

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

PUBLIC SAFETY CLUSTER

Transcript

April 30, 2025, 4:31PM

P

Public Safety Cluster Open 1:14

Good morning, everyone.

I'm gonna start the public statement.

Cluster Gender Review meeting today for April 30th.

Yeah. We're gonna meet somewhere.

Sorry about that. Sorry about that.

Is it on the TV garden like the volume on the No?

I'm sorry, sorry.

I did not.

See if they can hear me.

Oh.

There's multiple people who are.

Yeah, I'm trying to mute all those folks online.

Do you think your online?

Books online if you can.

It's gonna be building a lot of homes.

You knew your phones are working.

We're having an exit on here.

Please leave it there.

All right.

Thank you.

We need to like mute everything.

And melody.

Sorry about that.

OK. Third District, third district.

Good morning, everyone.

Steven Edwards twice this is.

With my colleague Nick Whiteville, Justice deputy.

Excuse me in the audience. Are you on? Are you?

Are you on the? I think it's over here.

Is this one right here?

Yeah, that's right. It's the team.

There we go.

All right. Yay. Thanks. Dirty. OK.

Sorry about that, Steven wondered again.

Not really, no.

Good morning Kyle and Chloe are here for the 4th.

Thank you. And our Chair, fish district.

Good morning, Chandra crossing for supervisor barger's office.

Her fellow Arianna here as well. It's great.

Sorry about that real quick.

I wanted to let everyone know that item 4B has been continued to May 14th and that's the first section CF1 has been of withdrawn by Council.

So with that, we'll call the order and first name is the information items.

The first one is a item 2A.

Is it 4 letters from Sheriff Department approval to accept a unit work from the United States Department of Justice Office of?

Justice programs for the firm discretionary community project.

Are there any questions for this morning justice departments?

I did have a question.

Hopefully somebody can. LSD is available with the announcements that I believe I don't know.

The weeks are all blending together.

It was two weeks ago that a lot of federal DOJ funding was cancelled.

Is this funding still?

Should we have someone in person? They said you want to come up and. Oh, hi.

Thank you.

So whether or not this kind of been cancelled, as far as you're aware and what status is I guess, good morning.

Lisa died from the grants unit with the Sheriff's Department.

No, as far as we're aware, we don't have any indication.

Sorry, we don't have any indication that the funding is going to be cut.

We have really good contacts person at bja. Aaron has been in constant contact with us.

She has been helpful with us as far as all of the things that we want to do with this grant. She hasn't given us any indication that we have anything.

About in fact I was doing some research last night.

I did find a list about 19 pages worth of the 811,000,000 that the federal government has cut and we are not on that list at all.

None of our grants so far have been affected, including this one, so we don't have anything to indicate so far that that it's going to be an issue. Thank you.

Any other questions? OK.

My next question is.

It's vague as to what equipment's gonna be purchased, so I was just wondering if you could.

There's a few things on the list.

Lieutenant Barclay couldn't be here in person.

He should be available virtually to go into a little bit more detail, but it's just basic equipment for the station that they've been needing for a long time.

One of the things they need to do is replace their search and rescue vehicle.

The one they have is just old LD and so they're looking at replacing.

That. Let's see. One of the other things that they are looking at.

Replacing.

New fire extinguishers in their car throughout the station. Obviously we know the importance of that.

They also are looking at getting some fire equipment for the deputies fire response crew.

Kind of go bag type backpack that they can use in the field.

God forbid something happened again, that they need to respond to a fire emergency situation.

They have a little bit better equipment on them now.

They're a little bit better equipped to respond.

Bonds fire emergencies in the future.

So here to help prepare them for that.

Also, trauma kits basically just advanced first aid kits that they can use on themselves or public in the field in the event of emergencies or traumas that might happen.

Social masking vehicles, better helmets, Shields, things like that. Lieutenant Barclay, are you?

He's on on line. Can you?

BL Barclay, Brandon L. 9:08

Yeah. Good morning.

Good morning.

Thank you, Lieutenant Barclay.

I'm functioning as the acting captain for Santa Clarita. Being working on this grant for quite some time and and again just to emphasize, she nailed most of the items. And thank you for hearing us today, justice deputy.

So the new rifle plate Shields the ballistic panels, new ballistic panels that are made of ceramic, which are actually 3 lbs.

So on critical incidents, our deputies will be more provided safety and ballistic panels that are very lightweight and they can respond better. And as she discussed our search and rescue truck and then fire packs, which we believe is quite innovative, allowing deputies in North Patrol division to have.

Fire packs.

As you know, we had the Eaton Palisades, the Hughes fire, these type things where deputy could deploy.

We understand we're not firemen, but we'll have an option to.

To put out a fire quickly, there will be cross training on that.

And again, the tactical trauma kits, I know she touched on most of things already and and and thank you for that, Miss Dai.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 10:12

Thank you.

All right. We have a question.

All right.

Thank you very much.

For comment, any public comment on this item 28?

Een do you know who moved item 2B2B is a share four letter approval of the Los Angeles County Sheriff Department to purchase 1 liquid go.

A dual mask spectrometer, bumpers, mistaken. Are there any questions on this item?

Just one the cost of one unit is 250, so I was just wondering where the cost is. Department. Is anyone online that can answer that question?

CF **Correa, Kirsten F.** 10:55

I'm here from the crime lab.

P **Public Safety Cluster Open** 10:58

Sure that.

CF **Correa, Kirsten F.** 11:00

Kirsten Korea, from the assistant director from the Crime Lab.

P **Public Safety Cluster Open** 11:01

So.

Hi in the latest update each you're purchasing one unit and one unit cost 250,000 but then the total cost is 527.

So I'm just wondering where the why that cost is so much higher than the unit.

CF **Correa, Kirsten F.** 11:18

One the purchase of one unit and all of the components is actually closer to \$530,000. The most recent quote we got was about \$530,000.

P **Public Safety Cluster Open** 11:29

Thank you.

Any other questions?

Just stephanies.

Do you see none public comments for this item? OK, seeing none, we move to the motion a portion of this meeting.

Just want to remind everyone this meeting is being transpired, so we'll move to SD1 board vote.

Hi everybody.

Thank you for being here.

I'll try to do this as quickly as possible. As you can see for the motion what we're trying to do here is create a pipeline program.

For reforming criteria.

As well as factors from LA County Training Center to be able to get jobs with our LA County Fire Department County, they're only being are being employed by the by the state. So we're hoping to create that pipeline with this county where we're asking in the motion is.

For career development, intern, wildfire violent firefighter position to be created for a reentry program to be created that is very structured and.

We will be in partnership with Jaycod, the fire department.

We're also asking for a mentorship and support structure to be part of this program in a well to robust training program. We also are asking County Council to work with the Fire Department resources to see if there's maybe some criteria for the jobs that will prevent certain people.

From qualifying for the job and see if it's a possibility. If they're able to change that, if possible, without losing the integrity of John.

And also asking for support for folks with disabilities with getting a better expungement.

It's finding that we're asking the public defenders APD to help a little bit with that as well and also identifying sources for the work that we're asking to do, so that in a nutshell, that's kind of what the motion is trying to do and is about recognizing the Commitment of those who already helped protect the communities during some of our most devastating wildfires just passed earlier this year.

Many former incarcerated individuals have built hands on experience, and these creates a fair opportunity to build.

On that training, most importantly, it ensures that the county.

And not just the state steps up to provide a pathway into meaningful public service career.

OK.

Any questions from?

I guess I think this is wonderful.

So in director of one.

The establishment of a subspecialty career development intern.

Would that be done utilizing existing resources in the fire department?

Is it an ask for like?

More budgeted items for the fire department.

Are they going to be transition like how do you?

Have chief gather here. But from my understanding.

We were talking to two apartment and yes, I was trying to see first of the worst precision that could be switched to those switches. OK. Is that something that's feasible or something that would good morning Rodney.

I'm the assistant chief of the Air Wildland Division with the fire department.

So in reference to your first question, there is that the initial concept is that we would use existing staff and then establish the program.

Right now we're working with Jcod on. They have a cohort cohort that's just starting. Candidates and working, putting them through their firefighter training to get them to the highest level of opportunity to place the highest level with Cal Fire US Forest Service for those entry level wildfire jobs.

So right now we would use existing staffing and then as the program developed and we find avenues funding then looking long term we would have to establish additional positions most likely.

For the sustainability of it, yeah.

So the idea would be that you utilize the existing kind of programming and maybe enhance some of that program, like when JAYCOT has in a women's viral because their program expand on those for these for this specific population and need. And then of course if I'm hearing.

Longevity wise, ask for positions.

Correct. And that's that career development interim position that would have to be ordinance.

That would create a position within our paid fire camps. Our hand crews for that placement of the folks that are coming through J cod, getting the initial training going through that eight-month program and then have the ability to get that internship with the county hand crews which.

Again, builds in towards that that experience level to test for that position is a permanent county employee and then it and we're working with JCOD. We provide them with.

Fire training so it would be our personnel partner with Jay Codd to provide the. The wildland fire structure fire A level of EMS training that makes them viable candidate throughout the state.

What would be the runway of when you would need to sort of, you know, seek those positions?

If in a permanent sense, yeah. Are we talking about the career development interns?

Like. Yeah, and. And that's and that's what's in the motion there.

So, you know, obviously it'd be the exploratory side of it, of of how we would develop them working through human resources.

So I think the the first step is.

Establishing the JCOD training pathway to get us the candidates and then figure out what that's going to look like as far as the interposition goes and how many we would provide.

Thank you.

OK.

Thank you.

I have some questions for you, chief. And then for the 1st district.

So Annabelle mentioned that currently the fire department doesn't employ individuals from like the CDCR program.

Is that true?

So you don't have because I know we participate right in the CDCR program.

None of the graduates come to the LA County Fire Department.

No, and it's it's through the background process.

So it's our our entry level. So we'll go through backgrounds and there's disqualifying. Factors in there that eliminate them to be candidates.

In there and I think that's part of the conversation about the expungement of records and how we identify what level of offenses expunged to make them not get disqualified in the background process.

So, are those disqualified disqualifications unique to LA County Fire, or are they in state statute to disqualify?

I thought I had nothing to do with an EMT certification, really, and that's to move into the firefighter ranks. And this addresses wildland firefighting positions. So to get into the firefighting.

Ranks that EMT is a state licensure, right?

So it's a state level where the felony is a disqualifier for that state license for EMT on the wildland fire side of it. When you go to Cal Fire US Forest Service, they do not have that as a disqualifier.

So that's unique to the fire department. So we could change that, yes.

Well, I mean, we'd have to explore through with with County Council and all the avenues, but I guess it was so cool to look at, OK.

So I think that then Annabel then directed for.

That's what you're trying out, right? OK.

So then follow up question for you.

This says you know, direct that those be waived and then in 4A it says all other applicants will be assessed on a case by case basis.

So I guess I'm a little. Are you asking the fire department to waive these disqualifying factors or are you asking them to assess on case by case the applicants it's asking to see what?

Criteria can be reached now to apply for all folks, right?

But there's certain, like obviously, more serious.

Offenses such as they wouldn't be able to waive. And if there's other serious offenses, that wouldn't.

That would disqualify someone.

Aside from what decided already when it looked like a trio of the ones that County Council and Fire department closest Stargate for, everybody who can wait, if there's something.

Someone who maybe has something still that would disqualify looking at that.

Case yeah.

OK.

So asking to kind of wave some things that could you like maybe in like in in alignment with the way that the state has waived?

Those background restrictions, but then also looking at case by case. OK, that's helpful.

And then and then that will be a process that chem counseling can work out together. And it looks like you're gonna be reporting back in 60 days, right?

So you'll be telling us what you worked out, what you discovered and what you can do.

Great. And then just really quickly, annali think there's a a typo, right?

I think it says twins graduates from and then there's two spaces that have access.

I'm assuming you mean from latc.

Latc is that one? Yes. OK.

This is 2 words. Directive 2 it says.

Establish the structure to ensure that graduates from space based have ongoing access to mentorship.

Personal. Oh yes, talking about.

So that's LICTC.

That's what I thought.

OK, I think those are my questions. Thank you.

I know Sophia.

Sophia, do you have any questions?

Is there anyone on line that have questions from the board offices?

You speak up.

SS Soudani, Sophia 20:40

Hi. Hi, this is Sophia Tienie, John from supervisor corvas office.

Just a quick question and it may have already been addressed, but has there already been an established number of positions for the interns that that classification that's going to be established or is that still in the works of what's going to be identified?

P Public Safety Cluster Open 20:59

That is, yeah, I think that that is yet to be established because we got to find what the funding source is going to be so that it's going to really dictate our capacity that we can provide the internship positions.

SS Soudani, Sophia 21:13

Got it.

Thank you.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 21:16

Brian Hoffman from CEO has comment.

BH Brian Hoffman 21:21

Yeah. Thank you, Darde, and good morning, deputies.

Again, Brian Hoffman, public safety budget manager and I just had a friendly suggestion to Directive 1B, which is developing the pipeline program in that CEO should not be the lead as developing such a pipeline program is not our expertise. Rather I recommend it should fall to the.

Line Department's implementing the program, or if CEO remains the lead, I would just be curious to that decision making process.

So thank you.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 21:52

Thank you. I think we were trying to make it so that the you took the lead in terms of helping with that, but we'll make that more clear.

BH **Brian Hoffman** 22:00

OK.

Great. Thank you.

P **Public Safety Cluster Open** 22:06

Any questions?

If not, any other comments?

Any public comments?

Oh, I'm so sorry. I'm sorry.

It's OK, I said it very low. So.

Unsafe.

There's an ask for and sounds like there's clearly a need for some funding for all the things listed in the above directed.

What fiscal year are you looking at?

Are you all thinking about? Because, I mean, we've heard there's a lot of.

I mean, we all know.

Where we're at, nurses go and see with the county. And then also, you know, there's been multiple motions that would have been funded.

So wanna be talking about?

I'm not.

I'm pretty sure I don't even think it'd probably be the fiscal year since we're kind of getting closer to the end.

So just trying to be based on the report by what they're recommending. What are we doing? Yeah, OK.

I know Adam facedo. Did you raise your hand?

Your hand was great.

You wanted to say anything, Adam.

AB **Adam Bettino** 23:23

Yes, just, just quickly, can you guys all hear me?

I'm. I'm sorry. I'm. I'm otherwise tied up.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 23:26

Yes.

AB Adam Bettino 23:29

Otherwise I would be there in person.

Just want to thank the 1st district and and frankly the other board offices we've talked to along the way really want to thank Chief Gaylor.

For the support that we're getting from fire for the current cohort, the support that we're also getting from DHR, we've had a lot of fruitful discussions about creating this pipeline leading up to this. So we're excited.

We're excited for the partnership. We're excited for.

Our cadets who are there now and and the future cohorts.

So just want to thank everybody for for pulling this together and working really hard to get this done. Thanks.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 24:02

Oh.

Are there any public comments for this item?

OK. And state your name and we'll start 2. Anthony, first speak, Sir.

Go ahead, Sir.

Yeah. Thank you so much.

My name is Anthony Corleto.

I'm a resident at the two program Associates, student justice. As a former incarcerated firefighter, I can personally attest that the experiences gained in fire can can change lives and communities.

In fact, former fire camp participants have lower recidivism rates than people charged. At the same time, with pensions do not participate in the program.

And due to record high cost of incarceration, we feel that policies that reduce physician only make physical sense of our camp personally instilled in me and believe that could be a productive member of my Community, steal my re entry after release was one of the most difficult experience out.

Of radi.

Antry requires obtaining basic but costly necessities, which I could have obtained had there been pathways to employ. My skills and training after release this January.

Incarcerated firefighters Mr. Los Angeles, yet upon their release.

They will face significant barriers to many available first response professions.

I feel that we should invest and promote the healthy safety and stability of Los Angeles in our communities and we just like to thank supervisors Solis for authoring this motion as well as Jay Codd, the DEO and the LA Fire Department, and we look forward to supporting this.

Motion and support. Thank you.

Thank you very much.

Is there any other comments?

Raise your hand on teams.

All right, seeing none.

Thank you, chair.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Before we begin, the board letters, if there's any other comments in person, please fill out the card on the table and.

Thank you.

Move on 248.

Great. Show me.

Yeah.

Is that the one?

Is this the one that?

Yes, in terms of the title.

The title page.

The first page.

So while we have the PowerPoint get pulled up, we do wanna make sure that you know there is transparency in what we're doing today.

This is gonna be part one of two meetings that we're gonna have about this particular topic. The sheriff has requested to address the cluster deputies, and he unfortunately couldn't make it today.

So we will be hosting a second meeting at a time when the sheriff can attend, which will be in May 21st.

So if there's any lingering questions, there will be another opportunity for us and the public to hear about this item.

All right, I hear you.

Craft screen is frozen for some reason. If you want to start speaking on it, I'll try to get that going.

I don't want to work your time perfect.

So good morning, justice deputies and thank you for this opportunity to present to you the Commission's proposal, visions to chapter 3.79 of the county code. My name is Charmaine Mosley. And I am the executive director of the Commission and presenting with me is the.

Commission's Chair Rob Bonner.

Who has worked tirelessly and passionately for over 9 years as a volunteer Commissioner on this Commission and for the county.

I want to also thank Executive Officer for the board Eddie yen and his team for preparing and issuing the Commission's document package for this meeting.

It has taken some time so we are aware of that. So we thank him for that and chairman and I are here to request that your committee forward, the Commission's proposed recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

It's quite a cool one.

In this presentation, we will explain why the Commission believes that these revisions are necessary for the Commission to have effective and meaningful oversight of the Sheriff's Department.

Yeah, yeah, I'm trying to.

I apologize.

So a little bit about the background.

We do have a background slide up here, yeah.

So, since this Commission was established by the Board of Supervisors over nine years ago, the role of civilian oversight bodies for law enforcement organizations has evolved and expanded across California and the nation. We've seen oversight bodies being given subpoena power unfathered access to confidential information.

The ability to independently investigate complaints or systemic issues within law enforcement agencies and more since the murder of George Floyd, Tyree Nichols and the loss of so many other lives by law enforcement over the last several years, this trend towards more robust and independent oversight bodies is reflect.

And measure R, which Los Angeles County voters overwhelming overwhelmingly pushed and pushed for and approved in March of 2020, and more recently, the passage of AB 1185 by our state legislature.

For counties to create sheriff oversight entities such as ours measure our

engagement. Independent subpoena power and the ability to use its own staff or the office of the Inspector General.

To investigate complaints. Although measure R wasn't added to the Commission's ordinance until July of 2024 and the meeting confirmed regarding the subpoena of witnesses is near completion, based on the experiences of Commissioners who have done this work for so many years.

The proposed divisions to the ordinance will align us with the principles of effective civilian oversight.

Yes, we have made some improvements, but the Commission's ordinance has not been significantly.

Updated since 2016, our 10th anniversary is approaching in January of 2026, and the Commission and so many community members think it's time for the county to have a civilian oversight body with real, effective authority.

It is time for an improved COC 2.0.

Before I turn it over to Chair Bonner to go over each revision, let me briefly state that the value of proposition, of effective civilian oversight of law enforcement agency.

As endorsed by Nicol, only by understanding that and one understand the policies needed to make it happen. We believe that uncovering and highlighting systemic issues within the LSDLASD the Commission will develop and present thoughtful recommendations to the sheriff regarding changes needed in L ES D's policies pract. And also its handling of citizen complaints.

Smart and effective oversight will result in #1 and increase professionalism within Eli esteem and better assurance of constitutional policing. #2A reduction in costly liability of the county for deputy misconduct and #3 an increase in public trust of L Es D. Optimally effective oversight, however.

Requires the enactment by the board of the Commission's proposal visions.

And now I'll turn it over to Chairman, who will go over the Commission's proposed divisions.

What a page are you on right now? I'm sure you have it all.

Right.

Proposed division.

So that's.

Next one.

Yes, this one.

Can you put it on full screen, Jarvis? Yeah.

Could they make it?

Can you make them larger?

Because I know what he's going to be able to read the PowerPoint.

He stole it.

Yeah, ex. The participant study in the top right.

What's that next?

The participants versus participants in the top right, there's an X, right?

14 months ago that was a weird.

Yeah.

Although I think you need to at the bottom on the computer that's showing the power bridge, you need to put in which is that this one and it won't reflect on.

It it just shows it on.

Mine doesn't show it on yours.

Well, yeah.

Scroll to the right so you can see the right.

You don't see the list from a lot.

No.

I mean at bomb.

Sure. I think that's fine.

Fine.

OK.

Maybe if we could go back to Slide 3 for me.

Badri, no, OK.

OK.

I think we've got it's as good as it's gonna get, yes.

And anyway, let me let me just start. Thank you.

Miss Mosley and I want to thank especially the justice deputies and their respective supervisors for this opportunity to present and discuss revisions to chapter 3.79 of the county code proposed and recommended by the sheriff.

Oversight Commission. And I also want to thank.

Our the executive officer for the board, Mr. Young and his team and and our Executive Director for getting the word letter out so we could.

Bring forward.

Finally, the proposed revisions.

I say finally because we've made these proposed revisions and and.

The oversight Commission essentially adopted these proposed revisions, approved them and requested they be sent to the board through the justice departments back in September late September of of last year.

So it's it's been a while coming, but we're finally here and we're we're, we're we're glad for that.

The let me just start off by saying.

We believe that the board, your principles and the public want to see more effective oversight of the Sheriff's Department.

So we start from that premise that premise is wrong.

You can forget about these revisions, but we start from that premise.

Coc believes that its revisions, which were approved by unanimous vote of the oversight Commission, as I said last September, are essential to achieving effective oversight of the Sheriff's Department.

Without them, we're not going to be able to achieve certainly optimal effective oversight of the Sheriff's Department.

I prepared a PowerPoint here and I shouldn't say I prepared our table staff at the Commission prepared it so and this. This particular slide was addressed by Miss Mosley.

So I won't go over it again.

I just want to say though.

P Pua, Ann Marisse O. 36:25
This is Anne.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 36:26

I was with eight other Commissioners.

Was appointed and sworn in by the Board of Supervisors in December 2016.

And we had our first meeting.

This is civilian oversight Commission. In January of 2017.

You know, after that it is important to note that in March of 2020, the voters of the county did provide this Commission.

Our Commission would subpoena authority independent subpoena authority and independent power to investigate any matter.

Relevant to oversight of the Sheriff's Department.

Let's go to Slide 4 for just a second and I know this mostly covered this, but I just

want to stress because if if one if all of you and your principals don't understand the value.

Of oversight.

What effective oversight could really mean for this county?

Then you're not going to understand these provisions, but effective oversight is extraordinarily important.

Important to essentially being able to do something very important for the Sheriff's Department and that is to increase the professionalism within the Sheriff's Department of its 9000 or so foreign deputies.

To better assure that constitutional policing takes place, if this Commission can do that, we have the tools to do that. It will lead to a reduction in liability of Los Angeles County for payouts and settlements for.

Use of excessive force.

Other kinds of misconduct that are engaged in by deputy sheriffs, it will reduce that. And by the way, last last year.

At least according to the data I have, the county paid out \$99 million in settlements, most of which were related to the unconstitutional use of force by deputy sheriffs or other unconstitutional conduct.

And I'm, I'm going to say one other thing.

It will increase if we're effective.

It will increase public trust.

In the Sheriff's Department, that's a good thing. We want to see that happen.

And this Commission would be right tools with these revisions can make that happen.

So we proposed a.

Provisions to 11 sections of the chapter 3.79 of the county code.

Many of them are minor, by the way, and I want to quickly walk through them and I'll do this as quickly as I possibly can.

And and I will pause at any point for any questions at any, any justice deputies may have.

But let's go to Slide 5 if we could. That's section.

3.79 point 1060010010. Excuse me.

By the way, I'm just gonna say I'd be happy to explain this minor name change in the mission's formal name, but I don't think it warrants their time. And so unless there's a question I'm moving on to the next one, just slide 6.

Only your question, so Slide 6 is.

This is the proposed revisions to.

020 and it looks like there are a lot of revisions.

There, but in fact there are not a lot of revisions there.

That's basically just a reordering and a re sequencing of the purposes that are already stated in .020 slightly revised in terms of the sequencing.

The only the actually. The only thing of any significance that we're talking about in 2420 is the fact that we have inserted the word independent before the words provide oversight. So it would it will state.

Or the real amendment there is simply that.

It will say that the severe old psych Commission that the Board of Supervisors expects this will be an oversight Commission to provide independent oversight of the Sheriff's Department.

That's all it says.

And I I realize some have thought that this means we're trying to greet an independent agency within the department, within the county or not.

It's just, it's just A to make clear.

What I think that with the Board of Supervisors, it was very clear on from the outside.

In fact, I remember.

A supervisor, Sheila cull. I remember.

Supervisor Mark Rodney, Mark Ridley Thompson Thomas excuse me. And frankly, Mike and Tonovic, who initially appointed me, I mean they they all urged us to be independent, right?

I mean we're that's that's that was the the key thing and I think that's true all the supervisors.

Today, and I will say that there to my knowledge, there's never been the board or any individual supervisor has ever attempted to observe any kind of pressure or influence on the civilian oversight Commission because they do view us as independent.

It's never happened, but I will say not so long ago, the former sheriff of this county.

Accused this, this Commission of being pawns of the Lord, and of course, as with so many things that he said.

This was false and had no foundation, in fact, but nonetheless there was nothing that explicitly said we were independent in our in our ordinance.

So it needs to be in there.

And importantly, the voters of Missouri gave you know when they voted for that they

they gave us independent subpoena power.

So that changed things. Whatever it was in 2016 that that would, that's a fundamental change because that's voter derived subpoena power and over the over the Sheriff's Department.

And lastly, if we could go to slide, oh, I go to slide seven. I'm going to do that.

Those are just the points I made there, but let's go to Slide 8.

This is just this.

This is, I think, important for all to know, and that is it's noteworthy that the NAPLE, which is a National Association of Civilian open site for law enforcement, has emphasized that establishing independent law enforcement oversight bodies is unquestionably the best practice.

After.

And and by the way, certainly after the murder Torch Floyd, frankly independent, is gonna word either in the the body of over the title oversight commissions or certainly under charters since then.

So it's unquestionably the best practice.

I mean, there's just no sound reason not to do it.

But I pause on it because I know I've gotten some pushback.

Not from the Justice Department, but for the supervisors.

But but from other people say OK.

So let's go to let's get Slides 9 and 10 and go to slide 11, which is the the revisions to .030.

And there are a number of revisions to emissions, a pretty long section, but.

.03 OB F&G are basically just clarifying.

Just clarify the existing duties of the Commission duties we've been been performing. Essentially, since 2017 and I don't see anything that particularly requires discussion there.

So I would say though on .03 OB.

And we've got K up there. Can we go back to B?

There's OK, so there. There's a sentence there that says, by the way, is totally conforming to the measure R, but it does one important thing. And by the way, if you don't know what it does, you you might ask a question.

The morning plays there because one important thing what it does if that section does it, it makes clear that books and papers.

Is used in measure R.

Includes electronic documents.

That's all that provision does. It makes clear that it includes electronic documents.

But measure R.

Use the word books and paper.

So why bother doing that?

Why don't we avoid litigation on that issue so?

That's that's the only change made there, but it's important to understand.

That there are reasons behind every change that the Commission is proposing here.

Let's skip.

Let's let's go back now.

I were to it's slide 11.

Yeah, Kay.

So Kay, this does have.

A1 significant revision to it, and that is it provides that the sheriff will have 60 days to adopt the recommendations of the Commission or explain in writing to the Commission why he or she.

Has not adopted them.

Now that amendment, by the way, is best practice for us.

So we get oversight of law enforcement.

It is needed to ensure that the Commission's well researched and thought out recommendations are responded to in a timely manner and not buried, so we urge the justice departments to urge their principals to adopt that measure. By the way, I'm glad the sheriff will have an OPP.

To come here before and say whether he.

He thinks that is a bad idea.

Yeah, we think it's a good idea. The sheriff should be doing that.

And 60 days is plenty of time.

Because I I will we, we bet.

When we bet, we talk to the sheriff before we make a recommendation, we develop recommendations.

We actually ask the sheriff's in clip form before the formal Commission itself, formally adopts them.

We got his input once he knows what we're going, what we're proposing, and sometimes we will say, yeah, you're right. We need to change that in some way or another.

I'm talking about recommendations, for example on when body worn cameras are activated.

We make recommendations, but by the way, were rejected by Bill and OPA, Sheriff Bill and away. But as to make sure the body worn cameras were activated, we discussed that with the sheriff. I have been.

I don't want to go on record here saying we discussed that with former Sheriff bill away, but because many times he he did not want to meet with us, but so I'm not going to.

I won't say one way or the other.

You'll blog out whatever it is.

Doesn't matter in any event.

So that's that's that's important to us.

We it's important to the Commission if it's have any rigor to it, that the sheriff respond to our recommendation. We can reject them.

No question about that.

But he needs to if he's going to do that, he should.

He should at least make a statement of why he's rejecting a recommendation, for example, that we made with respect to when.

Body worn cameras would be activated and whether the failure to do so after training should be submitted.

To disable OK.

So let's get to the slides.

Well.

Skip song. Let's go to Slide 13, which is 03/1.

This this just clarifies that the DOC Commissioners or staff conduct conduct jail inspections.

I mean, I can't believe there would be an objection.

So that's I'm going to move on unless there are any questions so far.

Let's go to .035, which is slide 14.

The important revisions, by the way, this is the second paraphrot, and this is where the important revisions to .035 appear.

1st If you it's, it's a little busy, but it eliminates the industry important things.

So does the point.

035 said important revision does three things.

First, it eliminates the legally incorrect language that the Commission is not

authorized to go into closed session because it's a brown act body.

This is an incorrect statement of the law, and for that reason alone should be removed.

So it does that.

Second, although the Commission is a brown act body, the Brown Act commits it to go into closed sessions, not just for attorney-client discussions concerning pending litigation or anticipated litigation, but we believe it also allows us to go into closed session to receive subpoena confidential documents that we.

Subpoenaed these confidential documents that we subpoena, by the way, are needed to evaluate the performance of Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department employees.

And to investigate citizen complaints involving alleged conduct by sheriff's deputies. Thus the language is added to section 035 that provides, and I'm going to quote it almost as if it starts off with a Commission may not receive records protected by any law protecting the confidentiality of records, including Penal Code, 832.7, etc. And. Then the new languages, unless such records are subject to disclosure under the Brown Act.

In close session.

So that's the added language.

If by the way, if Assembly Bill 847 passes.

It should probably say brown act or other state law.

3rd the language, the third thing it does is it adds language that expressly recognizes that subject to an MOU with the Sheriff's Department.

Confidential records may be provided to members of ad hoc committees of the Commission. For those three things.

As the Justice Department's know, these issues are in litigation right now.

This isn't threatened litigation.

They're in litigation on March 18th.

A couple of months ago, the sheriff filed a declaratory relief action in LA County Superior Court that asked the court to decide these these issues.

Can we go into closed session to receive subpoena documents?

Can any enter MOU to give ad hoc committee subpoena documents?

Both those two issues are are or will be before the court.

And of course, the Commission, if you, I think you may be aware of this with the Commission, will be filing an action in Spirit board itself to enforce its three

subpoenas.

Which on advice of County Council the Sheriff's Department refused to comply with in part on the assertion that the Commission cannot perceive confidential subpoena documents in closed session.

This, the Commission believes in, will assert in the litigation that there is a legal basis under the Brown Act exceptions.

And judicial decisions to go into closed session to receive confidential documents.

We expect the Court will decide these legal questions.

Nevertheless, it would be important that the Board of Supervisors not foreclose.

Of course, from deciding these questions.

All right.

So that's an important one and I we're going to discuss probably a little bit more in the different context under .100.

Let's go to slide 16.

This is .040. It proposes that the Commission be consulted before the board appoints an add large member of the Commission vacancy.

Well, we already do that.

So it's just confirming that the board doesn't want us to do that.

That's fine, but we just want to have some input on who the Commissioners are.

Because we know what it takes, the time it takes, we know the kinds of expertise and background and experiences life experiences that are important to being disturbing on our Commission.

When we go, 090 recognizes the graphics of the Commission from the outset that periodically established at our committees to focus on specific issues and report back to the full Commission. By the way, this has been extraordinarily important part of the Commission and its ability to be.

As effective as it has been over the past seven to eight years.

OK.

Let's go to slide 100 and I'm almost done.

This language.

That's added to .100.

It was actually in response to language that County Council proposed.

So we didn't originally have this language yet, but.

This language little is language that.

I can't quite read it from here, but it's the Commission may only meet in procession

purposes permitted under the Crown Act.

Or state law and the Commission will confirm County Council before going into closed session.

So that's what we're proposing in .100 and we believe that would be appropriate language because that the board isn't deciding at the court, ultimately will decide whether we can go into closed session to proceed, subpoena document confidential documents and that's the way it should be.

But we're gonna.

I know County Council has a different view on this and we're looking forward to hearing from them on that and we'll respond further as necessary.

So let's go to slide 20.

And that's .110.

That's a slight organizational tweaks that are explained pretty well. I think in our written statement that we submitted to the justice departments and then proposed section 3.79 point 140, we, as I believe consistent with with the current practice.

So to be able to provide effective oversight is important, and these are relations.

Are Justice Stephanie's these provisions are needed to put the Commission in the best position to do that.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak to you and to this public safety public safety cluster meeting. If there, by the way, happy to entertain any questions. Really happy.

I actually I want you to if if there's anything confusing about any of these revisions.

I actually want to try to clarify them.

Here if we can.

Thank you, Sandra.

Thank you.

So we want to hear from Counselor Colby pulling to questions.

Is that the perfect?

All right, County Council.

Good morning. Justice deputies and thank you chair Walter and Miss Mosley for your presentation.

My name is Jansson Diaz.

I'm a senior deputy county counsel with the Office of the County Council.

What do you have my colleagues?

Hi, Matthew Gill, senior Deputy County Council, Thomas Sponen, senior Assistant

County Council, Lily Campos, Assistant County Council.

Again, thank you justice deputies and as you all heard from Chair Barnier and presentation, the COC is proposing multiple revisions to its ordinance today on behalf of County Council, we are presenting an ordinance amending 3.79 of the county code, which would authorize the COC to.

Meet the closed session.

Currently, the County Ordinance establishing the COC does not authorize it to meet in closed session.

Therefore, pursuant to the Brown Act, all discussions by the COC must be public. In addition, the Brown Act does not have an express provision which allows the legislative body to meet in closed session solely to have a confidential discussion, and that even applies not only to the Co.

But to the Board of Supervisors as well.

Therefore, this ordinance removes current language from the ordinance, which limits the cocs ability to meet in closed session.

Specifically, this ordinance will authorize the COC to meet in closed session in two situations.

First, regarding penny litigation arising from the coc's issuance of a subpoena pursuant to state law or the county code or any other action taken by the COC, this authorization falls under section 54956.9.

Of the Brown Act, which permits a local legislative body to hold closed sessions to confer with its legal counsel regarding pending or anticipated litigation.

Second, this order. This ordinance will authorize the COC to meet in closed session. Pursuant to the Brown Act to discuss with executive officer the appointment evaluation or performance or dismissal of the Commission's executive director or staff.

This authorization.

Under 54957 B of the Brown Act, which permits a local legislative body to hold closed sessions to consider the appointment employment evaluation of performance, discipline or dismissal of a public employee.

In summary, justice deputies, this ordinance will provide the COC the authority to meet in closed session and make recommendations on the Commission's staff personnel matters.

And come forward with Council on certain litigation matters.

And with that being said, thank you again for your time today and myself and my

colleagues were open for any questions you may have.

We, by the way, we want a short response to that, but good.

Basically, by the way, we're we're we're pleased that County Council has recognized that there are instances in which clearly and plainly under the Brown Act were entitled to go into closed session.

I mean, we're clearly entitled to go into closed session and discuss pending litigation for enforcement or subpoenas, and they recognize that and they they put that in there.

In there.

But they I think they're reading the the performance of the evaluation of performance of county employees really too narrowly. By the way, I respect their opinion on this. I'm not.

I'm not just saying this, this is a.

This is an area in which reasonable, I think lawyers could disagree, and I think reasonable lawyers here do disagree.

They want to restrict.

And limit us in a way that we could not.

By board ordinance.

Go into closed session to receive subpoena documents. We say, by the way, I have a reason authority on this.

I mean, there are some pretty I don't just say myself, there are some reasonably good lawyers on the Commission that have worked in this issue and we take we we just say look, we think we have a good argument.

In the court, assuming the legislature doesn't resolve this itself, but in the course in the in the spending litigation to be able to.

Argue that we can go into closed session to receive confidential subpoena documents under our subpoena power under measure. Our subpoena power and the power given to us under the government code by AB 1185. And they say no, we're reading it very narrowly.

But look at the language.

The plain language, frankly, the first thing, by the way, the first thing a judge does, and I confess to having been one for a brief period of time.

But the first thing a judge does.

In interpreting a statute.

If they look at the language of the statute in this case, it's it is, as as Jansen said, it's 5

core 957 of the government code.

B. And it says that you can't go under closed session to evaluate the performance of public employees. Just to say we have to be the employee agency.

It just says you can do that.

We evaluate the performance of deputy sheriff.

That's our fundamental job.

We're doing that every we've been doing that for seven or eight years.

We just have not been able to get confidential documents from the Sheriff's Department because the Sheriff's Department and County Council says we can't get them illegally. We think we can get those legally.

We actually think will prevail in court on this. What we don't want to see is the word adopt A version of .1100.

The County Council's approving to prevent the court.

Actually allowing us to access confidential documents through subpoena by going into closed session.

And this the what they're proposing actually would prevent the court from ruling, even ruling in our favor.

So make it moral.

Make it more open-ended. We're not saying we're permitted to do it, but just say, as permitted by the state law, if we're permitted to do it well, we can do it.

And we'll get, by the way.

There will be court resolution of this, I can assure you there was going to always be, but now there's it's a certainty there'll be court resolution unless ABA 47.

Passes before there is a court resolution which will crop the whole thing.

And will remove the issue.

In any event, so I just wanted to understand that we have we have a reasonable disagreement on it.

They agree on everything.

That's expressly clear.

We're saying this is it isn't totally clear, but it's reasonably clear, I think, or at least it's arguable within the balance of reasonable disagreement between lawyers, it's arguable either side.

So why would the board take sides on this?

So our provision just says let's it's permitted by the Brown Act and state law and and we go from there, OK.

I'm sorry to make that so long, but it's a really important point because this is this would be the big loser for effective oversight if we can't subpoena confidential documents and get them in closed session, we we're not going to be able to do the optimally effective over.

That we believe the oversight Commission should.

Be empowered and charged to do.

Thank you.

Thank you.

And just can I just respond?

Very briefly to that.

Appreciate that the Commission has a different view of the legal issues than County Council does.

We are happy to provide you with a follow up legal analysis of the Brown Act issues and the confidentiality issues following this meeting.

Thank you.

And we would also we would like Oakley County Council to give me some help through a process to share with us.

So we can probably agree on most of it.

I mean, so, I mean, but we'd be like an offer, we want to make sure that.

At least the the lawyers on the Commission have an opportunity to take a look and and weigh in on we can certainly provide the Commission with our legal analysis as well.

As we have done.

And I think we've provided you with ours already, but yes, OK. Thank you.

Alright, I can start with some simple questions.

Go ahead.

Alright, I'm gonna start with simple question for the COC for your proposal in your board letter, it mentions a request for staff, right?

You're asking for quite a lot of changes, so there's a section on fiscal impact.

So my question for you is, given the fiscal situation that the county is in right now.

If you are unable to get more money.

And more staff for all these changes.

Will you still be able to?

Meet the duties laid out in this ordinance.

Change without any fiscal or staff backing in addition to what you're already respond

to that person.

Giving us authority and duties.

And everything we've asked for, it is a good thing.

But let me assure you that we from the outset we understood.

We have to prioritize what we can do.

We've always understood that we have a small staff, the Commission is part of volunteers. There's only limited time, so we won't be doing everything.

In other words, let's let's say citizen complaint, right?

This this just makes clear that of course, of course, the oversight Commission.

I mean this is.

I don't even think it's debatable. Of course we were able to consider citizens oversight complaint and we should be able to do that and we should be able to.

If we have a complaint and a citizen has made that complaint to the Sheriff's Department, we should be able to go in and look at the confidential records.

What did sheriff do?

CU **Chidinma Ume** 1:04:31

What?

P **Public Safety Cluster Open** 1:04:31

Did it investigate it?

What did it do?

How did it resolve it?

CU **Chidinma Ume** 1:04:34

That's for junior, that is for.

P **Public Safety Cluster Open** 1:04:35

Did it? Did it interview the right people and the like?

CU **Chidinma Ume** 1:04:40

They're Thunder.

P **Public Safety Cluster Open** 1:04:42

Sorry if you're online, please mute your phone or your screen.

Thank you. But the point is just that we can't do it doesn't mean we're going to be able to do it with our existing staff.

Of course, we're not going to be able to do it.

We will be able to do it, maybe in some selective cases that we think are really, really important because they relate to systemic issues and problems within the Sheriff's Department.

Like deputy gangs and deputy slicks.

Just to give an example, most of the time we will do what we currently do, which is we will refer these to the Inspector General.

99% of the time these are going to be referred to the Inspector General.

It's only going to be at an occasional exceptional matter that the Commission will undertake it, because we don't have it, so we have to prioritize.

So it's just a matter that if we don't have the authority to do it, obviously we can never do it. We actually think right now this is just clarifying.

We think we have the authority to do this.

In fact, we've been doing it for seven years, but we, but we're not able to actually effectively do it because we can never at the at the current the way this is under the current structure, we can never subpoena and actually or even look at confidential documents at.

The service department.

Nobody in the oversight Commission.

And that, by the way, to me, is ridiculously absurd. So.

Yes, it will not be an impact because we're not taking on.

We're not. We're not going to expand our role, particularly what are we going to do our priorities.

Will be systemic issues and we have to prioritize what those are. Our executive record has been phenomenal because she actually has come up with and some discipline here in terms of our what our vision is, what our strategic plan and objectives are for this coming year, those are.

What we focus on, so we have the resources to do that, but if we take on everything, no, we can't.

And I realize sometimes the public expects you to take on everything.

We have to be selective and we've been very selective. If you look at it, I mean we've got.

We were instrumental in getting body worn cameras expanding methane.

We were instrumental in exposing the continued existence of bevy gangs and deputy cliques within the Sheriff's Department and making recommendations, so we will focus on the big systemic, systemic problems of the Sheriff's Department.

And we've been doing that.

So I'm confident, even with subpoena power, to get confidential documents when that in those situations that will help us.

That we'll be able to do that frankly without any fiscal impact.

The only fiscal impact here is if we're doing effectively, we're going to reduce that \$99 million settlement payout that the county makes.

Annually. Sorry, a long answer, but thanks and so kind of you touched on some of this a little bit, but then I think my next question is with these expansions.

Do you see redundancies or how do you see roles with the OIG, the Civil Branch Commission and potentially the civil service?

Great, but that's a great question because there is overlap, right?

Clearly it's just it's structural overlap.

And and the let me just start off with a really great example because you mentioned Civil Branch Commission and that is.

The oversight over the county jail.

Which has been plagued historically with.

Concerns about real concerns about the use of excessive force.

Course I can send.

I mean that this goes back to my days on the Citizens Commission on jail violence, right?

I mean, in our work there, but we have three different groups.

So how how would you do it?

We we would like to have as we put in the ordinance, the ability to inspect the jail, to be clear and make unannounced inspections to our staff and us, but will we do that? We will do that.

First of all, we're not going to do that.

Regularly, we will usually be. First of all we have. We are coordinating with the Civil Branch Commission.

And we certainly are going to leverage the Civil Branch Commission because it does that on a regular basis.

It inspects the jail facilities and we're going to leverage the OIG.

In other words, most of the time, when there's a problem, it requires somebody to go

into the jail and inspect.

We're going to ask the either the OIG or the civilian Commission to do that.

And why is that?

Well, we have to do that and frankly, it makes sense to do that so long as there's an IG.

It has a staff of 30 + 6 or seven of whom are totally devoted to essentially the jail facility. Makes sense to use the IT resources and it makes sense to use the Silver brand Commission.

So we're not, we're not gonna go.

It may be we never do an unannounced inspection.

We just wanna make sure that we have the authority to do it and there will be sometimes where?

The board itself asked us to go in recently to.

Determine whether menstrual products were available.

In in the county jail, I mean.

Technically, I guess somebody could have said no, you can't go in because you don't have the authority to do it. But we did go in, by the way.

And so this just confirms that we have that authority.

It doesn't mean we're taking over, that we really are.

And if I can write it differently, we can write it differently.

I'll make that clear, but I think we've tried to say in that very section that we will leverage the resources of the SBC and the OIG to do probably most of the physical inspection occasionally.

By the way, we're concerned that they're not doing it properly.

We need to maybe go in and see ourselves.

Whitman, central. And we don't want, we just don't want to be precluded from doing that.

Right and right now.

Right now, the sheriff runs the jail.

We we show up.

They're not for us to come in here. We need to show them.

Oh yes, under county ordinance we we have that authority, but we're not.

Look, we realize we're supposed, by the way, I I know our executive director here is what I'm saying.

We're not going to.

We do not need to expand our resources.

That does not mean we couldn't use a couple more staffers.

I mean, but and I realize we're inside budgetary time.

So I'm unreasonable expectations.

But it doesn't mean we could use a little more staff because we have a very small staff that does a heck of a lot.

I mean, I can't tell you how, how hard they work and so. So I don't mean to preclude that by saying that we'll do everything without any additional resources, but we can do it and we will do it because we don't have no resources. We prioritize, we've always.

Prioritized we've never tried to take everything off. Picking on the big issues.

That afflict the Sheriff's Department, and that's what we'll continue to do.

So what about the Civil Service Commission and your like discipline in terms of looking at discipline and making recommendations and stuff?

How would you view and legally? I don't even know.

Maybe County Council?

Like, how would your role different?

What if you had two different reviews of discipline?

Like, how would that work if when we have the Civil Service Commission and then now the COC would be involved in discipline?

Well, the Civil Service Commission, you know, I mean, that's by the way, that's an independent Commission, right?

And it and but it it, it's handling discipline appeals, right? And anybody any county employee, including every deputy sheriff's in 502 appeal any discipline they receive not any discipline.

I think it has to be more than 14 days. Don't only do that.

Certainly terminations. They're all appealable to the.

Discipline and those are really we're not even in that. We're not in that category.

Really. What what what we're really saying is.

That there are times.

When the Civilian Oversight Commission.

Wants to say something about discipline, or lack thereof.

We really by the way, that provision says, as permitted by law.

So let me just let's be clear.

That means we can't.

We can never make a public statement about a deputy who an individual deputies receive discipline.

Even the sheriff can't do that under the law.

We can't do that.

That's all we're talking about. What we're talking about is something, by the way, that the ACLU brought to our attention.

Not too long ago, we're talking about, for example, head strikes in county jail.

I want to give you that example.

That's right.

16 head strikes.

They looked at them.

No discipline, by the way.

A head strike ordinarily is a violation of Sheriff's Department policy.

To strike somebody they had or push their head into a wall.

And make that's against your policy. So the question is why no discipline?

Why no internal investigation?

And we need to have access first. That's confidential information.

We're not, by the way. We refuse access to that information by the Sheriff's Department because it was confidential information because it does involve individual deputies, right?

I mean, who are responding and and and perpetrating headstrikes?

So it's confidential information, we can't access it so.

But the point is that we need to be able to comment publicly, not on that individual case, but of the pattern of lack of discipline. We need to be able to comment on whether we think.

There's been lack of discipline in this area.

Certainly we're entitled to publicly comment on that. We're not commenting on any individual deputy's case, by the way.

I'm happy to consult with County Council before we make a public comment.

Hope I do.

You can hold me to that, but the reality is we need to be able to comment on discipline.

It's broadly it's not.

So that's why it's that section. And by the way, that is .03.

Oh Ki.

Think K.

That section just says we can. We can comment on it, but it's as permitted by law.

So please understand that.

So really, it's not anything we please understand. We do not have the power to discipline any definite the sheriff does.

We do not.

We're not asking for that power.

We do not have the power to even.

Though we can't even we can't even criticize.

An individual.

Case that involves a named deputy, because that's not permitted by some permitted by state law. Whether that should be the case or not.

So it's, but it is making clear that we do have some role in commenting on discipline, at least on a broad general level.

I mean, let me ask you this question.

Why has anybody been disciplined for being a member of a deputy gang or a deputy clique?

Alex.

Policy back in February of 2020, it didn't prohibit the association of Deputy Clerks, but it did use the term anyway.

I mean, has anybody been?

Investigators are disciplined under that section or the more recent section that prohibits law enforcement gang. The oversight Commission should be able to equip and say, well, you know, the discipline in general for these cases has been adequate. You're not getting rid of deputy gangs because the discipline's inadequate, either because there was never an internal affairs investigation, so there couldn't be any administrative discipline or there was one.

And it wasn't adequate.

It didn't even ask about Deputy Gang Association or tattoo.

Of the people that were interviewed, I mean, we need to be able to comment on on these issues, but not on specific.

But we're not comparable in any way to the the function that the Civil Service Commission performed and and we're not, we're not subsuming the overall discipline I mean.

People may want us to do that, but we're not asking for that and and we don't.

We're not.

We're not going to be doing that. I hope that someone answers. Yeah, it does.

So from what you're saying, you know the Civil Service Commission, right?

They review individual discipline upon appeal.

So they're looking at people who were disciplined, right?

And who are killing? You're saying kind of the opposite, right?

We want to be able to look at patterns and instances where maybe there was no discipline or there was no investigation.

Discipline was inadequate or the discipline was inadequate and and kind of look at that.

So it's not individual.

Let me get involved in this one person who was disciplined and see if that discipline was.

Should be.

Change right?

Yeah, I mean, like, can I give you one more example?

I mean, maybe I'm, but I really. It's just really important for you to understand what our Commission does and what it doesn't do.

But one thing is let's say we talked about activation of body worn cameras.

You know, I would really like to be able to go in and look at not just one case. I want to look at.

We're going to look at multiple cases where there was no activation, and yet the county is just paid out, you know, ten, \$10 million.

We'd like to look at those cases, not just one case.

Why wasn't somebody born activated that's number one?

Was there any discipline meted out to that deputy who just cost the county 5 to \$10 million for not activating the camera?

Was there any?

Was there an internal investigation? We want to see. This is a pattern. We're not looking at one case. We're looking at multiple cases, identifying cases where the activations didn't occur. And by the way, if it hasn't occurred and the county.

Paid out undergrads of County Council.

Millions of dollars on that case that needs to be changed and you have an oversight Commission that can only do that by accessing confidential documents to see what happened. Why these.

Why they're not being activated and then if it's a policy issue, recommending a policy to the sheriff to fix this, which it means you get discipline and it's serious that you can be terminated if you don't turn on your body worn camera.

You've got to get people's attention.

Look, I believe in training.

That's really important.

Training goes on for so long, it's time now that those cameras that the county pay for.

Deactivated when there's an encounter with the public and it's that. That's what we do and that's what we can only do by accessing confidential records or reports, because we don't even know. You asked me, well, how many times does that happen? We don't know because.

Because we can't subpoena and access those reports because they're confidential.

So if you want an effective oversight Commission.

That's we need these.

We need these revisions, OK.

Thanks for that. That's awful.

Really. What's awful?

It was kind of a softball, I think you went out of the scope.

That's OK.

By the way, I'm guilty of that. It's fine.

I just wanted to go back to the staff and and and just, you know, piggyback on what chairman said.

Nothing in this ordinance impacts the staffing of this Commission. However, language that was in Measure R that passed in 2020 and that was added to the Commission's ordinance in 2024.

That may impact some of our staff members, so I just wanted to add that it's not language that's in this ordinance, but language that was in measure R.

Other question I.

Let's go.

Yeah. So.

So just backing up for a second here.

So the board letter that we're looking at is your looks like it's your preferred language and it doesn't yet reflect County council's comments or suggestions. Is that correct?

I just wanna make just starting off on what we're looking at here, like I'm the language. There is a separate board letter.

Yeah, there's a separate board letter.

So they have a they have a separate.

Excuse me, I'm sorry to talk over you.

There's a competing .100 that the County Council is is that the own, OK.

I guess I didn't see the 4th letter.

Is that is that the only point of contention supporting the two board letters or?

So it's wouldn't say it's a point of contention. It's an alternative, right? If the board wanted to take.

An action immediately to rectify the closed session issue that has been raised.

We don't think that is a controversial change, whereas there are other changes.

In the Coc's proposal, which have implications, as the judge noted, there is pending litigation and there will be pending litigation and there are other issues going on that we think.

In order to address immediately the closed session issues, we can do that with the amendments proposed by County Council.

And I see that you said before letters size scrolling too quickly.

On the litigation piece.

Can we clarify? Is the brown Act question part of that litigation?

I thought.

The litigation is about whether the documents can be shared, which is different.

With between Sheriff and Coc. So I don't wanna speak on behalf of the sheriff, but maybe that'll be discussed at the next meeting. But you know, on it, on its face, that declaratory relief action is about the sharing of confidential.

The the paragraphs 13 through 15 territory relief action serves taking the position that we cannot.

Go into closed session to receive confidential documents.

It's that issue, and it's gonna be added issue in our enforcement action as well.

So if that question is whether or not we can go into closed closed session to receive confidential subpoena documents, is before the court right now and going to be reported in in our court.

As I understood, the declaratory week is about whether documents can be shared, not closed session piece.

Well, is that in the you have to read the allegations, the allegations of the Sheriff's

Department in County Council.

Oh, I'm sorry.

County Council, by the way, I was actually on behalf of the sheriff.

Clearly says. I think it's paragraph 15. I could be wrong.

But essentially, we can't go into closed session.

Therefore, he cannot allow this without being a document.

Can I?

Can I just in any event doesn't in a way at Darby? It doesn't really matter, because even if it isn't, it is there.

But I mean, it's also going to be raised in our enforcement action.

But can I just hopefully in a week or two to clarify, though Jonathan's point? I so I don't think either action right now gives you that authority correct. You would still have to wait for the court or a change in state legislation to allow you access to. Confidential, even if the board permitted no, because because there was another party. Not here.

But they they will.

They'll seek to enjoin it.

So no, yeah, we we need a court decision or legislation.

One of the two.

Or an MOU, right?

No. Well, we could get an MO U, but there are drawbacks to that one.

I mean that I I can take some time.

I think I try to explain them in my my written statement.

There's serious drawbacks to just having an MO U. First of all, it's entirely voluntary on the part of the sheriff.

Maybe the sheriff will be a good guy and MOU with us, but he's not going to do that without a meeting first told by the public record.

I'm not revealing any confidence and so.

And and secondly, so there's no compulsion under it, he doesn't have to.

Service department any time that feels like it's not going to give us something, it just it doesn't have to.

So we we really need to have this.

We need to have the subpoena authority, and that's what the that's what the voters of LA County gave us in March 2020.

They thought it was going to be effective.

It turns out it's illusory.

Unless we can go under closed session to get confidential documents.

So and that the same, by the way, that's the same was true under the government code section gave it gave our oversight Commission screen authority.

25303.7 so we it is an issue.

I'm just sorry.

I mean, there's no way to avoid this issue and and it's going to have to be resolved.

Either by the legislature in court, no, the board can't get.

The board can't say.

Oh, we, by the way, we didn't even close that.

We're not saying that the board should adopt an ordinance.

It says that the Commission can go into closed session to receive subpoena document.

That's not what we're proposing.

Because we know that. That's that's that's a question of state law.

It's a state statute that has to be resolved in court by the state legislature.

Pick up. OK. Thank you.

Can we clarify?

Or maybe just are you able to share this space?

Why not like? I'm looking at the competing language where it just calls out the two Brown Act bases.

Substantively, how is that different from Coc's languages? Saying legally you know what's permitted under the Brown Act?

So one of the issues that we've raised is that currently COC in addition to the language that.

Both versions are taking out of the ordinance.

They're appeared intro clauses like that aside, currently under the ordinance, there is no basis and they will disagree with this.

But there is no basis for this COC to meet in closed session under the Brown Act.

And so part of what?

Our proposals are intended to do.

Is for the board to authorize the CEOC to make recommendations on.

Issues that they could then discuss in closed session.

I got you. So so for instance, with the personnel exception, the CSC is not the appointing authority of the CSC staff, the executive offices.

But if the board authorizes them to make recommendations to the Executive Office, then they can meet in closed session to discuss those issues.

Similarly with the the Sakena enforcement right, the Sakina enforcement, whenever we litigate those issues that is brought on behalf of the county, the county is the party to the litigation, not the COC. But if the board authorizes the COTC to be involved in that decision making, then they.

Can meet in closed session.

And having it in the ordinance ensures that that there's a clear line.

For that authority, for them to meet in court session.

So it's not a limitation on their ability to be in close sessions actually facilitating their ability to meet in closed session.

So to the to the express desire of COC, why couldn't we add?

Could we add so you have A and B here, right? A. Well, let's just to provide recommendations to the EO specifically about the Commission staff, to their point about the broader oversight of.

Sheriff's Department why couldn't we authorize them to provide recommendations to?

I guess it would be the board about individual share cases.

So and then they then subject to the litigation about whether the information could be shared. They could have need in closed session to make those recommendations.

And and this is we'll provide an analysis, OK. Of these brown act issues in our in our memo.

But yeah, there are limitations in the broad act, and that's the point of contention is that.

The the Brown Act doesn't, for instance, authorize any legislative body to meet in closed session just to receive confidential.

And I'm saying that either.

I'm saying you understand our legal position is totally contrary to that and the effect of this of their language is that the board will be preempting, including a court or even the legislature, because it's now saying those are the only two instances the board is giving estimation dire.

That those are the only two instances, those limited instances in which we can meet in closed session.

And the board should not do that because that that's puts us in a straitjacket. It prevents the court from deciding.

This question do you see why?

Please ask me if you don't because I I this is this is this is the fundamental issue here.

I understand your position, yeah.

Oh, OK.

Yeah, but but OK, so if you agree with County Council that we're limited to those two limited situations under the Brown Act, well, and you don't want the court to decide that issue. As a matter of policy, the board is a matter of policy. The board can do.

That.

There's no question about it, but as a matter of policy, if it does that, it will preclude us from getting confidential documents under subpoenas, because it's saying those are the totally two things where we go into closed session.

That's not necessarily true, because you have the ad hoc solution in here, right?

That you can have an ad hoc committee that can interview so, but hold on, I have a question. Then I have to go to the chair.

For really terrible things about the ad hoc solution, even though can I can I respond to what you just said? Because I think that there is an in between here.

I don't think that it's just what you're saying and what Tom's saying.

Like what if my opinion is that right now, under the current Brown Act, those are the two situations that we can go into into?

Into into a closed session, because that's what the board of I see, right?

But hold on. That's what the board of that's the only way the board can go into closed session.

Why would Coc be any different?

But there's pending litigation and there's pending this.

The law, right, the state AB, whatever it is, right. So if the court says actually there is a third situation, you can go into closed session for to review confidential documents or this law passes that says there is this third situation can we?

Add that like. Is there a way to after the court decides this? You know for us 'cause, that's what you just said here that you want.

But I I'm so confused.

I was a judge, but you said that the courts do not respond to a supervis act.

The the argument will be either the Sheriff's Department or perhaps some other party that intervenes.

Their argument will be there's no reason for the court to decide this because.

As a matter of policy, the board has just decided.

We can only go under closed session for these two limited purposes and we can't go into closed. Ergo, we can't go into closed session to receive confidential document. End of story. Into court case, I think. Let me let me just let me interview here. So I think what you're saying here, what you're saying is saying you want the court to decide. I think what you're saying is based on the courts, the County Council board letter.

That you're referring to the County Council, correct?

So I think I think we're kind of meeting in the middle here.

So I think what you're saying is looking at the County Council board letter just based on closed session.

Yes, you're saying it could be a clause that is added in there that says if the court decides we can't, if the law passes, can we expand it?

So I agree with you.

I don't wanna get the clarification by the way.

That would be fine. If that's expressly put in there so the court knows it's not precluded or in the legislature.

I mean, won't be precluded if it passes that. I just want you to understand why point I hope because it's.

If if you don't do something like that, the current language.

Would would would would stop. The court would stop for resolution.

You're saying if we keep it?

With just those two, then the court would look at it and say we're not even going to decide if it's allowed or not because the board has limited the board is limited.

OK.

So two options.

One is, you know, the ordinance can always be updated at a later date if there's a change in the law. Two is taking no action now and waiting for a resolution of the litigation before moving forward with an ordinance so that it's informed by whatever decisions are made.

By the court.

Or the legislature.

That's a possibility.

Delay .100 do we have any timeline on when the courts gonna get back to us?

Well, I can tell you.

I mean, I think the only Council can, but I've had a lot of problems learning myself.

So typically we we wanna limit, hopefully limit the factual issues here.

So it's a pure question of law for the court and and all of that.

But even saying that, I mean, we're talking about, you know, six months to a year.

Get a spiritual decision.

There will be an appeal.

I don't know whether it'll be by the Sheriff's Department or some other organization, but there will be an appeal to the under Court of Appeal and so you're adding at least another year to it.

So we're talking about that, you know, roughly A2 year process. Maybe County Council disagrees with me.

Probably probably.

The Supreme Court will deny a petition.

And so it's about two years and we will find out what the law is, whether or not we can go in full session to receive confidential documents.

Which, by the way, delays any kind of effective oversight.

Except we need competent documents for two years.

But that's that's the judicial process.

We're hoping the legislature will short circuit that process with 8847 because that's that. If it goes through, probably you were talking about, you know, why delay or August?

Can we clarify if AB 847 passes right?

Which has the explicit grants in state law.

This will be 25303 which gives us.

You don't have to often work, so we're still evaluating.

The short answer in terms of the brackish here, there's the language in the current ordinance that arguably limits them.

A meeting, right?

OK, so so you know that aside.

But again, I think the two issues are.

The board delegating authority to the CEO to undertake specific tasks.

That would bring them under the branch or or under any new legislation to meet in closed session. That's what that's that's why I said to be clear, right. So just to make sure I'm understanding this distinction, your analysis of their, so the Commission proposed language, the Commission may.

Only be in closed session for purposes permitted under the Brown Act and your view

is that because the board has not delegated them any of those specific tasks, that language actually does nothing because they still have no basis to meet in closed session.

I just wanna understand that that's a position that's that's the concern. OK. Raised. And so ABA 47 passed saying that. So you're still analyzing whether that would be enough or whether the board would still have to delegate some specific tasks to use that authority. That's still an.

Open question.

Yes. And the complication with that proposed legislation is that it refers back to the personnel exception under the Brad actor rather than creating an independent authority.

For, for instance, oversight commissions to meet in closed session to undertake their oversight functions.

Correct, it gets back to the issue.

You know which Kyler raised about the different roles, for instance with.

The Civil Service Commission, which clearly has.

A role.

Role in personnel matters to make decisions regarding individual personnel matters.

That is what.

The brown exception is for and in. The purpose of it is to avoid embarrassment of the employee.

So it is very much an individual thing.

The question is, would their current functions fit under that branic perception?

And we'll discuss that in our memo.

But hold on. If we accepted the proposed language from the COC right now, the way that I read it is it says we can go into.

It eliminates the the clause that says you can't, right?

So it says you can go into closed session for what's allowed under the law.

So if we adopted that language instead of the county Council's language, then right now what's allowed.

But I know you disagree, but what we think is allowed is those two exceptions under Brown act, right?

The no.

That's what.

That's what, that's what.

Drop that they're saying.

They need. They're saying their language, need the board, need their position is the board needs to delegate those specific tasks, yes, to use those exceptions. But right now if we don't delegate those tasks, there is no basis.

That's at least the position, even if we adopt those language that says you can go into closed session for what's allowed under the Brown Act.

Why? Because the COC, even under the amended ordinance, does not have any functions that would fall within the personnel exemption under the Brown Act.

Or the litigation exceptions because the litigation it's county litigation, the COC is not an independent entity.

But what if the subpoenas 'cause if we pass this whole thing, it gives them expanded subpoena authority, right? Isn't that?

We've always brought that litigation.

By the county.

It doesn't give us expanded contain authority.

Let me just start off with that, but let me just say, I mean this is a really fascinating discussion.

It's not terribly relevant to what the oversight Commission does or what it wants and what it needs, but the reality is OK.

Here's what could happen.

The court could say that we're entitled to go into closed session to receive confidential documents and the board it does nothing.

That's the end of the legislature, says we, by the way.

And this is in the latest version of the Bill 4847.

8827 it says we can go into closed session.

To receive confidential documents, right?

It's an exception to the Brown Act. Now, if either one of those two things happen, the board doesn't do anything right, but because we're.

We can do what we can or permitted to do under the Brown Act and have just been decided, but the board could always go back and say, as a matter of policy, we don't want the Commission to be able to receive confidential documents in closed session where we.

Say policy control over this and that we don't want is the policy to be exercised.

Before the court decisions court decision and and or the legislative decision, and by taking these these two limited things, that's a policy decision by the board based

upon a legal argument of Council that is contrary to a, by the way, a more plausible legal argument that the Comm.

Has.

And we will submit it to you.

Actually, our, our our argument actually is more plausible than their argument that we don't have this power.

But let the court decide that we're not asking the board to decide that question, but if it's a matter of policy, it wants to limit us.

Of course it can't.

It could say we can't go into closed session for any purpose.

The board can do that if it wants to do that, it should do that. I mean, that's a policy decision for the board.

It's not a legal decision, it's a policy decision.

So we're just saying as a matter of policy, don't adopt that now because the law doesn't require it because.

There, there, there.

I'm not saying they're wrong. I'm just saying we have a equally plausible legal position that we can't go into closed session to receive subpoena documents, even though there's not an exact wording of that under the statute.

The wording under the statute, and please somebody look at the statute right.

The wording under the statute is that exemption and it's 54957 B. One that exemption says.

That a body of brown act body decommission can go into closed session to evaluate the performance of employees, public deputy sheriff it says it right there in the language.

It's plain language of the statute, so they're saying no, we should limit that. On what paces? The plain language actually gives us that authority.

So can we actually stick on that point?

Do you actually just want to go back to this to County Council and clarify so that language, right, that.

Body legislation.

Body, like the Commission, can meet in closed session right to evaluate public employees and do other things. But that exception, if the board delegated an ordinance to the Commission, the duty of the, you know, as one of its additional tasks, making recommendations about sheriff deputies, could they use.

That exception to meet or use that basis to meet the post session.

Yes, if the board delegate that authority.

To the Commission to make recommendations.

Regarding individual.

Sheriff deputies.

Then they could meet in closed session.

Under that exception, so it, but it has to be, you know, again, they're not the appointing authority, right?

There has to be some delegation from the appointing authority to meet in closed session to make recommendations, but structurally it'd be the same structure as your existing A which is make recommendations to the EO who is the appointing authority for the staff of the Commission.

Yes, OK.

So this this discussion is interesting.

We're not asking.

Yeah, we're not.

We don't want to do that.

We don't want that.

We want is the ability to look at systemic issues where there may be no public complaint and we need confidential information and they so don't limit us to making recommendations to the board. I mean that's another limitation that would prevent us from doing what I've tried to explain.

We're trying to do in terms of oversight. OK, so I want to be mindful of time 'cause.

We still have a pack agenda and we have Part 2 in a few weeks, but Steven will be the last and then we'll have to move on. Go ahead.

Thank you and I appreciate the discussion and the the different points of view.

I'll try to be quick. I I guess I'm.

I am trying to ask the policy question here, not a legal one, but I I'm open to all views. The version of this where an ad hoc committee, assuming it's allowed under the law, would be able to access confidential information. Seems to me that under the coc's.

Current structure that ad hoc committee could make those aggregate type recommendations for the full body.

Without the full bodies viewing the confidential information itself.

And I believe that the reason the COC wants authority to see the confidential

documents in closed session is so that the full body can see the stuff, not just the apparel.

No, not exactly.

I mean, not exactly how it would work, I don't think.

If we receive confidential documents in in in closed session, we think we can't under subpoena, but for the whole body, not just for the whole body's receiving them.

Yeah, we would have a small subset like any other committee.

Question. Would that would look at him?

That would be in our case, that would be an ad hoc committee, right?

So we would have the committee look at them, but then the ad hoc committee, we wanted to be able to, we want to be able to go into closed session then if it has recommendations, for example on why body worn cameras aren't being activated and actually has to.

Discuss confidential information. It needs to be able to discuss that confidential information with the rest of the body because the body is a majority, it's fine.

We need, we need all Commissioners, actually to have the ability.

To hear that confidential information.

And have it discussed and that would be in closed session by the way.

So that's that's what's needed.

And frankly, if you don't have that, then you have a small subset of the Commission.

Well, you have the majority of the Commission that's in the dark of why we're making a recommendation so, well, I guess, I guess I'm imagining scenario where the ad hoc committee would look at the confidential records.

We have five incidents where this deputy activated delayed the activation of their body worn camera and the ad hoc committee.

Board members are few are right.

Would be able to go through the actual substantive documents.

Look at the investigation and then they would make recommendations based on their what their, what they're observing, right.

And those would be to the full Commission in a public meeting, they would be policy based recommendations the Sheriff's Department needs to change its discipline metric for delayed activation to include no fewer than 10 days suspension or the Sheriff's Department.

Needs to change the review process so that a Lieutenant in a different unit.

And it is the one responsible for investing, right?

All of that seems like it doesn't require the full body members to actually see the case file, right?

There's a way because the way it works currently, like for example some of the ad hoc members become experts in things that the full body doesn't need to be an expert in, right?

That's the way we typically do commissions in account, yeah.

And by the way, I agree with almost everything you said, except that that there comes a point where.

In questioning the ad hoc committee, the IT will.

Maybe not always sometime.

Why they came up with this recommendation, they need to actually share.

Some closed some confidential information with the full Commission. We need to be able to go into closed session to discuss that. That's what. That's what lots of Commission's oversight commissions do, by the way.

That's what Andy, otherwise you're excluding actually a majority of the Commissioners were actually having the knowledge base. But of course they would not be reviewing the documents I just went through a review of the Gordono documents, I mean the.

The that's me and JP Harris, who's a, you know, 31 year veteran of the of the Sheriff's Department.

We're doing this because of the litigation purposes, but we reviewed some.

But I might need to discuss in possession what what's been redacted and why, and and so forth.

Or other confidential information of those documents with with the, with the full Commission, though, and we should be able to do that.

So you're right.

I mean, it's the initial review.

Of course, we're not going to have every Commissioner do it. Probably.

Few commissioners, and we usually have specialized knowledge on our ad hoc committees, but we need to have the ability.

To share.

On occasion, that confidential information with our fellow Commissioners, so they understand.

And are making an intelligent vote for the recommendations that were saying that the sheriff should adopt.

Thank you.

Sorry Sandra.

One more for County Council.

You're saying and I know you disagree with us, but you're saying that under current law, if we don't explicitly say that the COC can meet in closed session for those two reasons, they still can't.

So is there a way for us to give them that explicit authority right now so that they can meet in closed session right now, but not?

Preclude or limit them to these.

Too, and still leave it open for the legislation or the judge to wait. Is there a way to add a seed that says, you know, if the court allows blah blah blah, then they can meet in closed session for blah blah.

We can certainly look at alternatives and make recommendations.

Publicly. All right. Thank you.

We are public comments.

Due to the robust conversation with professionals, we're going to limit public comment to one minute per person.

There are over 100 folks online, so make sure everyone gets a chance to be heard first in person.

We want to recognize Shaun Kennedy.

Sure, David.

I'll start your time on your because I didn't hear how long.

Good morning, Shawn Kennedy.

I'm a clinical professor at Loyola.

And a former member of this Commission for nine years and I'm here to stand up for the Commission's version.

I served on that Commission in the work it does was so important to me and the people in the Community who have no voice before the supervisors and the moms of dead kids would appear before us every month and make pleas for the Commission to do something.

About police shootings and police violence, they would ask us to push for systemic reform and we would try to do it. But over and over again, whether you're on an ad hoc committee or the whole Commission, you could never get the information that you needed to make inform.

And intelligent recommendations to reform the department.

So I hope that the justice deputies will recommend to adopt in full.

The Commission's version.

Because it's really needed most of my information when I was on the Commission came from the LA Times.

That is really sad.

And then finally, I just want to say to end, we are so far behind the curve in this county. In 1992, the Independent Colts Commission urged the board to create a independent Commission and on the advice of County Council, we went 25 years. Before that happened, we can't continue delaying meaningful police reform.

Form we have to act now.

Thank you very much.

Next we have colon.

Speaking.

My name is Celina Coleman. I speak to you today as the impact residents, President and founder of power positive incorporated, as well as the LA County employee.

Family has dealt with the behavior of lesd harassing my family since 12/20/2015 and witnessing other families to continue to experience what my family has is stabbing the cause and the long term effects on our community from LASD is detrimental to the county as a whole.

Understanding the operations of Los Angeles County as a whole, being a delegate of SEIU 660.

Before 720 sciu 721.

Standing on the stage to convince SEIU 60 members for the merger, I say this to you. It's a conflict of interest for county councils who advise lesd not to comply, and unjust LA County as a whole, just as officers use a labs as a shield of protection, we have a county clause under discipline that states behavior unbecoming of a county employee. This is defin.

Behavior unbecoming of LA County employees.

I support the CLC and what they have done today with the CLC being able to take action and change the behavior of officers. Thank you.

Thank you, Stephanie Lewin.

Go ahead.

My name is Zachary Luna and I'm the author of The Who was killed by two alley County Sheriff Jeffrey in 2018 as part of the Jeffrey Gang initiation. Since the CLP was formed in 2016, Alexey has repeatedly refused to hand over crucial information.

Hiding behind confidentiality and technical excuses.

We want reform after reform, get delayed and watered down.

It took five years of unnecessary, finally updated new support policies comply with state law.

It took two years of back and forth for alias.

We should adopt the policy supposedly banning deputy banks, and even then that policy barely meets the requirement and says nothing about deputy gang terrorizing our community. We created the CLC of shining a light on these abuses.

But without full access and legal authority, the CLC cannot fulfill this. Right now, the Commission.

Is being asked to police one of the world's largest sheriff departments with one hand hiding behind his back. Alexi has exploited every ambiguity to resist oversight, even going so far as to target officials themselves.

His culture of secrecy should not be allowed to exist for higher SB, hiding behind confidentiality and also technicalities to block this one. Thank you very much.

Next we have Eric.

Eric, wanna stand up and we'll start your time and start speaking.

Hi, good morning.

My name is Eric Miller.

I'm a law professor at LMU Law School and currently serving the Civil Rank Commission, which is jail inspections. While I speak to my experience as a Commissioner doing oversight, I do not speak in my capacity as a Commissioner.

I support the proposal to reform the COC ordinance, in particular section 3.79 point 035.

This section gives the civilian Oversight Commission limited access to L ESD records, including personnel records.

The County Board of Supervisors, acting through County Council a range of privileges and protections that make it difficult for oversight bodies to review the activities of the Sheriff's Department, effectively our ability to obtain information from the sheriff's is limited at best. Incorporating the COC subpoena power with the. Power to engage in closed session. A subcommittee review of records is essential to ensure meaningful oversight.

Under the current ordinance, the Board of Supervisors has insured oversight at the discretion of the Los Angeles Sheriff Department, which is little better than no oversight at all, and in some ways worse, because it gives the appearance of

oversight where none exists.

I urge the board to adopt and fool the changes both by the Commissioners who are consistently stymied in their efforts by not just LASD, but the county itself.

OK.

All right, time when you start speaking.

Cancel the contract strongly supports revising the Co CS ordinance so that is access to information and its powers are clearly articulated.

The COC must have the tools and access it needs to properly address corruption with LASD. Lasd is known to be home to racist and violent deputy gangs in the Antelope Valley. We have the rattlesnakes, the Cowboys and we have wind of a new deputy gang in Palmdale.

New sport?

They also are what you mean are harassing our greeting families out in the animal valley like the Nunez family the Commission was created by the people of Los Angeles to have an oversight of the Sheriff's Department. But as we hear time and time again, the Sheriff's Department th.

Their nose believes it doesn't have to follow the recommendations of the COC.

The COC is simply acting and trying to help the Greene families.

Like I said, like the Nunez family.

Like Vanessa Perez.

And so you must go back to your supervisors and ask them to please you as the CEO.

C is here with questions.

Thank you, Nessa.

Your last person in person.

Speak well started time when you started speaking.

I'm trying to find an SB1421 records by the transparency page. When Deputy Paul Sidana was assigned at my daughter's high school, I found nothing in the school district said the same.

I knew that was impossible because of what it was done to Joe. What was under my son Joseph.

So I don't know Deputy Pauls it on the punch. The last 14 punches.

Of of 121 a 600 transparency page, anything.

Yeah. Therefore, I turn to the COC.

Hopes that with their voter approved subpoena power would assist with this.

This is what the people voted for. I'm asking as Joseph's mom.

For the board to approve the amendments to the COC ordinance, so the Commission has access any to look into what happened to my son Joseph, as well as Emmett Brock and Andres Guardardo, because I've been in this room before, I noticed there are new faces, so therefore I.

Want to show you guys Joseph's face to put a name with his face?

What are the ask you what is the department height?

Thank you very much for your comments.

OK. Are there any other comments in person not removed online? OK, sorry, go ahead.

Thank you.

I'll start telling you about speak, OK?

Thank you.

Good morning.

My name is Ali Rubinfeld.

I am with the Loyola Anti Racism Center and check the sheriff, a coalition of over 30 Los Angeles based organizations led by families directly impacted by violence at the hands of the Los Angeles County Sheriff Department.

The organization's been checked. The sheriff advocated for the creation of the sheriff's Civilian Oversight Commission in 2016 in response to years of abuse by the department that was spotlighted by the 2012, 2014 Citizens Commission on Jail Violence that has been experienced by these famil.

And their communities for generations, unfortunately, and by no fault of the COC itself, nearly ten years after the board established the COC, the oversight these families and organizations tirelessly fought for has yet to be fully realized. Since the coc's creation.

Every sheriff's administration has refused to disclose information information to the Commission.

By pointing to provisions of the COC ordinance or state law, the Department of Corrections Oversight and Disclosure, County Council, the author of this ordinance, empowers LA to continue to lower oversight by advising them based on language. In this order, Co ordinates that is FS confusing and contradicts itself.

And at worst, contains the statements of law.

However, the the people on standards are not confused about why they want what they expect from oversight of Lac D, as shown by 76% of Los Angeles voters who supported the Ceoc's access to confidential information when they voted for the

COC to have subpoena power.

Under Measure R, in the absence of the site, LA County taxpayers received millions of dollars.

Next we'll start.

Hey, Peter, you're online.

You wanna meet yourself and start your time when you start speaking search.

PE Peter Eliasberg 1:58:27

Thank you, Peter.

Relias Berg from the ACLU of Southern California and one of the lead counsel on the Rosis litigation that Commissioner Bonner referred to.

Just very briefly, I'd like to say I see no reason why.

The board should accept the cramped reading that County Council is proposing.

There are simple ways to deal with this.

Why would you handcuff the Commission when there is a possibility that both litigation and legislation will make clear that the Commission can receive confidential material?

Personnel records and review them in closed session.

Simply amend the Charter to allow them to go into confidential session review records consistent with the Brown Act and state law that solves the problem.

And there's no reason for the county council's cramp reading or to waste time in the future if the legislation goes through or litigation shows this, to then amend again, especially since it's taken County Council about six months to get around to putting together a proposal for the.

Board in the first place.

Just do it now.

Allow them to do it consistent.

Allow the Commission to go into closed session, review records consistent with state law and the Brown Act, and that solves the problems. Thank you.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 1:59:35

Peter, thank you very much.

Next we have Yousaf.

What started your time when you start speaking?

Remove yourself, Lisa.

YM Yusef Miller 1:59:49

Yeah, this is Youssef Miller.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 1:59:49

Is it not?

YM Yusef Miller 1:59:50

Can you hear me?

P Public Safety Cluster Open 1:59:52

Yes, go ahead.

YM Yusef Miller 1:59:53

Yes, this is Youssef Miller. The North County Equity and Justice coalition. The saving lives in custody California, and I support these reforms for the Commission to be able to have transparency and be able to be involved in the in the closed sessions, and this transparency is never the enemy. It's never the enemy to families. It's not the enemy to any of the activist groups or any of the teams that have shown up today. We support you and we. We encourage transparency because that's the only way we can have access. Access to accountability. Thank you.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 2:00:25

Thank you very much. Are there any other folks wishing to make trouble? Comments line. If not, then we move to the next item. Thank you. Thank you. Yes. I'm glad you're. Right. Oh, sure. Wait a minute. Yeah, y'all should go.

Further, but people haven't agreeing anyway.

Yeah, I'm just waiting.

For me.

And I'm stressing I'm still under good.

Yeah, thanks to you.

No, I'll not necessarily worry too much about. Yeah.

Let's go ahead and go.

Great. Good morning, deputies.

Kiwan King with CEO budget, community Care and justice unit.

I'm here with my colleague Vincent Emerson Emerson, who's lead on all things CSI.

We are discussing item 4C before you today.

It is a public hearing board letter that is critique approval from the board of the csci year four spending plan.

There is a rather lengthy set of documents in your agenda packet.

We make it a little easier to walk through.

We prepared a 67 page PowerPoint.

It should be the lead.

The material.

Most of today's presentation will walk through on just the six or seven pages on PowerPoint.

The PowerPoint addresses all of the 30 something to 40 pages of the board letter on the budget adjustment and all the attachments.

We are happy to talk through any questions that you have on the details of if you like and I want to be attempted to time so.

If we.

Don't have time to resolve all of your questions. Happy.

Jaykon, the Cfcj program administrator, is participating online.

They will unleash to the extent that you have any questions that are specific to jaycom and then to the departments that are included in the recommendations for funding.

Are also available online and will unmute to the extent that your offices have questions.

Can I get a time check and ask if you want me to do the 10 minute version or the 20 minute version 10 minutes version? OK, I'll try and go as quickly as possible, so I think Darde has the slide desk. One second great.

Once you start, I'm going to pull it up right now.

Great. I'll start on Slide 2.

So Slide 2 is really just kind of a A A legend or a key to walk you through.

Each of the individual accountants, including the board letter and the Pai, won't walk through all of this detail. I think, for for your reading pleasure, you'll probably get the most benefit out of the 1st 12 pages of the documents. The actual board letter with the narrative detail of.

The attachments I would focus on attachment 2B and five.

Those are the actual lists of the spending plan.

Projects that are being recommended for cleaning or the lists of one time funding that are recommended for reallocation.

I'm going to go ahead and skip to the next slide. We're on slide three of seven now on the numbering is the most right hand corner of this slide. If you wanted to give you some spending plan history here, this is the 4th efci spending plan this is.

The first spending plan.

But is subject to the public hearing requirement and that is because the litigation with Measure J was resolved in March of 2024.

The for the first three board letters, the CSCI board policies governed the csci allocation process.

The Charter language includes a public hearing requirement, and that's why we are before you today.

We will submit the board letter assuming concurrence.

On May 8th, for the June 24 public hearing.

You can see here very quickly we laid out the four csci spending plans to date starting with year one and 2122. Each of the numbers is additive and so year two, there was an incremental increase of 100 million of ongoing cfci funding the total. Ongoing funding in year two was 200 million because we had the year one amount. 100 and year 2 about 200. Likewise in year 4.

The total ongoing CFCl funding is \$300.6 million.

You'll you'll notice there is a rapid escalation in years 1-2 and three.

That's because we we started in 2122 after Measure G was passed.

Post litigation and then after the board adopted the CSCI funding plan to move forward with CSCI as if.

Measure K We're still in effect.

The most recent csci calculation for 2425 showed a smaller increase the first three

years.

The board directed CEO to build up the full 10% of unrestricted locally generated revenues set aside.

That's why you have 100 million, a 100 million and 88 million year for the increase to the set aside its 12.3 million.

I'll also note that.

The language in red toward the bottom of Page 3 as of last fall.

The ongoing budget for CFCI was 300.6 million, the one time carryover as of October of 2024 was 325.8 million for a total cfc budget of just over \$626 million, based on the most recent.

Financial data that CEO has the anticipated carryover into 2526.

Is 284,000,000.

I'm going to skip ahead to page four of seven.

Of page four of seven includes highlights of the Charter language and the CSEI Board policy language. The Charter language includes the the general information on.

The csci measure Jane obligation as well as the detail on at the very end of that sentence, the board shall allocate on an annual basis.

After input from, among others, Republican County departments at a public hearing.

The Charter language is a little more general to the Board policy language that your board adopted in August of 2021 is more specific and provides detail on how the Advisory committee and how CEO.

Are tasked with moving forward with spending plans.

So the second bullet point walks through subsection 6C, the board policy, but very clearly assigns responsibility to the Advisory Committee to put together recommendations for the annual set aside the advisory committee.

Works with Jacob and their community engagement partners to hold the process put forth.

Recommendations those recommendations are sent to both CEO and Jacob.

That occurred in October and December of November of 2024.

Jaycod prepares the draft board letter, provides it to our office.

They did that this year in February, I believe. And then our office for the work policy is responsible for reviewing the advisory Committee's recommendations. CEOs, draft board letter and then we bring forth a set of recommendations for your board to consider.

Subsection 6D includes detail on the process for unspent one time funding.

This is the first time that a CEO has brought forth one time funding recommendation. CfcI under subsection 16.

The board has specified that Aceo should make the one time funding recommendations on part of the spending plans.

We briefed the Advisory Committee on this language specifically in Mark.

We returned to the Advisory Committee on a week or a week and a half ago on April 20th, with a detailed briefing on the one time recommendations that are in your packet today.

And that are part of the board letter.

I will move forward to page 4-5 in the interest of time. Page 5 includes the high level recommendations on the the board letter.

That is, before you on June the 24th, has three major recommendations.

Recommendation A is to approve 6 projects funded by the \$12.3 million set aside.

These recommendations originated with the advisory committee.

Which began meeting on the year 4 recommendations in May or June of 2024.

The committee adopted final recommendations in October of 2024, and JAYCOD provided those recommendations to us in December.

I do have one correction on the second bullet point. We had to make a change based on feedback from one of our departments.

The total on screen is 8.1 million.

Williams County departments, we are going to recommend that the county.

Department share decrease to 4.6 million and the TPA share increase to 7.7 million and that's because one program was recommended to be administered by Lanaya, the LA Native American Union Commission which is.

Minimally staffed and doesn't have the capacity to launch a whole program until we are going to recommend that that program go to the TPA.

With Leneak as the subject matter expert, sorry, can you say those numbers one more time? TPA is increasing to what, sure TPA is increasing to 7.7 million?

And County department is decreasing to 4.6 million, and so now instead of three of the six being in the TPA 4.

The six projects, yes.

And as with prior spending plans, county departments will send the majority of their funding out to CB OS or contracted vendors.

The second major action in the board letter is to approve the transfer of 219 million in unspent one time funding.

Detail is provided in the attachments that are part of the board letter and we're happy to talk with you offline on the full detail if you'd like.

All of the funds.

Are one time they originated as part of the 325.8 million in one time funding that was part of the supplemental budget in October of 2024.

CEO wanted to focus on funding that has been unspent for more than one year, and so we worked with Jcod, who received information from county departments on what their service needs are and what their financial needs are in the current year. And so the reason.

The number before you is 219, which is about 100 million lower than 325 is because we wanted to be sure that this action doesn't impact ability to administer their programs in the current year and so if departments self reported that they would need to.

Encumber the funding or they would need to spend the funding.

We took that funding off the top, so to speak.

And we reduced the amount from 3:25 to 19.

The last major action is to approve 15 new projects across eight or nine county departments, with a portion of the unspent funding.

It's one \$69.2 million. The remaining balance of funding.

About 49 million will be held in a cfc to be allocated account.

That's where we budget csci funding that has not yet been allocated.

To a specific project or program on your board.

Our CEO's goal in pursuing the one time funding recommendations now is to be sure that we're putting underutilized resources to work to benefit the Community, to provide needed services at a time where we know the county is facing very major budgetary pressures.

There are many changes in the criminal justice landscape and CEO wanted to ensure. As I think the board and members of the Community would agree that funding is put to use now to provide services in the Community and to address ongoing board priorities in care. First jail last and in ATI, all of the recommendations in the one time funding proposals are.

Fully aligned.

With prior csci spending plans and with the provisions of Measure J.

And are part of the the 9 allowable categories of expenses that both measure J&B board policy layout for us.

I will skip to Page 6 which is my last presentation page.

I provided some detail already on the two distinct proposals that are part of the spending plan. The \$12.3 million was allocated to six projects total.

The largest portion, 8.8 million, is for projects that we would consider one time in nature, including some capital project funding for Jacob programs, some infrastructure and other grant funding for current CFCI grantees.

And then there's one program, three and a half million dollars for service expansion through.

The TPA and the LA Native American Aging Commission.

The second group on Page Six is some additional detail on the \$169 million in one time funding recommendations across 8 departments.

3 departments are new to Csci military and veteran affairs, Parks and Recreation and Public Library.

I won't walk through the full detail here, but I think I just wanted to note that. CEO.

CEO receive.

A lot of feedback during the departmental proposals as part of 242526 recommended budget.

CEO took into account feedback from the public Department of Budget presentations in February and March.

And crafted a plan that we believe.

Makes good use of the portion of the one time funding.

We're leaving again about \$49 million of funding on the program and we anticipate.

We anticipate establishing a more regular process and a more regular cadence for the one time funding recommendations starting hopefully.

This fall, with our year end call sense where we'll be able to assess how much additional underspend csci departments are generating based on their allocations in the current year. I think I'd also like to just finish off with a little bit of detail from our departments on their.

Community planning processes.

All of the 15 proposals that are part of the one time plan came forward in departments on met meetings lists.

Several came out of board motions, including a motion related to the buyers and eviction relief a few weeks ago.

Another motion meeting to.

Tgi services and departments themselves put forth their unmet needs requests and the recommendations for programming.

As a result of Anderson to their own community input sessions and visioning sessions.

With their constituents and with their services.

And so I'll, I'll stop there and see if you have any questions and we and the departments are available to provide any detail. Thank you.

Question.

I'm sorry.

OK.

Few questions.

So this the unspent funding that you're saying is one time funds?

Was it always one time funds from the beginning or is it only one time because it's been carried over so many times that now it's become much?

It is the latter.

It's it's one time because it's been carried over in some cases for multiple years.

So originally it was allocated for ongoing, correct?

So my concern is and I know last time we talked about like the stock program, right like that is beds that had received ongoing funding that now has become one time because it's been carried over right. If we move that one time funding then we're getting rid of.

A program that was supposed to be ongoing, right? So how many?

Of the programs that you know now, we're taking the money away from are gonna cease.

To exist as ongoing protests like the stock.

Is one of the unique programs. There are two programs total in csci of 90, something that are funded with one time funding exclusively.

One of them is the STOP program, funded with 15 to 20 million of one time one time funding. That is part of the closed Mcj project that is managed by the CC team. The Community safety implementation.

The other project is also from the CSEC allocations for J Cod interim housing Benz.

Those two projects are currently funded with only one time funding every other cscn project will retain its ongoing allocation, and so these recommendations don't address any of the ongoing funding that departments had at the start of this fiscal year and that they will continue to have on July.

1st.

For 2526.

For the two specific projects, including stop and Jcock interim housing beds, we are working with C SIP the Community safety representation team. I need to remind myself their acronym.

To.

We're working with the Csip team to get feedback from the departments on what their exact funding needs are for 2526. The CE OS priority as as the board's priority. Is to be sure that we maintain capacity, particularly in bed programs. And so we will continue to work with the C SIT team to get their recommendations on continued funding for 25.6.

I I can't speak to what they will recommend, but I.

'M I would be optimistic that funding would continue, particularly because the beds are filled and it's been a board and county priority to keep beds available.

Folks exiting the criminal justice system and to keep them fun.

But that agreement exists jaycar correct, like JCP.

Enney that they're working with, even though the funding now comes from cset.

Correct. OK. But so, I mean, if we're trying to find other funding for it, was there any thought of not taking the one time carryover away from this program and just letting them keep that funding?

Well, we are.

We are leaving almost 50 million of underspend in the to be allocated budget units, which you could think of as kind of a holding reserve.

We've done some internal forecasts on additional one time funding that's going to be available at the end of this fiscal year and we we are constantly optimistic that there will be a good amount of additional funding beyond the 49 million. And so we have.

We've been telling departments that have needs to work with their CEO budget analyst to submit their requests to be sure that they are able to continue providing services with CSCI funding and for for the stock beds in particular. I know that Vincent and others have been working with.

Csat staff and I believe they will be making some recommendations in final change of budget.

Yeah, I actually met with some of the CC staff yesterday.

And the stoppage are going to be funded.

Just trying to determine the amount of funding that the program needs.

Are they gonna be funded from this 50 million pot or no, it's actually from the from the Jason Pot, OK.

I'm not a Jason 42. OK, thank you.

Can you elaborate more on the 50 million this is on top of the 219,000,000 you're leaving fifty of one time unallocated unspent for what?

Cfci committee to decide what to do for.

Well, the the board policy.

Assigns responsibility for making one time recommendations to the CE OS office.

So the in one action we are transferring 219 from existing projects. We are recommending funding less than 219, about 49 million less that amount would fall to the to the allocated budget unit and then I think we would work with the board offices, DEP.

And the committee.

On figuring out how to proceed with some process to put together recommendations in future years.

For this 50 million or you?

And I think more, more generally, it's it's probably something that we will need to incorporate into your end closing.

As outlined in the CFCR board policy we we have a best gauge of our unspent fundings at year end.

Closed because everything is finished and closed out and so we we won't likely be working through that process as the fiscal year goes to end.

And then I noticed that for these one time funds projects are getting five years.

And typically csci is in three years.

So why are these projects getting more time than anyone who gets regular csci application?

Yeah, I think we wanted to provide five years of funding to allow time for departments and for the larger county to identify ongoing funding sources.

To support him at the conclusion of their five year term.

The CFT projects the existing CFCI projects are funded on a 36 month basis.

They are funded with ongoing funding, so at the end of the 36 months, the ongoing funding is still there.

With respect to the 15 recommendations here at the end of the five years.

More cautiously, optimistic that there will be some additional funding at the end of

five years.

But it's it's hard to predict where restricted NCC and RP test will go over the five year period that gives departments time to build their programs and it gives departments and the CEO time to kind of think through how we can identify.

Ongoing funding sources to take over funding at the end of the five year term.

We're also adding some counting positions that are funded by this funding.

It is.

Atypical to use one time funding to pay for a county positions. And so I think we wanted to be sure that we had a long enough time span that departments could bring on. Chief personnel deliver the services and then give us time.

To determine the long term funding plan.

And then just my last question is the Wildfire Eviction Relief Fund portion?

I know we have heard before, but there was a desire to use philanthropy, right?

Fundraise dollars. We've had so many fundraising efforts in LA County about the fires, so there was hope that that board motion and that effort could be funded by some of that. Did you guys?

Look into that. I mean the higher benefit concert that happened, all that kind of stuff like community csci office.

Yeah. So bien, the CFC.

Group we were not lead on the report back, so I'll do my best to respond fully to the question.

I know the board motion directed CEO to identify 10 million of funding to start up the welfare eviction refund.

CEO was tasked in that motion to look at all available sources of funding.

I know that CEO was able to identify about a million.

1.1 million of other funding, I believe.

It was NCC enabled ARP.

The 8.8 million is the amount that is to be funded by CSCI.

I believe Dcba may be on the call and maybe they can speak to the flanking angle. I don't have detail on that particular question.

AB

Alfred Beyruti 2:29:17

Hi Kian, deputies, this is Alfred Begley from the CBA. If I could address the question really quick, I think that the the what's reflected in the chart is the rent relief portion that would be provided to those impacted by the wildfires.

I think the question asked by the deputy was more related to the wildfire relief that's currently operational. And yes, that is partially being funded by. Philanthropies.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 2:29:49

But did you look into also tapping into some of that raised money for this cause? This is a huge chunk of like the cfci.

AB Alfred Beyruti 2:30:02

Not at this time, Keanu.

I think we're still maybe in the process of identifying the funding.
But no, no, not at this time.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 2:30:11

I mean, I think there was a request from board office in the past to look into using this. So I would like to see that those efforts were made.

Yeah. And and I can follow up with my colleagues at CEO who are more involved in the day-to-day on the report back and get some additional detail on the philanthropic angle for you.

I'll I'll try to keep it short.

I did have some questions, but they're mainly about how the CEO's office.

Stepping back, I recognize that this is kind of a new world for everybody, right?

And so I do want to acknowledge that some of this is kind of like a first go round for when the money's getting short.

How do we do this?

I wanted to ask some questions about the communication between CEO's office and the CSCI committee.

How you all have kind of dealt with that.

Some of this being kind of new, but then also kind of what your expectations are going forward 'cause, we're certainly getting a lot of increase you know and frustrations from community members who really feel like didn't measure J and cfci process community a sort of leading space on.

How these recommendations are shaking out? I understand about the board's policy, but again for for helping them kind of understand how they can maximize their input I think.

Curious to know and and disappear in the space like how you all are kind of thinking about that.

And how you've engaged with them and what you see going forward? Sure. Thank you for the question.

CEO has worked.

Very diligently to manage the communication protocol between the CEO's, office, county Departments, your Board and the Advisory Committee. We do our best to manage timelines and expectations.

I know that the advisor.

Committee has expressed in the past a desire for more timely and earlier communication from CEO, and I think we've we've tried to balance.

Their desire for early communication with our obligations to report up to your offices, to be sure that we provide the necessary detail to the board offices first.

Before we share them more broadly.

With respect to the one time funding proposals, we know that the Advisory committee has been working to review.

Year one projects that were initially.

Funded in 2122, four years ago, the Advisory Committee has been meeting at their regular and special meetings. I think the last two months, maybe 2 1/2 months.

To do a deep dive with departments into each of their programs when they launched, how much understanding they have, what their plans are for the underfund we have been very. We've expressed to the committee that we intend to continue working with them on.

Our expectations for the Protocol for future one time funding recommendations.

As as I think is clear in we we think there will be.

Substantial, substantial, we think there will, considering the size of csci, there is likely to be substantial underspend most likely every year moving forward.

I think because new projects take time to launch, you know, county departments and JCP time to put project designs.

Together and start programming the funding.

Programs on the county side cycle up and cycle down in terms of their spending, like when when new beds come online or new programs come online or staff come and stop go.

I think there's there's going to be funding at the end of every fiscal year that we will have an opportunity to work with your offices and the advisory committee.

To discuss.

The cadence.

When when do we?

When do we arrive at a solid number for our hockey?

What is the engagement process going to be with the larger public and the advisory committee?

And then how will we work to inform the committee, county departments and your offices?

On what?

This schedule is likely to be what the amounts of unspent funding are for each year.

And then what the timelines are for soliciting public input and input from others on potential projects that could be funded with this funding?

And current priorities for the county and for the board offices.

So can I ask two questions branching off of that?

One is basically like, so it sounds like you see going forward a role where there's at least communication about that one time, understand.

Type. Let's call it a bucket. I realize it's not actually a bucket, but let's call it that where the csci advisory body could in theory, if if we're started, if we've kind of settled on this idea that every year we're gonna have some chunk of that money it.

Seems like they will be able to build into their recommendations process.

Recommendations for that chunk of money going forward.

It sounds like that's what you're a possibility, but it also doesn't sound like that didn't work out yet. That is correct.

And then separate from that I guess.

My sense is that.

Is that some members of the advisory body at least feel like there was a significant delay in getting to this point that we kind of napped like the the understanding that we currently have now and that we've had over the last couple months could have been delivered like.

Two years ago, and I think there's a frustration there that they feel like, hey, if we had known this two years ago, then when projects were coming to us, we would have looked at them directly.

And we might have prioritized them differently.

And I think if I'm, I don't wanna speak for the members of the advisory body, but I also think there's a.

A piece of what they're saying that sort of feels like.

A sense that county departments were being directed to them with projects that were maybe not on equal footing in terms of the ability for the project to get up and running and and start spending down with, you know, some projects are much longer than others, right, like build.

Massive mental health housing project is a very expensive, labor intensive time intensive project which is different from you know we have.

A service that's already being provided in the csci money's being used to expand capacity.

In a way that it's like, you know, going from, you know, 500 service units to 600 service units, which is very different costure, but all those things end up in the csci. And I think there's a bit of frustration that until recently it was very diffi.

For them to understand what that looks like, what that meant in terms of understand and then sort of how that was going forward.

So I guess to me, I see those as like two different things.

But I guess it informs sort of the context cause for me I I.

Adhere and open this to kind of explore how to sort this mess.

But I also keep hearing the frustration.

So I I I don't know if there's anything to really do with that, but I and that is certainly what I'm hearing. I guess I'm thinking, I don't know if you think that's fair.

Yeah, I I've. I've heard the same feedback and I know jaycod as program administrator and as the advisor to the committee has also heard that.

I have a question for the public defender, but I'll follow up.

Any questions?

OK.

Any public comments for item 4C4C please speak up or raise your hand on teams.

OK, this one, Anthony, you have one minute please.

I'll start your time when you start speaking. Please send me your zip.

AA **Anthony Allman** 2:38:49

You. Thank you.

Special officials. My name is Anthony Allman.

I'm an Army veteran, executive director of its advocacy and former chair of the LA County Veterans Advisory Commission.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of CFCI funding dedicated to

improving the lives of justice involved veterans throughout LA County. On August 21st, 2024.

Directors and provided a briefing on the department strategy to end veteran homelessness in our county.

The following month, all 10 Commissioners voted unanimously in a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors in support of the department's vision Cfc dollars that will assist the department in accomplishing its goal of serving and permanently housing justice involved. Homeless veterans has broad based support from the L.

County veterans Community, I strongly encourage approval of CFCFCI funding to serve military veterans.

Thank you very much.

P **Public Safety Cluster Open** 2:39:47

Thank you very much.

Anyone else for public comment, please speaker, raise your hand on teams.

OK. Moving to the general public.

Comment anyone for general public comment in person or online?

We have one person, Carlos. Go ahead and I'll start your time.

You have one minute.

CM **Carlos Montes** 2:40:12

My check.

My check.

Can you hear me?

P **Public Safety Cluster Open** 2:40:15

Yes, go ahead.

CM **Carlos Montes** 2:40:16

OK.

Yeah, I'm sorry.

My name is Carlos Montes.

I'm with the central CS automation service organization.

I support the civil and Oversight Commissions ordinance, revisions to the Board of Supervisors.

Excuse me to the ordinance revisions.

I believe that the the Civilian Oversight Commission used to have independent subpoena powers.

I believe they should have the ability to investigate any complaint, citizen complaints as well as complaints from the county jail. They should have the ability to independently review resolution of these complaints, but also I think that the civilian Oversight Commission has should have the power and ability to.

Make recommendations for changes to the alley Sheriff Department policy.

Again, I support the civility of site Commission revision.

Of the ordinances they should have independent access to confidential information.

Thank you very much.

P Public Safety Cluster Open 2:41:15

Thank you, Carlos. Any other public comment?

OK, see, none, we will adjourn the meeting and we move to closed session.

Thank you very much.

● **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription