

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

July 2, 2025

PC Public Safety Cluster 2:38

Alright, good morning.

OK.

Here we go.

Good morning, everyone.

Welcome to the public safety Cluster agenda review for July 2nd. First thing to start with a self introduction from the board offices 1st District.

Good morning, everybody. And supervisors of district.

Thank you very much.

2nd district.

Good morning, everyone.

Natalie Roman Mitchell, senior justice deputy and then Dr. Franklin here is our justice deputy.

Thank you very much for district.

Good morning, everyone.

Stephen Edward, senior Justice deputy supervisor Lindsay Morpeth with me is my colleague Mike Aguilar and our colleague Nick Weil joining.

Thank you very much for district.

Good morning, clothingie rice for Supervisor Han and Alexandra.

Thank you very much.

And the chairs. Hello everyone.

My name is Leslie Camino, and this is the deputy for the Antill Valley Field Justice and immigration. And I have my team.

Hello everyone.

Ariana Gutierrez, USC fellow with SD5.

Anthony Rivera, student insert.

Thank you very much.

All right, first thing, following the meeting order, the 2nd is the information items.

There are no information items this week, so we will skip to the next item board

motion.

Before I start, I just want to note that this meeting is being transcribed, so it's FYI the 1st the board motion this week is from.

3rd district support for sending Bill 627 No Secret Police Act.

Thank you, Darden.

Good morning and thank you, tregomino.

My name is Mike Aguilar Gaudette, and I'm glad to see the Affairs deputy for the Third District. And thank you my colleagues on DICE Day, Steve and Nick.

I'm grateful for the opportunity to present, on behalf of the third district and our co-authors.

Thank you to the second district item 3 support for Senate Bill 627, which we actually are seeking to amend to read state and federal legislation enhancing capability during immigration enforcement.

Before you are our protected amendments, the additional motion adding legislation on the same issue that came to our attention after submitting the original motion.

As reported in the LA Times, in Bell, chaos erupted when masked men arrived at a car wash and began detaining its workers, sparking a confrontation with residents and immigration rights advocates before they were forced to hastily drive up over curbs and St. Islands to escape. In Pasadena a.

Man stepped out of his unmarked vehicle at an intersection, unholstered his pistol and aimed at a group of pedestrians before returning to his car.

Returning on its red and blue merchandise and speeding off Los Angeles, mayor said they show up without uniforms.

They show up completely masked.

They refuse to give ID. Who are these people? And frankly, the best they have on look like they're ordered from Amazon.

Are they bouncy hunters?

Are they vigilantes if their federal officials wise they don't identify themselves. These actions have resulted in widespread fear and panic throughout our county. Just yesterday, on the dais, supervisors had a robust discussion on what might cause someone to run from these masks.

Unidentified individuals in response, we've seen a number of urgent actions, including motions from the 5th and 4th districts, and thank you for your leadership on those motions and for the whole board for moving those forward.

We feel this motion is in line with those motions that support our state and federal

partners efforts in combating this practice.

Senate Bill 7.

Senate Bill 627, the No Secret Police Act by senators Weiner Scott Weiner of San Francisco County and Jesse Aragon from Alameda County, would make it a misdemeanor for law enforcement officer to wear any mask.

Personal disguise while interacting with the public in the performance of their duties.

Senate Bill 805, the No Vigilantes Act by Senator Sasha, Rene Perez of Los Angeles County, would expand the scope of existing impersonation laws to include additional categories if done with the intent to defraud, require on duty enforcement to visibly display identification, authorizes employees of any law.

Enforcement agency to request identification from someone claiming to be law enforcement and prohibits fugitive recovery agents from engaging in any form of immigration enforcement.

Finally, House of Representatives 4004, the No anonymity and Immigration Enforcement Act of 2025 by Congress, Women of Alaska's, of New York, supported by our Los Angeles County allegation members Congresswoman Congresswoman Laura Friedman and Bruce Rivas would prohibit Immigration and Customs enforcement. Ice agents from wearing facial coverings during enforcement actions require agents to clearly wear clearly marked clothing displaying their name in ice affiliation and mandate written justification for any use of a mask.

And report to Congress on any disciplinary actions or complaints related to this policy. Taken together, we believe this is a robust response to the reality we're faced on our streets and will bring back transparency and accountability and return the best public safety practices to those tasked with our.

Collective protection.

And with that, I'd happy to take any questions.

Are there any questions?

I have a question.

Just wondering if there you may have mentioned, but if there are any like exceptions with like surgical masks that people are feeling sick.

Of course.

So all all of these, all of these.

All each of these provisions you have within them exceptions for medical or other.

Are there necessary other necessary facial protection? Thank you.

Any other questions?

Any deputies online that have questions, raise your hand or speak up your hand.

Oh, for the ones in California.

Like, who's in charge of enforcement? Like who?

How would that work?

Sure. So it was in the case of the Secret Police Act, it would be a misdemeanor.

It would be local law enforcement and then this same would be the case for the novigliones act.

So either the sheriff's or Pasadena PD would go out to folks and try.

Any other questions?

All right.

Seeing now we'll move to public comment.

Are there any public comment for this item?

Do you speak up or raise your hand on teams?

All right, seeing none, we move this item.

Thank you very much.

We'll move to item 4, which is presentations.

First item is a board briefing from County Council in regards to 2425 new laws.

Introduce yourselves.

Yes, hello and thank you for inviting us here today.

My name is Shirley Edwards.

It's a Shanna Wilson, and we're gonna speak about a few laws that AP partners. What you do in the cluster, but also more importantly, what the board does when they need an open session.

Wise. Will you have a copy of all the slides in front of you?

Please on the very first page of the slide, there is a presentation.

Today is for information purposes only.

Is not intended to serve as legal advice.

If you turn the page to your next slide, you'll note that we do identify that several thousand bills were introduced in the two sessions, 24242425. As you know, although many are introduced, very few make it into law.

And we are going to even discuss fewer today, although your slides are more detailed, we spot it just a few because of limitation of time to address right now.

Let's move on to the next topic. In your slides, which is ethics and under ethics, we're going to cover SP1243AB3130SC1111. Starting with SB1243, the skills with campaign contributions report to supervisor under the Levy Act.

And what this law does and mends existing government code 84308.

Spill is supported by the county, by the way.

It increases the campaign contribution disclosure limit from over 250 to over 500.

What that means is that when board, member and elected official receives a campaign contribution of greater than 500, that will trigger disclosure obligations under the Levine Act before a vote.

But what this amendment does, in addition to increasing that threshold, it also extends.

The cure period.

For these, these campaign contributions from 14 to 13 days of accepting, soliciting, or directing the contribution, and it also removes certain types of proceedings from the definition of proceeding, which would trigger leviath compliance.

No longer are contracts valued under \$50,000 covered by Levine Act.

No longer are contracts between two or more government agencies subject to the Vine Act.

No more our contracts where no party receives financial compensation covered by Levine Act and periodic review or renewal of the development agreement.

Those are no longer covered by the levy net positive change.

Next slide, we're going on to AB 3130 and we're going to cover disclosures again for the supervisors and this is amendment. This is a new rule under 2504, three of the government code.

This is a transparency law.

This is distinct and separate from other obligations under the Political Reform Act and other obligations under section 1090 for conference in contracts. Those 22 trigger disclosure obligations before a vote. This is unique because this is distinct and separate.

This does not mean the board member cannot vote.

It just means there must be disclosure before there is a vote.

What this law says is that in an open and public meeting, a known if there's a known family relationship with the officer or employee of a nonprofit entity, that board member must disclose that information before the Board of Supervisors votes on the appropriation of the money this disc.

Has to be noted in the record.

This does not require recusal.

This is just transparency.

And family relationship is clearly defined.

To be any relationship by blood adoption, marriage, domestic partnership, or cohabitation.

All right, let's go on to 1090 now, which is SB1111, this is this does deal with disclosures under conflicts and contracts under 1090.

This is an amendment to section 1091 of that code provision.

This doesn't take effect until January 1st, 2026.

It's a good full year before or about half a year before this takes effect.

And with this law, if there is now established in the remote interest for public officers, if the public officers child is an officer or director.

Of or has an ownership interest of 10% or more in a party to a contract entered into by that board or body with that officer where the officer is a member. Or remember, if this is information that is actually known by the public officer.

This has to be disclosed in the record before the vote, but because it's of remote interest and there's a specific carve out for this type of disclosure, the Member can still vote, the officer can still vote on the matter, but their vote is not counted towards the total.

Official vote, in other words, the Board of Supervisors member, if that is the case of the Commissioner, whoever it might be.

Doesn't need to remove themselves from the room. They do not need to recuse.

They may vote, but the vote is not counted.

It's a unique way to capture this transparency in complex contracts.

All right, we're going to jump into governance and that's your next slide.

And in governments just so that you know advance, you have more sides of what we're going through.

I'm just going to cover AB 2715 for the sake of time, and this deals with the Brown Act under closed section, again dealing with the Board of Supervisors. Of course, under the Brown Act as.

You know, there are many reasons why the board may go into closed session, but they're all very specifically set out in the Brown Act.

And if you don't fall within each of these categories like potential risk of litigation or labor negotiations or negotiation of price in terms of real estate contract for example, then you don't need to go into closed session.

However, this is a new one.

This is now yet another reason we're going to close session.

This is going to authorize the board to hold a closed session.

With other law enforcement or security personnel on a threat to critical infrastructure controls or critical infrastructure information relating to cyber security.

Another valid reason to go into closed session.

Now jumping into elections, if you can turn your pages, we're headed into elections and I'm only going to cover one slide in this, this packet here. It's AB2642, and it deals with intimidation at the election.

Related activities are proposed.

This law was also supported by the county, by the way, and it's going to prohibit anyone from intimidating, threatening or harassing or attempting to do so while other people are engaged in certain election related activities.

This is a violation of the law and it can result in a civil action that can be brought by the aggrieved person who's been intimidated or by an officer holding an election or conducting a canvas, or even the attorney.

Well, just so that you know, openly carrying a firearm.

And during an election related activity or while observing it can be seen to be presumed to have been engaged in a prohibited intimidation in violation of this new law. This all is found in the election code 18580 OK.

We're gonna jump now to the public health, social services, probate for that reason.

I'm gonna send it over to Shannon.

All right.

Thank you, Shirley.

So we'll see an overarching theme during this legislative session where they dealt with mental health, homelessness, recidivism, and violence, whether it be with firearms or through other means. And so we're quickly just going to touch on a few of those fix in this area. So first we'll look.

At SB1184.

Mental health and voluntary treatment and antipsychotics.

Lantern feature Short Act provides for the involuntary commitment of persons who are a danger to themselves or others, or who are gravely disabled due to mental disorder for 72 hours. For evaluation and treatment. Now, if certain conditions are met after the 72 hour detention, then the.

Act authorizes the certification.

Of the person for a 14 day maximum period and depending upon the county, another 14 day or 30 day maximum period of treatment.

And that act also authorizes an additional 30 days of intensive treatment if certain conditions are met. So prior to this law going into effect, the law only authorized the administration of antipsychotic medications to a person who was detained for evaluation and treatment for any of those detention period.

Except for the 2nd 30 day period.

So what that did was involuntary treatment during a hold could be discontinued. If not clinically indicated.

To do so, simply because a person was in the process of transitioning from 1 hold to another type of hold.

So this law requires, under existent circumstances, in order for treatment with antipsychotic medication to remain in effect during any of the whole periods, provided that a petition for a new determination on the question of capacity has been filled.

Excuse me.

Filed and would require the order to remain in effect until a hearing on that petition. For the detention period is held and a decision is issued.

And of course, there are several G process protections in place while these proceedings go forward.

All right.

Next, we'll just jump to justice, safety and accountability, where first we're going to take a look at AB 2215 criminal procedure arrest.

This amends the Penal Code to explicitly authorize law enforcement to connect individuals they encounter directly to supportive services and treatment if they believe that doing so would be in the best interest of the public.

And community safety. This is in response to a 2016 created Leady pilot program that sought to improve public safety, reduce recidivism by increasing the availability of social services resources, and reducing the cost of law enforcement agencies and the burdens of the court system stemming from repeated Inc.

Now we're going to collectively take a look at a group of firearms.

Legislation.

So these are all aimed at reducing the risks involved in firearms. We're gonna look at 82739 followed by 82917, then SB1002 and SB1019.

For the sake of time, I will be as brief as possible as I go through these.

So 82739 requires a firearm that is used in the Commission of a crime to be surrendered to law enforcement even when the defendant is granted diversion. If the

crime would require the firearm to be surrendered if the defendant had been convicted of a crime.

So expand the existing nuisance laws by requiring any person who is granted diversion, as I said, to surrender their firearms. Specifically, it deems carrying a loaded firearm or carrying an unloaded hand.

In public or carrying a concealed firearm to be a nuisance which subjects the weapon to forfeiture under 82917, it expands the Court's ability to issue a gun violence restraining order where someone has made a threat or act of violence, or a person has.

Engaged in the unlawful or reckless use or display of a firearm that suggests a risk of increased violence.

SB1002 prohibits a person from owning or controlling ammunition if that person is prohibited from having a firearm.

Due to mental health disorders that possess a danger to themselves or others.

An SE1019 requires law enforcement agencies to maintain a public policy on their website regarding the destruction of firearms and confiscated and surrendered firearms must be completely destroyed by smelting, shredding, crushing or cutting.

All right. We'll quickly pivot to AB3083. Domestic violence Protection Orders.

This is another law related to firearm risk prevention. The domestic Violence Prevention Act requires a court before a hearing on the issuance or denial of a protective order to search specified records and databases to determine if the proposed subject or the order has, among other things, a Reg.

Firearm. And then finally we will take a look at SB1323, which has to do with criminal procedure and the competence dismant trial.

Under this law, courts are now allowed to make a competency determination based on the written evaluation of licensed psychologists or psychiatrists.

Courts may refer an incompetent defendant charged with felonies to mental health diversion programs in lieu of a hearing. It allows for the evaluation of the defendant by one or two licensed psychologists or psychiatrists and will require them to submit a report to the court.

It's also required that the court make a determination whether the regarding the department.

I mean the dependence. Excuse me, capacity to make decisions regarding the administration of antipsychotic medications. If either party objects to these reportings, then a hearing will be held to determine the competence of the of the

defendant. The burden of the proof in this matter is upon that party.

Seeking a finding of incompetence upon a finding of mental incompetence of a defendant charged with felony.

That's not eligible for diversion.

In the interest of justice.

Then potentially.

They could be restored to a competent state and have to go to trial.

So if they are, then of course the hearing would proceed and they will.

Go forward with the standard.

And that is it for each trial.

Wonderful. Are there any questions?

If not, thank you so much for having us today.

We appreciate.

There are no questions.

We move public comments.

Are there any public comments for this item?

Please speak up or raise your hand on things, please.

OK, seeing none. Thank you very much.

We move to next item, 4BB is a new letter from the CE OS office.

The license agreement with peace Officers Professional Association is operating automated tolling machine and more congressional facility.

Introducing. Good morning everyone.

My name is Michael Rodriguez.

I'm a section chief with the Chief Executive Officer Real estate division.

The purpose of the recommended action is to intergrade license agreement with the peace officers, professional associations, Copa Federal Credit Union, Copa Short to continue to operate in ATM at the North County Correctional Facility at the pitches Detention Center, which is located at 29320 the.

Old road in the city of Castaic.

Access to ATMs for Los Angeles County employees.

At the North County Correctional Facility.

He was previously non existent with no machines installed on site or at the other operational jails within the pitches property. As a result, county employees had to go off site to access ATM services to resolve this issue. In 2019, a board motion authorized A5 year A.

License agreement between Papa and the county. This license has since expired in the Sheriff's Department.

Now seeks to retain the ATM on the property.

Popa has absorbed all costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance and regular servicing of the ATM at the location for the past five years and would continue paying for these costs for the duration of the proposed license agreement. This includes the servicing of the ATM and other maintenance related services to the equipment.

Over the past years, Bopa has operated this particular ATM at a loss to the credit union in order to provide this convenient.

To its members, OPA anticipates this ATM continue to operate a loss.

For this reason, the proposed license agreement will continue to be gratis by allowing this ATM to continue in the secured area within the facility, county staff will be able to safely and conveniently access banking services without having to drive off the premises.

Pursuant to government code section 26227, the board has the authority to make an available real property.

Not needed for county purposes, to nonprofit organizations for operation of programs which serve public purposes and are necessary to meet the social needs of the population of the county.

Sheriff Department supports the proposed five year gratis licensing as it aligns with the previous motion and continues the current arrangement. I'm available to answer any questions you have and we also have Sheriff and Copa personnel on line in case you have questions.

Sure that those organizations.

Questions. Just stuff these for the assignment.

Just quick, is this new or is it? Is it a new contract or is it something that's in place somewhere between?

It's it's a new contract.

The previous one did expire, so we're doing another five year, OK? And it was always with this Federal Credit Union, yes. OK.

That's fine. OK.

Yeah, that's helpful. Thank you.

Just we were just chatting.

I was just curious.

You know, I imagine there's not a ton that you can buy on site with cash, but maybe there is.

Just wondering why staff might need cash on site?

Hopefully the sheriff can answer that question.

I think we have Janice or Michelle Danovic on.

Department online.

Speaker unmute yourself.

The department folks online.

Once. Twice.

Can you get that information back to? Yes, we will.

We will do that for you. Thank you.

I think it was also like.

The facility we still like, sure some fundraisers or have fun ratings, or if they're on long shift like.

Sometimes someone will go get lunch for them and they'll give them money so that they can buy the lunch.

And they do have sometimes, like the truck fundraisers and things like that.

OK.

Thank you.

Are you happy with that movie?

Yeah, that's fine.

I mean, unless the department has more they want to add to that, my confusion department.

There's more. It's not.

Yeah. At least let's go one with you.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Are there any follow up questions just service?

No, no other than I used to have to go up there every so often for.

Monitor tours and it's it's very convenient to have.

OK, 'cause, there are no other questions.

Are there public comments from?

Speak up or raise your hand on teams.

OK, seeing none. Thank you very much.

We move to general public comment.

Are there any general public comment for today?

Please speak up on teams or raise your hand.

Alright, seeing none, we adjourn this meeting.

We move to closed session.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.

□ **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription