before.

Yeah, I think it will.

Just kind of follow up on the budget is part of the budget ask also going to cover the evaluation of the program and who would be doing the investigation?

I think I think I could step into that.

We've done a few programs where recently we're evaluating a lot of our programs.

You do the work.

Program hasn't been evaluated and I don't wanna say 10 years or more, but we are happy to take that lift if it's part of the programming that and also the resources that get allocated.

Any other questions? I agree.

So then my other question is probably for layer.

Given that we've had the fire.

Fires all over LA County and some of the requests that are coming from the county to the state related to that, and I know there's some pieces in this related to some of that as well.

Just want to understand if if anyone from I don't think anyone in there to rental but if there's anyone online.

Where that fares and somewhere this request fears.

In relation to some of those requests, and if there's gonna be any challenges with some of those requests given there, and I see Angela's online and I do just want to clarify though, this is not an LA county request, right?

We're supporting a request from an assembly member, right?

But we're supporting other requests as well their own request.

So it's like, right, but that's different supporting our own request is that we're making a request.

This is supporting someone else's request, but yes it. But it is different than submitting our own request.

But Angela's on.

I see her hand, Angela, go ahead.

**AO** **Angela Ovalle** 31:34

Yes, hi, good morning everybody.

Angelova from legislative affairs.

Yes. To your point, we do have a significant.

Request into the state regarding our fire response and recovery efforts.

That we are currently working with our delegation to prioritize and discussion with the governor's office.

We have not officially seen this request from the Bear Institute.

We were given a copy of a letter I believe sometime last week with some information.

We are currently working on analyzing the bill as well, which was referenced in the motion.

So we don't have a position on this bill or budget proposal as of now.

We do have some questions, though, related to the pilot program, some of which were raised in this meeting.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 32:27

So I guess with that conversation or some of that information happened before the 18th meeting.

**AO** **Angela Ovalle** 32:36

Yes. So we have been reaching out to the departments to ask them to review the bill.

We do have some feedback from them that we're working through right now to put together an analysis for the board offices. And again, we haven't officially seen the budget request I just.

Asked our Sacramento office for a copy of the letter that you referenced at today's meeting.

So we can take a look at it.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 33:00

And can we have a copy of that as well and we're happy to share.



And it was submitted Monday, Claire.

Yesterday, yes, this was it's the, I think the letter that CEO Laura is mentioning is identical to the one that's on letterhead.

But we just got the letterhead version on Friday evening or Monday.

This can just not be done.

There's no walking there's. There's only three copies, unfortunately, but there is an addendum, and the actual request we can we can share. We can e-mail it to you.

That's fine.

Yeah. Any other questions?

No, that was good.

Any other questions?

Can I just add one thing?

I think you you brought up the wildfires and I think there is a real Nexus here with the type of job training programs that this budget request.

Would enable us to to do to have.

And I know that Vera can speak more eloquently about this, but there's, you know, the type of jobs that that this program would help train our LA county workforce to to have are directly related to kind of the fire construction needs that we have as a county they.

Would be construction related jobs right?

Behavioral healthcare for fire survivors debris removal, that kind of stuff.

And so this is a real investment and being able to fund that type of workforce that we need rebuilding I think is a worthwhile investment, not just you know, obviously we all care about providing people with you know, who have a Nexus, who have interactions with the CRIM.

Legal system to have employment, but also this really will support the fire rebuilding efforts.

So I don't know if you all want to ask that.

I think you articulated it well. The one thing I'll add is obviously fire relief is of utmost importance to LA County and to everyone in this room would agree with that.

And I think the county's efforts to get funding for that is, is really commendable and important and correct.

I think that if the county gets a lot of that funding, we still are facing a workforce shortage in LA County for paper healthcare, for construction, for all of those things.

And so you might face a situation where you have to hire folks from out of state

from.

Out of Los Angeles etcetera to build those jobs once you get the funding.

And part of what this the combination of this budget request and bill does is enable at least some amount of hiring of folks and training of folks who are right here in our communities who could really use a second chance.

Thank you.

Have a call all right.

Public comment.

Anyone here for public comment?

I think Carolina had something on it before.

**CG** **Carolina Goodman** 35:46

Yes, I I I apologize for having spoken out of turn before.

Please know that I advocate strongly for SB1231 and the jails to jobs budget request based on research that shows less recidivism for such pretrial diversion programs.

Unlike the knee jerk response of punitive methods of incarceration that do not increase public safety.

Thank you.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 36:18

Thank you very much.

Next we have Raquel. Raquel. I'll start with you 2 minutes when you start speaking.

**RC** **Raquel Derfler CTC** 36:25

Hi, good morning.

This is Raquel Dofler with cancel the contract out of the Antelope Valley. We're calling to say that we do support AB 1231, but we also want to stress that the Board of Supervisors must tell the probation chief that he needs to come to them for appro. Of any steps that he intends to take in response to AB 12/31.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 36:47

The wrong word. That's the next item.

**RC** **Raquel Derfler CTC** 36:50

Is that the next item? OK.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 36:52

Yeah, next item, OK.

Next we have Helen.

Helen, I'll start your time when you start speaking.

**HE helen eigenberg** 36:59

Good morning, Helen eigenburg.

I'm a constituent of SD3, just here as a human being.

And I would wholly support this motion having us be part of the pilot and the county supporting the legislators request anything that moves us more toward cares. First, jails last and diversion programs seems to be the way we need to be going, and I would support anything that.

The Vera Institute supports.

Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 37:30

Any other public comments? Are you still holding for the next item? Right. OK.

**RC Raquel Derfler CTC** 37:35

Yes.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 37:38

Alright, so that concludes SD4's motions.

Yes, actually, please be prayed from using the chat.

We actually don't have. That's OK. Thank you.

Yeah, it's not in accordance with the Brown.

So next we'll go to SD threes, motion, transparency and planning. Thank you.

Conspiracy planning during Probation's ongoing crisis, St. 3.

Alright, good morning everybody.

Thank you for coming.

Thank you to the members of the public.

This has been a fun meeting already and then I hope we're making it more fun.

This is a motion also for March 18th that sort of follows up on Probation's global plan presentation on February 18th, which if you haven't watched it and are

interested, I encourage you to check it out on the board's website.

Probation remains in crisis.

Los Padrinos remains unsuitable.

Staffing continues to be a challenge, and thirty officers were recently indicted and another pled guilty in a case involving use force in the halls.

One of the senior executives also recently announced their retirement and we think that this ongoing crisis and the changes in management increase the challenges probation spacing.

During the February 18 board meeting, Chief Guerrilla indicated that he didn't believe the proposals in his global plan required board approval and the challenge from our view supervising them. One of the offers authors of the global plan motion is that that motion on its face said that the.

Long term plan had to be approved by the board, so this motion seeks to make clear that probation does need to present its plans to this cluster and to the board that it needs to consult with stakeholders before it presents those plans.

And.

That is especially true of facilities like Kilpatrick, Knight or Kirby and Lt. Some of the larger facilities where we expect the largest amount of logistical challenges and just trying to get.

These things right?

We also, this motion also clarifies that probation needs to present to this cluster and board any plans that require change in the type of population served that facility.

I want to we want to specifically thank our colleagues for that consideration and for the members of the public and we look forward to your feedback.

Question.

Just in the directive, right?

It specifies it says changes for global planner, including but not limited to and then it says changes to the operations of Kilpatrick.

Very Dorothy. Caribbean Moscatr knows it does not call out the code page right. And I know that that was one of the first steps that she wanted to take was to close Camp page. Would that be?

Included as something that he needs to get approval for or is that not included?

If you can get back to me, yeah, we'll, we'll, we'll certainly and obviously part of the reason we did this.

I guess the chief wants to say something.

Oh, well, can you do you wanna?

So thank you Kat for that question. I appreciate it.

I'm not AI.

Don't think we're opposed to that sort of language if that's something that folks are looking to see.

I know there was a little bit I I felt that the conversation was a little bit.

Sort of confusing at the at the board meeting, so I'm not.

I don't think we're opposed to anything like that.

We really do believe that this should be as transparent a process as possible and as many stakeholders should be involved as possible, because there's a lot of moving parts, right.

It's not just probation operations unions, staff, the youth themselves, right?

But it's also then all the other county departments that are involved their stakeholders.

So there's a lot of a lot going on and that's part of why we're coming from.

So I appreciate the suggestion.

Certainly consider it.

I will also add quickly.

Central is not listed either, right?

That's true.

And I think that is because, you know, at least how he took it was that there was pretty broad support on continuum of the closure essential and continuing that move of all the medical equipment to those facilities.

And that move has been underway.

So the way that it's written here, these four are the ones that you require approval for, not Central Navy page.

You'll think about it and maybe add it.

Yeah. I'm. I'm not saying that. I don't know how Sandra feels, but I think that that was my my question to you is 'cause you specifically name like these four facilities? Like, what does that apply to the other ones? Is that, does that trigger anything with this motion?

I.

I I would suggest that if if you all think that it would make more sense to have all of them spelled out, I think we would be OK with that.

View the idea is to make this process as transparent as possible.

So if you're asking for something that would be more transparent, I don't think I don't believe that we would be opposed to that.

We certainly would consider I think that we felt like in the least these things needed to be in there for sure.

So if there requests that folks want to go beyond that, we're definitely open to hearing that. And then just to quickly add to that too, I think under.

+2 the second move clause.

Requiring approval or whether or not these facilities.

Serve staff versus youth.

That was kind of part of the conversation too, especially with a couple of disease camps, right?

And that was intended, I think to encapsulate those. But as Steve said, I think more transparency better.

Yeah. In the ticket I do.

I do wanna say that in terms of the central relocating the medical services from central to Los Cabinos, I feel like that is crucial for the Youth Atlas to have their medical on site.

We've seen that a lot of youth are not being transferred out of Libya's in a timely manner, and some of that has to do with them having to go to central for medical appointments.

So I don't personally feel the need to add central to this because I wouldn't want to slow that process down, but I don't know how.

No, it's OK.

I think the chief is the chief.

Someone did you want to say his hand down, chief, do you have anything to add on page?

**IB** **Isamar Bonilla** 44:25

MMM MMM.

**GV** **Guillermo Viera** 44:28

You thank you for giving me a bit of time here.

I'd just like you to consider four things with respect to this motion, because it would be absolutely catastrophic.

First, I'd like you to please consider language.

Language matters.

I know that you take great care for the narrative that you put, but I think that we should be accurate and there are statements in here, especially in the preamble, that are simply opinions that did not comport with my understanding of facts.

For example, the simply say that it wasn't considered.

On one or more items or that there wasn't conversation with other departments is just not accurate.

And unnecessary to support the motion itself.

Secondly, it matters because one of the greatest challenges that the county has had is that our control agencies don't believe probation department or the chief has the ability to make any significant changes to bring us into compliance.

Because all decisions must go back to the board, this has played the last several Chiefs and has actually brought out as one of the reasons at a public meeting with the SEC where they wanted input from the board itself in presentation.

So I hope that we're taking into consideration the impact that this has in a number of areas, one of them to actually come into compliance, if everything has to go back to the board when decisions have to be made with respect to Bsec and DOJ to that point.

Every single one of these moves proposed in the global plan.

Is as a result of either a directive from the Board of Supervisors.

There's the SEC compliance requirements for the DOJ.

So to Simply put that now, we would have to go through a completely separate process involving the public on some items that are changes that must take place for us to come into compliance with legal agreements that we already have with DOJ simply would be catastrophic. You, you.

Essentially, be saying we're not going to make any progress on coming into compliance with the SEC or DOJ.

I'm not sure that.

Those specifics have been taken into consideration.

Lowering the pop.

Providing better gender expansive services.

DOJ homelike improvements. There's a whole host of things that we are required to do.

That we're already.

Tardy in complying with that.

That this would essentially put a pause on and I'm not sure the county.

Should do that.

It would be my recommendation that we don't put additional barriers with respect to that. And then lastly, I would ask that you seek independent legal opinion on whether this motion interferes with delegate authority and WIC to the Chief Probation officer.

I believe it does.

I believe that the way this is spelled out, making decisions on population, especially in a detention facility under WIC, really is not something that can, by its simple order like this, be changed. So before this goes to the Board of Supervisors for a vote, I would encourage for.

There to be a legal analysis on whether that interferes with the independent authority and.

Really requirement for the probation chief to run a probation department. Thank you.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 48:02

Thank you, chief.

Are there any comments or questions?

I do actually.

Housing County Council given an opinion of their thoughts on this, given the statements given.

Well, I'll speak only for myself and for our office, but we have not received any of those comments from probation before today.

So if I don't know if County Council has received any of them, but we have not, I'm certainly open to considering them.

But that's the 1st I'm hearing.

Right, but not related just to the comments itself, but more to just the general idea of will this motion slow down any progress that we're making has County Council given any type of comments or have they opinion on this motion?

I think that's are you Jonathan?

Not that I'm aware of, but I can't speak for the the rest of my what what outreach was done by SD3 and folks at my office?

But we're certainly happy to follow up with that. The chief's comments and also you, Steve.



**GV** **Guillermo Viera** 49:11

If you do proceed to that matter, you may also want to consider.

The motion with emergency authorization with respect to LP and how that also would conflict with some of this.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 49:36

Are there comments or questions?

Alright, have a good. OK, we'll move to public comments.

**RC** **Raquel Derfler CTC** 49:46

Yep, Yep, Yep.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 49:46

There's a couple folks that want to speak on your cards.

**RC** **Raquel Derfler CTC** 49:48

All right.

**PC** **Public Safety Cluster** 49:51

I'll I'll call y'all next, OK.

All right, Raquel, I'll start you 2 minutes when you start speaking.

**RC** **Raquel Derfler CTC** 49:56

OK.

Thank you.

So once again, Raquel, do from cancel the contract down in the Antelope Valley.

We support this motion and we want to stress that the board must instruct the probation chief who is here, thankfully, that he needs to come to them for approval of any steps he intends to take. The Board's history of support for the probation chief is at at.

Best misplaced and at worst reckless. He has a history of evading accountability and transparency when things go sideways at the agency he leads, let me once again and stress the agency he leads the board's trust and probation chief Rosa must be based on his actions, not his.

Words under his watch. Thirty of his officers were indicted on 71 counts of child abuse, conspiracy and battery.

The California Department Justice investigation found 69 fights occurred among 143 youth ages 12 to 18 at Los Padrinos.

Yes, the same Los padrinos.

In the first six months after it opened in July of 2023, once again, Rosa touts that his department took decisive, decisive action by placing those indicted officers on leave without pay.

Let me just leave you with this.

What actions did he take prior to those criminal indictments of the probation officers under his watch? Thank you.

**PC Public Safety Cluster 51:15**

OK.

Thank you very much.

Next word called Kit Mendoza, Kit Mendoza. You want to come up and give your two minutes.

I just big. Yes, go ahead one second time. We start.

All right, all right.

Good morning or good afternoon.

I'm just here basically to talk about this motion.

I appreciate S for bringing this motion forward.

I think it's important.

I you know, I've been doing this work for the past 10 years as I start as a young person, 20 years of age. I'm 31 now and I've seen many chiefs coming though. And you know, I just would appreciate a very transparent in process. That's why I.

Appreciate his motion.

No, I think that the BOS all of you shouldn't abandoned the commitment the US already committed to in the past since 2019-2020 around, you know, making sure there's more transparency. There was a report that US approved.

The US approved, which is the DJ transition team, reported in one of those parts mentioned that you guys should have created a should advise your body. Probation should be engaging with more community.

There's there's a lot of these things that you guys talking about have already been agreed on by the board.

Let's not abandon those things.

I'm just here just to encourage more transparency and I support this motion.

Thank you.

Thank you very much.

Alright, Josh, go ahead.

Hi everybody.

My name is Josh Green.

I'm a member of the Jjcc, the GHRVG, the Community Advisory Committee of the JJCC, and I was on the Blue Room Commission for Public Safety for this county.

I'm here to assist, offer my context and my history just in case it's helpful. For the past 10 years, roughly a little less on that body.

I've probably worked with five chiefs or interim chiefs over 10 Deputy chiefs.

I've been at hundreds of public brown act meetings.

Thousands of subcommittee meetings appears to all the facilities as part of the JJRVG plan.

And I've seen a lot of dysfunction. And the thing that I've seen work is actual collaboration.

And that's what actually led to the global plan motion in the 1st place was working with SD2SD4, then Deputy Chief Patino and Karen Fletcher.

That led to recognition that we needed all collaboratively look at a global plan for managing facilities and population.

So now on the JGR BG we had to stop our work because we heard there was a global plan update coming. We had no idea what was in it, including probation department members who sit on that body with us.

So not only we not know what it was when we finally saw it, it's out of alignment with almost everything we came to consensus on in that process that we shouldn't warehouse kids in one facility that step down to be meaningful and outside of that lock facility moving.

Closer to community, so everything that's been discussed here as a in terms of transparency for me is a floor.

So it's a, it's a mandatory floor. What we should be aiming for is the ceiling, right?

We should be aiming higher than just mere communication about this.

It won't work if there's not collaboration.

I've seen that over 10 years.

All of this will fail.

And this is an invitation. I will continue to show up for another thousand hours, as will other partners in the county and community, but not there's not an invitation to collaborate.

Thank you very much.

Next we'll go online to Helen.

Helen, we'll start our time.

We'll start speaking.

**HE** **helen eigenberg** 54:24

Hi Helen again.

I just wanted to thank Steven and Nick and Supervisor Horvath for this motion.

I'm in full support of it. You know the chief and you're here and it's nice to see you.

You have history of evading accountability and transparency, and so I when I think back on all that, you have not shown up for and the 11th hour that you sent the global plan, I am floored.

I'm floored that this is acceptable and that the board voted to give you.

Executive power.

I'm just a constituent.

I've learned far more about all these processes than I would ever imagined because they're failing so badly.

And we are failing these youth.

So this the this motion would require you to listen to the experts, the young people who are currently inside the facilities that fail to meet the most minimum of regulatory standards and have the most to lose. This motion would also ensure that those actually serving and supporting young.

People are consulted, credible messengers.

And then finally, this motion isn't everything, because everything would be the shrinking of this department. That is, let us not forget, facing 30 indictments under your watch connected to, and I can't even say these words. 69 Gladiator fights harming 143 kids. Unacceptable.

So let's do the right thing.

Thank you for your your your what's the word? I want the speed in which you guys jumped on this motion.

Let's support this and let's do right by these kids. Thank you.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 55:52

Thank you very much.

Carolina Goodman, you're next.

I'll start your time when you start speaking.

**CG Carolina Goodman** 55:58

Hi, yes. Carolina Goodman District 3 again.

It's taken much too long to ensure the safety and well-being of the youth in our care.

We do not want our youth to live in unacceptable conditions any longer.

Of course, legal analysis is important.

Still, I support Lindsay Horvath's motion to have each step reviewed by the supervisors, collaboration with stakeholders, community organizations, county departments, Labor partners and the courts is extremely critical to this plan's success.

The care first, jails last vision must be the priority consideration for every single decision that is made. Thank you.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 56:45

Thank you very much.

Next we have Linda.

Linda, we'll start our time.

We start speaking.

**MK Milinda Kakani** 56:51

Thanks. Can you hear me?

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 56:53

Yes, go ahead.

**MK Milinda Kakani** 56:55

Great. Hi, this is Melinda Kakani with Children's defense fund.

I also sit on the Probation Oversight Commission as the second district's appointee.

Just want to affirm my support for this motion.

This really is kind of an unprecedented moment in LA County's history. Now that we are, you know, well over 60 days of operating essentially illegal facility and illegal

facility.

We are still under a DOJ settlement that frankly, I don't think we're complying with. We are facing again 30 indictments of staff of the probation department like this is the time where we need more scrutiny.

We need more accountability.

We need more transparency.

So while I understand that the chief feels like these steps would somehow hinder his progress, it isn't like we've made a whole bunch since his arrival.

And so I think something that resembles again a public telling of how he intends to move forward, how he intends to pay for this.

Why there is a need for essentially a cop city at Camp Scott and Scudder, how this would better serve our young people absolutely needs to be a public discussion.

So I am in support of this motion and I do hope that the other board offices see it's value because this department has lost.

All trust as it relates to the public, and this is a step that kind of starts to build that back up again. Thank you.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 58:30

Thank you very much. Next, Diana.

We'll start your time.

We start speaking yourself, Deanna.

Thank you.

**DA De Anna (YWFC)** 58:39

Good morning.

My name is Deanna Pittman.

I'm with the young Women's Freedom Center.

This motion is so important and really needed at this time because there's a lot of confusion and fear from the community.

Probation drop this bombshell of a plan and didn't consult anyone other than themselves.

This motion clearly allows for the board to do what they should be doing, which is approving the plan.

Further, this motion has to allow the county and the public to see a budget for all of the proposed changes and to be transparent with where this money is coming from.

Lastly, I also just want to uplift how alarming the proposal to move all girls and gender expansive youth to 1 Camp Camp Kilpatrick.

How alarming that is, the board promised to move towards decarceration of girls in 2021.

But consolidating girls and gender expansive youth into one camp seem to do the opposite, and instead it institutionalizes their incarceration. More than anything, we will be reaching out to have individual conversations with each deputy.

So I look forward to continuing this conversation and doing right by our youth.

Thank you.

**PC Public Safety Cluster 59:54**

Thank you very much.

Next, we have Tariq Tariq.

We'll start your time and start speaking.

**TS Tyrique Shipp 1:00:00**

Good morning, public safety cluster.

I'm Tyree shipping with the head of Recidivism coalition.

I'm also SD3 appointed Probation Oversight Commission Commissioner. I just want to say I really do support this motion.

I think the lack of transparency has been frustrating, even for somebody who sits on that oversight Commission and asks about this, this same motion, this global plan, a week prior before they presented it and couldn't get nothing. I think there is a real lack of, like, transparency for.

Community there is a real lack of transparency for people who do this work.

Credible messengers aren't getting the notice on these types of things.

And then we heard new youth the most.

And so I think that's another thing that we're not bringing up is that if nobody scrutinizes this, we hurt the youth the most and we need to be trying to bring up these youth. So when they do come home, they can be productive citizens. But we're lacking that.

Part of it. And so I think SD3 is doing a great job with this motion and I support it fully.

**PC Public Safety Cluster 1:00:58**

Thank you very much, Dolores.  
Start your time when you start speaking.  
Mute yourself?

**DC Dolores Canales** 1:01:06  
Hi, good morning.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 1:01:06  
Doors.

**DC Dolores Canales** 1:01:07  
Yes. Can you hear me OK?

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 1:01:08  
Go ahead. Yes.

**DC Dolores Canales** 1:01:10  
Thank you.  
Good morning.  
My name is Dolores Gonzalez.  
I am a community advocate and I am also.  
I was appointed on the Probation Oversight Commission by Supervisor Janice Han,  
and I'm calling, though, as a constituent and a resident of the district of Los Padrinos,  
and I fully support this motion.  
And I also want to uplift what the callers mentioned earlier about moving the girls.  
I I I am totally against that and I wanna voice that here.  
I think that this is a very important motion to pass.  
I asked the support.  
To pass this motion and also I wanna uplift the officers that were indicted. That 30  
indictments from the videos that were shown for everybody to see of just the  
violence that was occurring and that this, this is exactly why the Community stay so  
outraged constantly and it act.  
Undermines the work of the probation officers that are showing up daily to do their  
job, to care for the youth, to bring about change and and then this is what the focus



is.

Thank you very much.

PC

**Public Safety Cluster** 1:02:17

Thank you very much.

All right.

Are there any other comments? Please raise your hand on teams or speed up.

Anyone here in person?

Alright, so I can close out the motions.

Next we go to the presentation discussion.

First word briefing is from the OIG office. The Board of Corporate Finance.

Is that all there?

Good morning, everyone.

I'll try to keep it brief because I assumed that most of you have had the opportunity to read the quarterly report and so I'll focus on just sort of broad strokes and then if anybody has any questions, please feel free to ask those.

There were two deputy involved shootings this past that past quarter, the fourth quarter of 2024.

One was non fatal, one was fatal.

They're both described here, and as always, we have the areas of further inquiry, which are sort of questions that we have that we think that Sheriff's Department should keep in mind as they conduct their review of those shootings.

We do have a comparison chart of the shootings from 2015 through 2024.

And it does appear to be on a downward trend, but obviously you know, these are the subject to a variety of different factors. So it's hard to say whether that trend is due to something that somebody's doing.

Or whether it just so happens to be that way.

But hopefully it is due to the fact that there's been some laws passed about de escalation and the fact that.

Uses of force such as these need to be necessary.

So we're hoping that we see continue to see a downward trend.

I will note that the District Attorney's Office issued a large number of decisions on cases this past for the last quarter. They had only posted through November.

When we were able to access the website, so it's possible that the December postings will be available and if so, we will include those in the next quarterly report

as well. I would note that there was the fatal shooting of Ryan Twyman was on there for the other.

Deputy involved in that shooting, the one deputy that was involved in that shooting, was prosecuted, and that individual has led to the charges. I believe he was placed on probation and.

With a jail sentence, and that's noted in the footnote.

Then moving along to the Sheriff Department's use of unmanned aircraft systems, we did have some questions about some of these. For instance, a lot of these talked about looking for a felony suspect, and obviously there are implications in looking for a felony suspect if, for instance, you.

Did that at someone's home.

You would need possibly a search warrant depending on circumstances, so we've asked the department for that additional information and as a result of looking at these in part because the department now is implementing some new drone policies specifically with regards to Malibu.

West Hollywood and also in the fire areas, we are going to look at what those new policies entail and hopefully report on that. But we did note that there's a policy at the Sheriff's Department that the COC be notified of every drone use and the COC is does.

Not appear to be receiving those notifications.

At least nobody in the COC has received them, and it's that the executive director of the COC receive those notifications.

So we've noted that in this report and are hopeful that the sheriff will remedy that situation with regard to the Taser policy, we did a separate report on that and then we will include information each quarter on whether the basically the training on the new policy and the.

Implementation of the new policy.

Tracking Taser uses something that we've done.

Those charts are in there.

This past quarter, we did now include a review of Sheriff's Department's internal audits. The Sheriff's Department has done quite a few internal audits. They started doing those more recently under the previous administration. There was not a lot of audits and so we've decided that we will review.

The audits and include what we consider to be pertinent information from each of the audits, and then also any sort of comments that we have on the audits the

Sheriff's Department provides the completed audits to us. They also provide work plans for the work plans we do comment.

On those ahead of time, we will note that we comment on those ahead of time, but we generally probably won't bring to everyone's attention publicly what those comments are prior to the implementation of the audit.

But there was one work plan presented to us during the fourth quarter and we're kind of a little bit off on the fact that they may present them to us during the quarter, but we may not be able to to produce the product until the following quarter, so.

They it may be that there's a delay in US reporting on them. All of these audits are on the Sheriff's department's website for anyone to see.

But we felt that it was still useful to do a quick summary so that each of you don't have to review each audit to see that there are significant levels. For instance, if non compliance with many of the things in the Antelope Valley.

Then there's a section on letter to a journalist.

I won't go through that unless anybody has any questions in the custody division.

We can send you to continue to see overcrowding in the jails and even though they might be out or near or even under the BSCC rated capacity overall.

There are facilities that are over capacity and obviously the most concerning is men Central jail because of the issues with that particular facility and yet we can send you to see that there are more people in that facility than it's rated for.

There's also the PDCE facility, which is rated for 926 people.

And in just as of December 31st, there were 10 people in that facility and I we don't know why there is that disconnect with having that facility so underutilized and men Central jail over utilized.

We did separate reports on the availability of menstrual products. If anybody has any questions about those that report or the commissary report, I should be able to answer those questions for you.

I didn't intend to summarize those reports, but if you'd like us to present a summary of those, we're happy to show up at another public safety car to address those.

But I'm also happy to answer those questions today.

For in custody, that's nine people died in the care and custody of the Sheriff's Department.

Those deaths are all summarized in here, and we now also have, as requested by the board, the in custody overdose death section of our report, and in this particular case, there's one confirmation that a person died due to.

To an overdose, we are tracking narcotics intervention efforts.

Many of you might have seen that there was a Los Angeles Times article where one deputy was indicted along with. I think it was 17 other people, non non sheriff's personnel who were charged with bringing narcotics into the facilities.

We have sections on improving searches of staff and civilians with the Netflix of what each of the facilities is doing with regard to that. And then there's a summary of the number of site visits that we have at the various facilities.

I'm happy to answer any questions.

Thanks Sharon.

Any questions?

I I was.

Hopefully I I did have like a one or two, but I'll try to go.

And most of it might be last questions.

So if you don't ask, I will ask them.

There's a lot of a mountain hallway.

We have a busy morning part of mine and try to be short for some of the audits.

Do you all see whatever they think the corrective actions are supposed to be?

Because there were some like.

Concerning might not be the right word, but there were some numbers that were really low.

Yes, like 0% for documenting. The reason body worn camera was delayed, which is kind of a big deal.

It's also kind of a weird thing because the body camera comes on automatically, so it catches stuff too, which is also kind of cool.

Well, it only comes on automatically if you press it.

Oh, if you press it, it will catch a minute.

So if you press it, it will catch a minute prior.

To the interaction without sound and just so you know, LAPD has two minutes now. Some of this is just that.

You have to obviously keep all that video, right? So on evidence.com, whatever you. Capture. Then you keep, right? So. But LAPD does have two minutes back and you know we are seeing instances still where people don't turn on their body worn camera. And obviously that's really concerning because they've been around for a long time now, so it really should be second.

Nature. I looked at this. Sheriff's Department tries to teach people.

We also we also in other words, you get out of your car.

You see the steering wheel? You turn it on because it should be any interaction that you have with the civilian that gets captured.

But are they?

I guess the are, are they? And I don't know. Maybe I'll follow up with LASD, but it'll be. It'll be interesting to know if they have if they have, like a structural.

Plan approach training thing that they're teaching that we could sort of see happening because zero percent is not great and that's the 0% after you didn't turn it on.

So those are the folks who should have written in their report.

Oops, I didn't turn it on. You know? My bad.

I'll, I'll whatever. I'm just doing it next time. The station would be like it changed about 100% now.

So it's all good. But I mean they in all of these audits, they have corrective action and I'm very confident that in this audit the correction activist action is to train people to write why they didn't turn it on.

But as you know.

The issue with training is then people doing it, so there has to be a culture of there has to be a consequence for not doing it. And I'm not saying discipline or anything like that. Obviously for multiple times though, you would expect that there would be discipline but.

At least there would be. Each station is something called pleas.

Which are? I don't.

Sometimes people consider them discipline, but it's sort of like what you get in your performance evaluation, right? And in all actuality, it would just be something that your supervisor would talk to you about and maybe write up not included in your performance evaluation if then it didn't happen.

Again, but you would include it in a performance evaluation if it continued to happen, so that at some point in time you would impose discipline, but.

The the I will say that for the most part, I thought the audits were were well done obviously because we got these these metrics that there's 0% and so there are corrective action plans in each of them. And I for the most part, I feel like they.

Did adequately address the issues, but as you know, with corrective action, the corrective action has to be there has to be follow through. There has to be a culture. So training's not enough. If you don't have a culture of enforcement.

Thank you.

And then one more on.

Drone changes is was there a timeline? And I'm sorry if you said it and I missed it. No. So well West Hollywood and Malibu already have drone policies that their city council's approved.

And we have those and we're looking at those. And then I believe there's also an overall new drone policy.

So we're we're looking at those right now. I think the COC is also looking at them. In part because of concern that they're not being notified.

So we expect that we will have.

A more hearty look at what the drone policies are to be able to inform the board and the public as to what the changes in the drone policies are, and also how the sort of pilot programs at West Hollywood and the Malibu are working. And I think a. Lot of the intention is.

You know that it's not Big Brother watching.

It's the idea of drones being able to respond to a 911 call, right?

But then you have to do the balancing test of what's a drone responding to a 911 call and what's Big Brother watching, right?

So and obviously and same with the fire areas, right?

Like people whose homes have burned to the ground and and know that they may have valuable items still somewhere in the wreckage.

Like certainly they want the drones to patrol the area. And so it's just that balancing act of Big Brother is watching versus are we trying to respond to a situation that. You don't mind that Big brother's watching and limiting how much Big Brother is watching?

So that's sorted about got it.

And then I'll, I'll, I guess I'll follow up with with LASD. But I'm also curious to know. 'Cause.

There's a difference between CF Cs not getting notifications and communities complaining about it.

Are you all aware if there are complaints about the drones have gone or have are have gone up, gone down or whatever? I am not. But I can say that I haven't heard that there's complaint and I mean yeah, to be fair, I don't think the residents of.

The fire areas would complain and I also I think they'd be happy. And I also think that, you know, City Council for West Hollywood and Malibu voted for it.

Right, right. So but I can find out if we have any complaints, but obviously obviously we get whatever slice of complaints there are and then?

West Hollywood and Malibu might have complaints that well, but I can say that I did listen to at least one meeting in West Hollywood and the public comment was mostly.

You need to do more to stop crime and not were really sad that Big Brother is watching.

That being said, I still think as you know, as advocates, that we have to whether there's complaints or not, we still have to be concerned about the impact on the constituents.

Thank you. Questions.

All right, good.

And you might not be able to answer them, but I saw that for the QVC complaints within the facilities, the highest one was medical.

So I was wondering if you knew the breakdown of that. Is that because before the delay in getting access to care or most of the time, that's the general nature of the complaints is that they have an issue and that they're not being taken to medical quickly enough?

Or medical is not seeing them quickly enough.

Or medical just sent them away without really digging into the problem.

And so those are the the main areas.

And for the Sheriff's Department service, common reports for the complaints, either personnel or for services.

Is there?

Is there a way to find out what happened with those?

So the the yes and no.

They for the for the person who complained, they sent what happened, but they don't tell you a lot because the law prevents them from telling anybody.

So they can't say to a constituent. Yes, what you said was true and we did XYZ and punished 5 people. But what they can say is that they took appropriate action.

That's probably not comforting to the people who get the letter, but that's that's what they're limited in saying.

And so they, but they do send that, but by the same token, they're very far behind in responding to them, and I that was one of the audits in Antelope Valley as well.

Was that essentially none of the complaints were dealt with in the appropriate time

frame?

I think that was only for one station, but the other one wasn't, as in shoulders above that station. We are looking into both.

To supervisory sorry to WCSERS watch commander service comments reports as well what they're called. They're essentially complaints.

So we are looking into that.

We have a project right now where our office will be looking into how those are dealt with.

I would note that they they are manual of policy and procedure and the way that they dealt with complaints.

I.

I don't believe they've updated it as of yet, but there are in those policies as they are currently written, the wrong standards are written into the policy because those standards have been updated.

For basically, whether you have to find something by preponderance of the evidence or clear and convincing evidence, right?

So for complaints, it's sort of, and I'm talking in generalities for complaints if they find it to be finding. If we were not true is by a preponderance of the evidence. And then.

To exonerate an employee, it's got to be by clear and convincing evidence.

So hopefully they'll update their policies to include that correct standards for the findings, because the law changed and they had not updated their standards as of yet.

Any questions?

For the questions public comment, I see Raquel. We're going. Do you have your hand raised?

I'll start your time when you start speaking for two minutes.

RC

**Raquel Derfler CTC** 1:21:16

Yes. OK. I wanted to comment on a couple of things that Dara mentioned.

So one being the use of unmanned drones, I'm requesting that her office and the board itself look into MOU that has been put in place between the Lancaster Police Department and LASD for LASD Lancaster station to use footage captured by Lancaster, P DS drones.

It's of a concern to us because if you have drones that are flying over folks backyard,



how does that work? If the drone captures alleged illegal activity?

Are they allowed to arrest the person for doing something in their backyard when there wasn't a search warrant?

That's of a great concern.

The other thing is body worn cameras.

We know out here that they have the ability, as all all of the department does, to turn them on and off at will.

So speaking on Francisco Nunez's case, we have a witness who who spoke to us and let us know what that evening, that the what are the offers involved? Specifically said camera off, spoke some disturbing things to the young man and then turn the camera back on we.

Know when Michael Thomas was shot and killed in his own house by Ty Shelton in the summer of 2020. There was no body camera.

Footage was not turned on and that was why Ty Shelton was allowed to continue on. Because they didn't have, you know, footage showing that they murdered Michael Thomas on tape, and then he went on to murder Niani Finlayson in her own home in December of 2023.

So we would like the board and Miss Williams office to please take a look at both of those things. She can reach out to us if she has any questions. Thank you.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 1:23:02

OK.

Thank you very much.

All right. Next Caroline Rubin.

So we'll start your time when you start speaking.

**CG Carolina Goodman** 1:23:08

Thank you.

It's Carolina Goodman.

District 3.

Again, I very much appreciate the tremendous amount of work that goes into the Oigs report.

It's a model for oversight across the nation from OIG reports, we learn what is happening.

But what is the next step?

Do the supervisors now make commendations and recommendations?

Thank you to the OIG for reviewing drone policy and drone use with respect to 1st Amendment rights.

We continue to hear about overcrowding in Men's Central jail.

This is completely unacceptable regarding the use of policy. Please hold LASD accountable for bringing their policy into compliance and finally reminding you that even though Tasers are considered less lethal weapons, they can still be lethal.

Thank you.

**PC Public Safety Cluster** 1:24:02

Thank you very much.

Any other public comment?

OK, seeing none, we move to the next item.

Thank you very much, Madam.

Thank you, Darren, you.

Is the standing, standing briefing from the Probation Commission and office Inspector General firstly.

Good morning.

I'm Wendy Julian, executive director of the Probation Oversight Commission.

Good morning. Eric Bates, assistant Inspector General of the Office of Inspector General.

I'll start.

That's OK.

So we have our probation oversight Commission regular meeting next Thursday on the agenda the chief is intending to to be there to give a presentation on the global plan in response to some of the comments that were made at the board meeting with the ability to receive public.

Input both from the Probation Oversight Commission commissioners and the public at that meeting, so we're very much looking forward to that. The at the board meeting Supervisor Han actually asked the department to develop a pros and cons list about the global plan, which I thought sounded like a.

Good idea.

And so we are going to also create a pros and cons list. It is in draft form and we're hoping to have it published by Friday.

It will be a fact based document as much as possible.

And I think we'll address some of the questions that were brought up.

There are of course pros and cons to all of the facilities and all of the plans. I actually look back at a document that I drafted in 2021, kind of similar to what?

One of the what Josh mentioned earlier about one of the many, many meetings we were in about choosing where the sytf facility was.

I was perhaps writing in a little more honest way back then and I said something like the con is all the facilities have problems.

That continues to be true. Of course there are, you know, campus Kilpatrick is this beautiful brand new facility, which is I'll tell you, takes Me 2 1/2 hours to get there from my house.

So there are absolutely pros and cons that we will be sharing also on the agenda is the issue about the impact of the deployment of staff into the halls to into Wells Padrino Juvenile Hall to be able to come into compliance and avoid staffing crisis we have learned.

That probation will not be commenting on.

Some of those items that are the subject of litigation currently, however, I believe it's the intention of the leadership to leave the item on the agenda to allow for public comment and discussion on the item. There also is a question under there about use of force incidents in.

The field and there is an outstanding use of force item.

Data request that we are asking for from the department also on the agenda is a discussion of a process for obtaining data and information from the probation department. Unlike the conversation that has been happening at the COC, the data requests from the POC to the probation department have.

Nothing to do with the confidentiality of the documents, but rather just the process by which they are solicited and received. The Commissioners have expressed significant frustrations about delays and receiving those documents.

Partial submissions. Then there have been really big improvements in the way that things are submitted, and then lots of things that have happened sort of in between those areas. We also will hear an update from our CBO subcommittee that's community based organizations and how the department is working.

With CB OS at the facilities as well as sharing some data that we got from the snapshot on the charges that you face.

And a geographic report that has already been published.

That geographic report shows what you would expect.

There is a disparate impact depending on where you live in LA County on whether on your likelihood of being in the facilities. And we'll talk a little bit more about that.

I also wanted to share a couple of things not on the POC agenda.

First, I think I would be totally remiss to not comment on the 30 indictments, and I think I'll say something different, which is a reminder about who the kids are that are at Los Padrinios.

There's a 12 year old there today.

My baby is 12.

He was teary eyed this morning because his throat hurt and he didn't want to go to school.

That's hard for me to say without getting choked up. I apologize.

I actually I don't apologize.

There are there are 313 year olds 1914 year olds.

These are babies.

They're very small kids in the facility.

There are also adults in the facility.

There are youth who have extraordinarily diverse circumstances with how they're brought in. 42% of them have iep's.

That means they're receiving special education services 80% of them, according to Children's Data Network, have had contact with Ecfs and there are approximately 30% of them who are there on non 707 B charges.

So it's a, it's a very vulnerable group of youth and I think if that's important to remember in terms of these indictments, there's another group of people I'm really worried about with respect to these indictments. And that's the staff. There are a lot of staff at Los P.

And certainly at all of the facilities and throughout the department who do this work as mission driven work with purpose.

They're people who love kids, who love each other, who love their jobs, and this is a a very difficult reflection on those folks who are working really hard. And it concerns me about our recruitment ability, about our retention ability. And I just want to be able to say.

That that I think that overall it's just really sad that this is happening and I would agree with the statement that the department sent out that obviously this is a good thing to be rooting out some of these issues. But it's something that we need to continue to.

Pay very close attention attention to.

I also wanted to give an update on something we've been talking about sort of behind the scenes, which is the visitation policy in particular at Los Padrinos. Actually when the conversation started, it wasn't only about Los Padrinos, but we have since found out that the visitation policy at.

All of the other facilities is implemented differently, and specifically it came up with some conversations that were heard at the POC and the board about hugs, about moms being able to hug their their kids. And it's beyond moms, of course, caregivers and and other folks who come in.

It turns out in our review of the visitation policy of Los Padrinos that is shared by. The department with parents and with staff that hugs are not forbidden by that policy.

It that is just the way that they are interpreting the policy for safety reasons.

So we're working with some of the Commissioners and with some folks at the facilities to figure out some ways to help visitation be better.

Visitation is extremely important in terms of successful RE entry for youth. There is very clear research about maintaining clear connections with family, leading to more positive re entry outcome data. So we want to make sure that those visits are safe and also I don't want there to be any cont.

Coming in the facility, I know that's the reason that probation has prohibited this behavior. And so we've got to figure out with the data, do visits lead to contraband if they do, how do we stop that?

You know, the Commission has made recommendations a number of times about things like airport style scanners and other other methods of being able to make sure that there isn't contraband.

But if contraband isn't coming in through visits, then perhaps we could have a different way to make the visits more friendly and useful in terms of the overall mental health of the youth and their parents.

Finally, I just want to say something about the death of the POC dashboard.

That's our data dashboard that's public facing.

It is dead and will remain dead until we're able to redo it.

It's dead because the way that the population statistics are being presented has slightly changed. For example, the Sytf girls and gender expansive youth at DKC Dorothy Kirby Center are no longer called out.

So if we're doing a trend chart, there's this gap in the chart that makes the

dashboard.

Not really useful.

So we're going to continue to publish the data, but.

At some point this dashboard needs to be created and published by the probation department.

That's the way all the other departments do it.

I mean it's it doesn't really make sense for me to be doing it.

But because the information wasn't available publicly, we wished to take that on.

There is some light at the end of the tunnel.

Which is that the snapshot data that probation is now providing could allow for a much better dashboard because of the way that the data is presented.

It's not parsed out the way the current data is.

There are a couple of problems with that. One, we have not been regularly receiving it.

That's getting better and we have received it, but we need to get it every month. So we have a good dashboard and the 2nd is we we found some errors.

So I mentioned this about the DCFS data. If you compare the July data to the December data, there are records that are checked, DCFS or checked 707 B in July and not checked DCFS or 707 B in December.

So we want to make sure that the data we're providing is accurate.

And are hoping that the department will do their job in cleaning up their own data as they're sharing it with us so that we can share it with the public.

And that is, that's all I have.

Good morning again.

I'm going to use my time to discuss our latest report, which was a monthly report to the DOJ monitor.

Published it last week.

As you know, the stipulated judgement between the Department of Justice and LA County was amended in November, and part of that was adding three areas that our office is to review, monitor, report on and those three areas were internal affairs cases.

Closed caption TV review and searches.

So we had some existing and that'll be done monthly. We have some existing information relating to that for November and December.

So even though technically our report would have been on January 2025, we

included at the request of DOJ the information we have for November, December. So as far as the internal affairs cases, we reported that in November there were 34 referrals, 28 cases were opened.

In December, there were 16 referrals and 11 cases were open and in January there were 12 referrals and eight cases were open.

As far as the closed caption television review, they probation currently does not have a policy that's been approved by the monitor.

Regarding what they're to do regarding closed caption television review.

But in spite of that, we still reviewed what information they did have as far as use of force.

Reports and we looked at video recordings to see if there was any violations of policies in law and.

Part of our methodology is to take two days randomly at each hall.

And and we found inconsistent. Well, I should say incomplete.

We found incomplete reports relating to the officer's account of what happened and also missing medical reports.

So those are areas that we're going to be following up on and discussing with the chief to see how they can do better as far as that search logs are the third area.

And again, we reviewed documentation for November, December and January.

At Los Padrinos, we found in November there were 1267 searches. In December, there were 1609 searches.

In January, there were 1559 searches at Barry J. In November, there were 1455 searches. In December, there were 1329 searches and in January 689 searches.

Probation's policy requires 2 searches per shift, so that's a total of four searches for the day we found at LP in November. Only once did they do the required two searches per shift.

In December and January, they never did the required two searches per shift.

At Barry J in November and December, they conducted only one search, according to policy of two per shift and in January, only three times did they conduct the required searches.

Sorry, yes, searches of searches of the unit. Yes, thank you.

I'm not searches of the youth themselves, but searches of the units.

And that is important as we know with the problem of contraband and drugs being in the in the hall and all the facilities.

So we feel it's very, very important for them to provide the searches that are

required, at least the minimum searches that are required by policy and that is something I will be discussing with the chief. And I'm open for questions.

Thank you, Eric.

And when we pick up session.

And this might get questions. I'm not sure if we need probation would be the one to answer, but I was just wondering when this is something to like into the the changing population at LP from like the beginning of this situation now to something that we'll be looking.

Into for kind of perhaps our. Yes. I look at it very closely every day and some of the Commissioners also.

Their choice or receive the population statistics every day.

And so so we are interested in it because of the demographics of the youth that are there.

We also get this monthly snapshot that shows that, but in particular interested in a decrease in population and figuring out how that decrease is happening.

That's actually something that Commissionership has asked now on a couple of occasions in particular, he asked whether the decrease in population at.

Los Padrinos was related to youth moving out into their dispositions, so being so it was like a transfer.

The kids that were in custody with us at Los Padrinos now in custody with us at Barry J, which is the most common move.

That's what's shown in the statistics. An increase in the population of Barry J corresponding with a decrease.

But actually I did look back at this and if you look at the height of the population in July of 2024, the total detained population was higher, much higher.

By by more than 20 kids.

And it is now, so it hasn't just been about shifting, shifting kids around.

It has actually been about decreasing the population and so the where we've been most interested in that, the Commissioners have been most interested in that is in the intake process and how many of those youth have not been brought in due to the detention reduction plan or other.

Movements on the intake front to be able to do that.

Is that the question that you're asking?

Yes. And then kind of going along with that, I know that.

The last few months in of 2024, there was like a pausing some some reports that you



used to receive in population reports you received.

Now again, are there any other reports that I've used to get that you're no longer getting?

Well, there was also a gap in the receipt of the OC Spray reports, but those have since returned. So and all the population statistics through the time when the gap was have returned. So we've now received all of them.

The problem is is that the way they're presented has changed.

That's that's. That was the cause of the death of the dashboard.

So I think that I think that because we're doing the dashboard instead of probation doing it, they don't realize that.

A slight tweak and how they present race and ethnicity data et cetera, might impact the power BI.

Now I'm talking way beyond my understanding.

By my staff will be laughing at me later, but those little tweaks impact how we can record it because it changes.

So it's not the data we have now isn't comparable to the data we have before. But I mean I think I can say with clarity that the data now is better, it's cleaner and it's it's fixed in some ways.

So I understand why they put the pause and have fixed it. I can say that now because we've gotten it all back.

So I just hope that.

We can consistently receive those monthly snapshots so we can again provide a transparent dashboard to the public.

Would somebody mind if I made sort of a global comment about probation since? OIG anyway, which is just that, you know, the monthly report just shows A level of non compliance that we've shown in our monthly reports, our quarterly reports and our by yearly reports.

And while we keep reporting on these things, we don't have any explanation from probation really other than we don't have enough staff and people call out, right.

We don't have an explanation for them for why nothing has been fixed, right?

And I think that it's incumbent upon, you know the the board to to hold the chief accountable to at least explain why nothing's been fixed. And one recommendation that the Office of Inspector General's made over and over again is to disband field units and to \*\*\*.

Those people to the juvenile facilities and the reason for that is because in the

juvenile facilities we have a constitutional duty to house these youths in a way that meets their requirements of what the law in the United States of America requires. And so the fact is, is that we we keep reporting the same thing over and over again. And really there's been a glacial movement. I mean, like, I think in one category it was 0% compliance to 3% compliance at at its peak. And so I just.

Think that you know.

In in having the motion with regard to the global plan that there might be some consideration for requiring the chief to respond to why is there a complete lack of compliance with order settlement agreement? And so, you know, we will continue to to do our reporting and explain.

To everyone that there is no compliance, but at some point in time there, there really should be a response from the probation department as to why there's been essentially no increase in that.

Anything else?

Are there any presenters for the upcoming meeting?

Other than Croatian or is there like a town hall or anything coming up where other folks might be able to weigh in on some of these issues?

So I invite everyone to weigh in on state Commission. As you know, the only presenters will be Commissioners.

I think there's one or two things that staff will be presenting on and then the chief, I don't actually believe that anyone else for probation is slated to present other than the chief at this upcoming meeting.

And we are scheduling a town hall.

This is actually breaking news 'cause we just decided yesterday that not even official yet where we're going to have the part three of our detention and intake series.

So I've been thrilled with how those have turned out.

I talked to chair Mundo about it yesterday and we will be inviting representatives from probation, from OIG, from community organizations to talk about.

The process by which probation makes its intake decisions, and we're hoping to schedule that for March 19th. But again, it's not officially on the schedule yet. Thank you.

Yes, if I could just.

I did have one more thing in my notes and it's a positive thing, so I really wanna say it, which is that on February 15th, Commissioner Canales and Terry and I were invited to attend what was called an incident Free Valentine's Day event at Barry Jane

Eidworth it.

Was really a beautiful event.

It was a Valentine's Day dinner and dance in which the young people who'd been incident free for 45 days were allowed to bring a date.

It was normal and fun and laughing and candy, and it was so successful because clearly of the report and the work that staff put into it, not just to make the place beautiful, but also the relationships that the young people.

It was smart of them to invite us, of course.

Also, there were a lot of credible messengers there, so it really felt like a kind of relaxed environment.

Except for there were a lot of adults.

It was a very well planned and well orchestrated event and.

My congratulations go to the staff there for what they've done in terms of making this feel like something to aim for.

You could tell with the young people they were proud of being there and had a good time.

Thank you for that.

OK. Any public comment on this item 4B, please raise your hand teams or speak up?

OK, seeing none, we move on and I believe that is last item for public, for the open session, we move to closed session. Thank you.

OK.

Well, we'll start it.

Sorry, yeah.

Anyone here for general public comment please speak up.

I'll raise your hand on teams.

Alright, thank you very much.

Have a good one.

● **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription