PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	A Anonymous	Re: County Counsel Department Head Performance Evaluation. As a County Counsel attorney, I would like to convey my concerns about our Department Head and her staff. Upper management lacks the professional trust for County Counsel attorneys who have attended law school and passed the California State Bar exam. Management appears to believe that they are the only people in the office who take the oath seriously, yet they are no more educated or capable than the line-attorneys. In fact, they have far less emotional intelligence, insight, and perspective than most attorneys in our office. As attorneys, we are expected to exercise sound judgment in consequential legal matters, yet our office gives us little to no discretion over ordinary aspects of our workday. That disconnect undermines morale and sends the message that our judgment is valued only when it serves management's purposes. Our office measures compliance with attendance and unnecessary rules and policies, not performance. Attorneys should be held accountable for meeting deadlines, serving their clients, and producing sound legal work—not judged by minute-by-minute monitoring. To put this in perspective, we were recently informed to take time off of our timesheets if we discuss personal matters during business hours. You have a growing army of attorneys that are very insulted and angry. The pendulum needs to swing the other way. We need new leadership and compassion for how we are treated with regard to unionizing. The vociferous objections to our attempt to unionize are appalling and embarrassing. The amount of money our office has spent on fighting us is wasteful and horrifying. We need someone who appreciates our worth and treats us with the respect that we earned by being licensed California state attorneys. Thank you.
			Alfred o Retaliation	Lisa Proft is rude and unprofessional. Every time someone tries to explain something, they get interrupted or told they're confusing. And then later they get told they should feel "comfortable" sharing things, but it doesn't feel comfortable at all. It feels like whatever they say gets twisted around. TTC has turned into a hostile work environment, and there will be a mass exodus.
			Anon Nymous	How does the Board continue to have unrealistic expectations for TTC to modernize when its IT is not only unhelpful but refuses to collaborative with the business units?! And this is allowed by EBG and LP, why?? They continue to place unrealistic expectations on the department but allow IT to give excuse after excuse!

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	Anonymous Anonymous	I've worked in TTC for many years, and I've never seen morale this low. The Chief Deputy's communication style is harsh and disrespectful, and employees feel anxious speaking up. The Department Head does not step in, and the result is a workplace where people feel unsafe raising concerns. This situation needs to be investigated.
			Anonymous Anonymous	I write these comments anonymously as I fear retribution. County counsel, and the management team she leads have long memories and have been known to make things difficult for those who speak up. And so no one does. Take for example the fact that in direct retribution for speaking up against teleworking changes, all staff were required to sign letters where County Counsel deliberately ignored our civil service rights, and it was known that failure to sign would prevent promotions. County counsel routinely makes changes without the input of its line attorneys and calls us "complainers" or "babies" when we speak up. We have to clock in and out like factory workers instead of the professionals we are. Our workloads have increased beyond what can be done in a regular workday with the expectation you will work after hours and weekends to complete those tasks. And when you complain, you get more work. So people suffer in silence. This is malpractice. And now that the attorneys have had enough and seek representation, County counsel has elected to spend the minimal resources available to fight the union effort. The speaks to the grave indifference County Counsel and her management team feel toward the staff. No meaningful discussions, just orders. The truly sad part is County Counsel won't even read these comments or care to address the many morale issues in the office. Instead she and her management team will continue to bury their heads while knowledgeable attorneys continue to leave the office.
			Anonymous ANONYMOUS	Shame on you, Board of Supervisors! You continue to place unrealistic expectations so that you can look good in front of advocacy groups and your own political gain, not to mention the Board deputies expect the department to drop everything and handle the Board referrals. You do not care for staff who's faced with double or triple the workload due to the budget crisis. YOU have directly created the hostile work environment at TTC! Shame on you!!!!!

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	Anonymous Anonymous	Members of the Board of Supervisors, please hear us regarding the Office of the County Counsel. A few have spoken publicly. Many others want to speak but do not feel safe doing so. Please do not mistake their silence for satisfaction. I share the concerns expressed about our office. I am submitting these comments anonymously because I, too, fear retaliation for speaking candidly. We have reached a tipping point. Never have I seen attorneys from our office feel compelled to appeal publicly to this Board in this way. That alone should tell you how serious the situation has become. We need this Board to listen and take meaningful action. Speaking out is already a risk for those who have come forward. Their concerns deserve more than acknowledgment. They deserve a response that produces real change. Please stop County Counsel from continuing to spend public funds to fight our efforts to unionize. This Board has consistently voiced its support for organized labor. We ask you to uphold those same principles for your own attorneys.
			Anonymous Anonymous	I am a resident of the LA County and also a family member of a TTC employee. I voted for Supervisor Horvath. I watched my loved one who used to love their job to now loathing going to work. I am shocked at how the County allows TTC's Department Head and the Chief Deputy to continue to lead a department that's responsible for the billing and the collection of 2.4 million property tax bills. The leadership is toxic, and Lisa Proft is a bully who creates such a toxic environment, and worse, Liz Ginsburg turns a blind eye and condons this behavior. I'm deeply disappointed at the Board and I'm saddened to see the evolution of my loved one. I will not be voting for Horvath.
			Anonymous Anonymous	I respectfully request the Board to investigate the Chief Deputy at TTC on the grounds of breaking the County's Policy of Courtesy and Respect in the Workplace, policy #809, and for violating County's policy of equity and harassment 9.015. Lisa Proft violates the policies and must be investigated

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	Anonymous Anonymous	TTC is the department that bills, collects, and processes the 2.4 million property tax bills and the $25 billion in tax rolls. The property taxes is a MAJOR source for the Los Angeles County that provides all the services for the 10 million residents. However, EBG and LP are reluctant to ask for resources so that staff can process the money that the County desperately needs. Why, you ask? Because EBG and LP don't want to look bad in front of the Board. Data that clearly tells the story, albeit not the one that EBG and LP want to tell, are being manipulated to paint a false narrative, creating a façade that the department has to manage on the backs of the overworked and anxiety-ridden staff. TTC needs proper resources to collect the property tax revenues. The Board needs to wake up and face the harsh reality that more services will be cut if you fail to provide proper resources to TTC so that we can get the money in.
			Anonymous Anonymous	The Board needs to investigate into how the IT unit is being managed. IT should be the supportive unit to all the business unit, but instead the business unit must justify why it needs the support of the business. Other Counties have extremely supportive and helpful IT and they are able to roll out services that benefit the taxpayers. TTC's IT gets kudos from EBG and LP for creating TTC Microsoft Teams backgrounds. It is laughable.
			Anonymous Anonymous	This vicious cycle of DH and Chief Deputy will continue for as long as the Board conducts the DH's performance reviews. The only way to ensure the DH/Chief Deputy support its employees and do the right things by the constituents is to conduct 360 degree performance reviews that include direct feedback from the employees. LA County, you will continue to encounter this issue if you continue to go about things status quo.

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	anonymous anonymous	The Board continues to expect rapid modernization from TTC, but the department's technology limitations make this unrealistic. Unlike other County departments, TTC's IT does not want to collaborate with business units, and leadership allows this to continue. The head of IT is great at deflecting responsibilities and this behavior is allowed by both EBG and LP. As long as these issues remain unaddressed, the department cannot meet the expectations being set. The Board should really worry about how TTC is going to implement the $400 million etax project with its current IT leadership.
			anonymous anonymous	Both EBG and LP have to go! They are the reason why the previous ATTC of Public Finance left TTC after 6 months!

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	Anonymous Anonymous	The behavior coming from Lisa Proft has become intolerable. It is bullying, plain and simple — a sustained pattern of condescension, humiliation, and intimidation that has poisoned the work environment. The constant interruptions, the eye rolling, the sarcastic digs, the belittling comments, these are not isolated moments. They are a defining feature of how leadership chooses to interact with staff. Employees are routinely spoken to in ways that are demeaning, dismissive, and completely unacceptable in any professional setting. The behavior is controlling, erratic, and hostile. Staff are interrogated instead of consulted. They are mocked instead of coached. They are blamed instead of supported. Meetings that should be collaborative turn into public takedowns where employees are talked over, contradicted, and made to feel incompetent, even when they are following the exact instructions they were given. The leadership style is not just ineffective — it is toxic. It destroys morale. It crushes initiative. It silences honest communication. It punishes employees for telling the truth. And the worst part is the blatant manipulation: demanding “high level” information one minute, then attacking employees for not providing enough detail the next. Insisting on “positive nuggets” for the Board while ignoring the actual operational reality. Pressuring staff to reshape data to fit a narrative instead of addressing the real problems. This is not leadership, it is image management at the expense of integrity. The intimidation tactics are unmistakable. Comments about the department having a “long memory.” Accusatory questioning designed to corner and undermine. Public remarks meant to embarrass and belittle. These are not slips of the tongue. They are deliberate choices. This conduct has created an environment where employees feel anxious before meetings, afraid to speak openly, and constantly bracing for the next verbal hit. Staff are being are being broken down. No department can function under leadership that behaves this way. No employee should be subjected to this kind of treatment. And no organization should tolerate a leader who uses fear, humiliation, and manipulation as management tools. This is not strong leadership. This is abusive leadership. And it needs to be addressed , decisively and immediately.

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	Anonymous Anonymous	Shame on you, Board of Supervisors! You continue to place unrealistic expectations so that you can look good in front of advocacy groups and your own political gain, not to mention the Board deputies expect the department to drop everything and handle the Board referrals. You do not care for staff who's faced with double or triple the workload due to the budget crisis. YOU have directly created the hostile work environment at TTC! Shame on you!!!!!
			anonymous anonymous	Anxieties and low morale aptly describe the current state of TTC, thanks to the toxic leadership of EBG and LP
			Anonymous Anonymous	County Counsel has hired expensive private attorneys to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. THIS IS A COMPLETE WASTE OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. Your Board's support for organized labor makes County Counsel's opposition, to its own employees' organizing, especially difficult to reconcile. Their actions are not in line with Los Angeles County's beliefs. We have to ask, why is County Counsel management committing substantial public resources and time to opposing its own attorneys' effort to obtain collective representation? Because they have wronged us and are fighting to protect themselves with public funds. This raises serious questions about whether public funds are serving the public interest or management's interest in maintaining control. I argue that County Counsel is completely misusing these public funds.
			Anonymous Anonymous	Lisa Proft is a bully!
			Anonymous Anonymous	Lisa Proft is ALL of the below. Workplace bullying is a repeated pattern of harmful, unreasonable, or abusive behavior by one or more employees directed at a worker. It is designed to intimidate, degrade, humiliate, or undermine the target, creating a hostile environment that can cause severe physical and psychological stress. Work Interference and Sabotage Unrealistic workloads: Setting impossible deadlines or changing rules on purpose to make a person fail. Verbal Abuse Public humiliation: Mocking, yelling, or making offensive jokes targeted at a specific employee during meetings.

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	Anonymous Anonymous	I'm honestly scared to say anything at work anymore. The way we get talked to by the Chief Deputy is rough. One minute we're told to keep things high level, then when we do that, we get told it's not enough detail. Then if we give detail, we get told it's too much. It's like you can't win. And some comments feel personal, not work related. Lisa Proft is a bully.
			Anonymous Anonymous	I don't usually complain but things have gotten so bad. Meetings feel like interrogations. People get put on the spot; she asks questions in a way that feels like they're being judged. And then later LP says they want us to "share our perspective," but when we do, it gets shot down. Doesn't make sense.
			ANONYMOUS ANONYMOUS	The conduct displayed by Lisa Proft has crossed every line of professionalism, respect, and basic managerial competence. The behavior has been consistently dismissive, condescending, and openly hostile. Meetings that should be collaborative have instead become arenas for belittling staff, interrupting them midsentence, and reducing their contributions to punchlines. The constant eyerolling, sarcastic remarks, and cutting comments are clear violations of County policy. LP is disrespectful, plain and simple. Asking "why are you still talking," and mocking their explanations is not coaching, it is humiliation. It is behavior that erodes trust, destroys morale, and signals to the entire department that staff is not valued here. The pattern is unmistakable: • Public embarrassment • Contradictory demands • Accusatory questioning • Dismissal of legitimate concerns • Pressure to manipulate data for optics • Intimidation disguised as "feedback" This is not leadership. It is control through fear. The repeated insistence on "positive nuggets" for external audiences, the Board Deputies, while ignoring the real operational constraints, shows a fixation on appearances rather than substance. Staff are not here to polish someone's image. They are here to serve the public. Being told that honest data is "not good enough" because it doesn't make leadership "look good" is not only demoralizing, it is irresponsible. The behavior has gone beyond impatience or poor communication. It has become a pattern of belittlement, gaslighting, and retaliationtinged intimidation. Employees are left anxious, demoralized, and afraid to speak up, because every attempt to raise concerns is met with hostility, sarcasm, or outright dismissal. This is toxic leadership. And it is long past time for it to be called out for exactly what it is. TTC

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	Anonymous Anonymous	Dear CEO, I'm writing to urge your office to review TTC's staffing model. Your office has curtailed many positions throughout the years, and yet you give no consideration to the fact that TTC needs sufficient resources to collect the property taxes in order for the County to carry out the services for the residents in the County. It has become literally impossible to do what TTC is mandated to do while advancing Ms. Proft agendas. Staff is tired and demoralized. Please understand that it makes sense for TTC to have the resources so the department can collect the taxes that the County desperately needs. Thank you
			Anonymous Anonymous	The way staff gets treated in meetings is incomprehensible. People get embarrassed in front of others. Also too much pressure to make reports look “positive” instead of accurate. It’s not right and definitely UNETTHICAL!
			Anonymous Anonymous	I am submitting this comment to raise concerns about recurring conduct from Lisa Proft that has affected morale and psychological safety. Several meetings have included remarks that were abrupt, dismissive, or belittling toward staff. questioned in a manner that felt more like cross examination than professional dialogue. In multiple instances, staff attempting to provide operational updates were interrupted, spoken over, or bypassed entirely. Feedback sessions intended to support employee development instead shifted into personal commentary unrelated to job duties. Statements implying that the department “has a long memory” have created fear of retaliation for raising concerns. These patterns have discouraged open communication and made employees hesitant to share operational realities, especially when leadership expresses a preference for “positive narratives” rather than accurate data. This environment does not align with respectful workplace expectations
			Anonymous Anonymous	Leadership keeps talking down to staff. Happens in meetings a lot. People get interrupted, embarrassed, and questioned in a rude way.

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	Anonymous Anonymous	I'm writing to raise concerns about the Department Head, Elizabeth Buenrostro Ginsberg and the Chief Deputy, Lisa Proft. LP breaks the County's Code of Conduct policy everyday in the way she conducts herself and communicates, and EBG is complicit in allowing the behavior. LP is abusive, she talks down to the team, and she is known to roll her eyes during meetings if being presented with data she didn't want to hear. She openly belittles meeting attendees by making statements such as "I have no idea what you're talking about". LP demands presentations to be "high level"; but because she's clueless in the operations of the department, she questions the "high level" presentation for additional details or data; however, if the presentation contains details, LP would then criticize the team for being "too much in the weeds" EBG needs to be held accountable equally as LP because she allows this behavior and she turns a blind eye to what's happening in the department. TTC Employee
			Anonymous Anonymous	Has the County not learn any lesson from the Dept. of Aging and Disability and the Dept. of Economic Opportunity? TTC is now the 3rd toxic department. When will the Board learn its lesson?
			Anonymous Anonymous	Dear Board of Supervisors, Non Elected Department Heads should not be rated by the Board or its Deputies. This creates an environment of managing by desperation and fear as the DH makes decisions based not on how to better the department and its team, but how to please the Board. The 2 objectives often do not go hand in hand. The DH loses sight on the people, and focuses singularly on what they can do to appease the Board. DH's performance evaluations should include a component of 360 degree feedback from the staff. This is evident at TTC, EBG and LP are hell bent on how to look good in front of the Board that they have forgotten who's working in the trenches day in and day out. We're being told all the time that elected department heads have more autonomy while department heads who are appointed capitulate, these department heads put their interest above the departments so that they can secure a good performance review.
			Anonymous Anonymous	Employees have repeatedly shared concerns about leadership's communication style and its impact on morale. Despite raising these issues in multiple meetings, no corrective action has been taken. Staff continue to experience dismissive comments, abrupt interruptions, and accusatory questioning.

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	anonymous anonymous	I work at TTC, our department has demanded us to return to the office 3 days a week when gas is over $7 a gallon. The department gives no consideration to us who don't make the salary as the executive managers. I used to love this department but I will be looking to get out.
			Anonymous Anonymous	There is increasing pressure to frame operational data in a way that appears favorable rather than accurate. Staff have been asked by LP what can we “tell the Board” and encouraged to highlight only “positive nuggets,” even when those do not reflect actual workload or performance constraints. This pressure has made it difficult to communicate real challenges such as staffing shortages, technology limitations, and competing priorities. When employees attempt to explain bandwidth issues or project timelines, they are sometimes met with accusatory questioning or told they don’t know how to manage priorities. This environment discourages honest reporting and undermines informed decision making
			Anonymous Anonymous	Lisa Proft is a bully and she’s toxic! EBG is an enabler! I feel sad for this department.

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	**Relate To**	**Position**	**Name**	**Comments**
CS-2.		**Oppose**	Anonymous Anonymous	It is unfortunate that as an attorney in the Office of the County Counsel that I do not feel comfortable putting my name to this public comment. CoCo is run in a way that does not foster voicing one's opinion, especially if it isn't part of the regime's agenda. Ms. Harrison is an incompetent negotiator and has led the Board to believe the concerns of the attorneys is related to things that are trivial. This is not the case. Ms. Harrison and her management have intentionally acted as obstructionist in our attempt to unionize and have been letting a $1000+/an hour Washington, D.C. attorney thwart our plans and to ram in policies and procedures during this period. There is no justifiable reason for them to do this. They should have accepted the Union and begun fair and reasonable negotiations, with the assistance of the CEO. I somehow believe that CEO Joseph Nicitta would have taken a vastly different approach than our CoCo and her Chief Deputy Tinkham. Again Ms. Harrison and her team of sycophants are afraid that they will be shown to be ineffective in negotiating important deals for the County and its employees. Perhaps Ms. Harrison has not informed the Board that under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. This is not a privilege. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to recognize the union we seek that was overwhelmingly approved by the non-managerial attorneys in county Counsel. Make Ms. Harrison and her team do the right thing, let the attorneys, like the other attorneys in the County, exercise our statutory right to form a union.
			Anonymous Anonymous	A good leader is someone who listens to the voice of the team, a good leader is someone who walks in the shoes of the team and tries to understand the challenges of the team, a good leader is someone who motivates the team, a good leader is someone who advocates for the team, a good leader is someone who does not lead with fear and intimidation, a good leader does not bark out orders, a good leader earns trust and buy in from the team, and a good leader comes from the place of support, and not from the place of "what can you do to make ME and my boss look good?" Lisa Proft and Elizabeth Ginsberg are NONE of the above. It is a shame that after what we have already witnessed from 2 other County departments of "what not to do", that we're back in the place where the leadership is destroying the department right before our eyes.

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			Anonymous Anonymous	Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors, I am submitting this complaint anonymously due to concern about potential retaliation. That concern is based on repeated statements made by the Chief Deputy that “the department has a “long memory” a veil thread that if we make one wrong move then our career at the department may be over. I respectfully ask the Board to initiate an independent review of the leadership culture within the Treasurer and Tax Collector Department. This complaint is not about a single disagreement or isolated incident. It concerns a pattern of conduct that employees have described as abusive, intimidating, and dismissive, as well as the failure of senior leadership to address those concerns despite repeated opportunities to do so. Employees have been interrupted, publicly criticized, spoken over, and subjected to belittling and dismissive comments made by the Chief Deputy, Lisa Proft. In some cases, discussion has shifted from substantive exchange to extended questioning, when LP did not hear the answers that she wanted to hear. The Department Head, Elizabeth Buenrostro Ginsburg, is well aware of the abusive behavior but chooses to do nothing While leaders have the authority to hold staff accountable, accountability should be communicated through clear expectations and respectful feedback. Repeated use of dismissive language has significantly affected morale. Employees have reported statements made by LP such as: • “Why are you still talking?” • “You’re losing me.” • “Too much in the weeds, keep things at a high level”, but she would comment “I don’t understand, you should explain things better” when information were presented at a high level, • “You’ve been talking for 15 minutes and I don’t know what you’re trying to say” • “That’s not a difficult question” while rolling her eyes Employees have also described being publicly embarrassed during meetings through comments unrelated to work performance. Employees who have attempted to raise concerns have reported being advised instead to improve how they communicate with Ms. Proft or simply learn to work through it. According to employees, the result is a workplace where they believe there are limited avenues to raise concerns without worrying for retaliation or impact on future promotional opportunities. Employees have reported repeated instructions to develop reports and

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

presentations based on what leadership can communicate to the Board of Supervisors rather than on operational challenges. Statements emphasizing questions such as:

• “What can our boss tell the Supervisors?”
• “How do we make our boss look good?”
• “Give me positive nuggets.”
have been described by employees as recurring themes.

The Board must bear responsibility because they created the environment to which motions upon motions are being handed down to the departments, and Board referrals have created exorbitant workloads for the staff, but the expectation from the Board for a quick turnaround has not eased.

Employees have expressed concern that there is pressure to present a positive narrative for Board briefings even when staffing shortages, technology limitations, or other operational conditions do not support that narrative. Rather than encouraging candid reporting, this environment has discouraged discussion of risks and operational constraints.

Many employees believe this pressure originates from expectations placed on department executives by the Board and the desire to present favorable information to the Board. Whether intentional or not, that pressure appears to influence executive leadership and, in turn, managers and staff.

The consequence is a culture in which employees believe that accurate analysis is less valued than information aligned with a predetermined narrative. This does not serve employees or the taxpayers.

The Board benefits from accurate information about operational challenges so that informed policy and budget decisions can be made. Employees should not feel pressured to frame data primarily to avoid difficult conversations.

Taxpayers deserve better.

EBG and LP do not understand what their staff do and the challenges of doing the good work with limited resources, and everything they do is from the perspective of how they can appease the Board, and not because they care about the staff.

Most employees remain committed to serving Los Angeles County taxpayers. They continue performing difficult work despite declining morale because they care about public service. However, many now describe the department as a workplace marked by anxiety, reduced trust in leadership, and uncertainty about whether concerns can be raised safely.

I respectfully request that the Board consider:

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	• Conducting an independent climate assessment of the Treasurer and Tax Collector Department. • Providing employees with confidential opportunities to speak with investigators outside the department. • Reviewing whether executive leadership practices comply with County policies regarding respectful workplace expectations. • Evaluating whether concerns about retaliation are discouraging employees from using existing reporting channels. • Assessing whether operational reporting is being influenced by pressure to prioritize favorable messaging over objective representation of departmental conditions. This complaint is submitted anonymously because employees have expressed concern about potential retaliation. I hope the Board recognizes that anonymous complaints may indicate that employees do not believe they can safely speak openly. Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your commitment to ensuring that Los Angeles County employees can work in an environment built on professionalism, accountability, and mutual respect. Respectfully, A Concerned Employee
Anonymous Fear of Retaliation	The Office of the County Counsel claims to foster DEI, however, its treatment of its employees reveals otherwise. The County Counsel attorneys can't even exercise their legal right to unionize, evidencing that County Counsel management wants to continue to stifle their employees' voices and keep them quiet and under submission. This is not a stance that promotes or aligns with diversity, equity or inclusion.
Anonymous Person	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	right to form a union.
Anonymous Person	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
Anonymous TTC Anonymous	Dear Supervisors, The County's Policy of Courtesy and Respect in the Workplace clearly states the following: Abusive conduct means conduct of an employee in the workplace with malice, that a reasonable person would find hostile, offensive, and unrelated to the employees legitimate business interests. It further states Abusive conduct in the workplace can involve misapplication or misuse of authority, which undermines an employee's right to work with dignity and respect. I'm submitting this anonymously due to fear of retaliation by the department's Chief Deputy and Department Head. Lisa Proft, the Chief Deputy uses her position to intimidate, retaliate, and inflict psychological trauma, and Elizabeth Buenrostro Ginsburg endorses the behavior. It is insulting for the employees to hear Elizabeth say in the Live From LA County podcast that she's the type of leader who "motivate and inspire", when she takes a backseat to Ms Proft's egregious behavior. I'm also raising this concern anonymously because our DHRM is friendly with them and will not report the violation of policy. I ask the Supervisors to launch an independent investigation before the situation worsens. Thank you
Anonymous TTC Anonymous TTC	Things are really bad at TTC, employees are scared, frustrated, demoralized, and exhausted, and this is all due to Lisa Proft's lack of leadership. She only cares about how to placate the Board and does not care about the impact her decisions will have on the employees. Ms. Proft is the antithesis of every thing the County stands for. Ms Proft is unfit for the position and must be investigated and removed from her position immediately before TTC lands in the media.

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Anonymous TTC Anonymous TTC	Lisa Proft needs to be discharged for creating a hostile work environment and Liz Ginsburg needs to be investigated for condoning the behavior.
Anonynous Anonymous	In several meetings, LP has used a tone that was demeaning. Employees have been told their explanations were unintelligible, asked why they “couldn’t just say that earlier,” and criticized for providing either too much detail or not enough detail — even when following prior instructions
being bullied	LP needs to be investigated for breaking County’s policy, Courtesy and Respect in the Workplace. TTC is going up in flames.
Citizen Employee	Under the leadership of this County Counsel, workplace morale has been irreparably damaged. Hardworking employees bound by a Code of Ethics by the State of California are treated as though they have no ethics at all. They are constantly and needlessly under the watchful eye of management. In December of 2025, a "Letter of Expectations" was distributed and employees were forced to sign even after many objections were made to its contents and contradictions. A pervasive culture of distrust has created a workplace environment where management cannot be relied upon and are instead avoided. Attorneys are insulted daily by automated timekeeping systems. Mental and physical health has taken a back seat to micromanagement and draconian employment practices. Back-to-office mandates were arbitrary, established without any input from the attorneys impacted and were imposed inequitably across Departments. As a citizen of the community and public employee, the misappropriation of public funds in an attempt to defeat a legal and widely supported effort to form a union is reprehensible. The public deserves better from the Office of the County Counsel. The Board of Supervisors deserves better from the person entrusted with managing its public servants and public funds.
County Counsel Current Employee	Leadership is not the word that describes the Department Head at the Office of the County Counsel. Control is. Management’s opposition to our efforts to unionize clearly reflects that approach: preserving its own authority at the expense of giving its attorneys a meaningful voice—and using an extraordinary amount of public funds to do it.
Frustrated at TTC Employee	I don’t care about the so called fun fundraisers and the holiday party that I still have to pay $20 to go, I just want more telework days. The department doesn’t care that gas is over $7/gallon and I can’t afford that…
James Madison	County Counsel leadership under Dawyn Harrison has been extremely ineffective and has lowered office morale to the lowest levels imaginable. The unnecessary micromanagement of professionals who are all capable of doing the work required of them is not becoming of a person heading the one of the nation’s largest public law offices. Of particular concern to the Board of Supervisors is the County Counsel’s extreme hostility to union organizing. We know the Board and its individual Supervisors have championed the rights of workers including their right to form and participate in unions.

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	The Board, therefore, should look critically at the County Counsel's extreme hostility toward her employees' attempt to form a union. She has retained a white shoe DC law firm (Sheppard Mullin) to come up with every asinine argument to delay the inevitable, the formation of a County Counsel union. We are now in the 9th month of a struggle to form a union with further delays anticipated. The fact that this is the first major push at unionization at County Counsel should show how intolerable conditions are here and that employees, who were skeptical of unions, have become ardent supporters. This falls squarely at the feet of Ms. Harrison and her lack of leadership. I hope the Board will know that if the union busting behavior of the County Counsel is not checked, her labor abuses will continue with the Board's full blessing.
Jane Doe	Due to concerns about retaliation, I am submitting this public comment anonymously regarding the performance of County Counsel. I am deeply disappointed by recent changes within County Counsel that have had a disproportionate negative impact on caretakers and working parents. These policies and practices are inconsistent with the County's ARDI mission and strategic goals, which emphasize a workplace that is accessible, respectful, inclusive, and supportive of its diverse workforce. I am also concerned about County Counsel's opposition to its own employees' efforts to unionize. In January 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of their right to unionize. Since then, County Counsel has opposed and, in our view, intentionally delayed efforts to unionize, including by using outside counsel to oppose the employees' efforts. Employees have a statutory right to form and join a union free from employer interference, coercion, or intimidation. The use of County resources to oppose employee's efforts to exercise that right is particularly concerning. This conduct contributes to a perception that County Counsel is increasingly unfriendly toward its workforce and is particularly troubling given the staffing departures and resulting workload increases. These policies also have operational consequences. Employee departures have increased workloads for remaining attorneys, affecting morale and making it more difficult for remaining attorneys to provide timely, high-quality legal services to the County. Increased turnover and workloads diminish institutional knowledge have resulted in slower responses and reduced quality of legal services to County departments and the public.
Jane Doe	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Correspondence Received

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

	performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
John Doe	Dear Board, I'm writing to report the HOSTILE and TOXIC work environment at TTC caused by the Chief Deputy, Lisa Proft and the Department Head, Elizabeth Ginsburg, for endorsing the Lisa's behavior. Goal posts keep moving, the leadership lacks empathy, staff is over worked and tired, and the managers are demoralized. TTC has a dedicated team who is committed to serve; however, the toxic leadership has created an environment where no one wants to speak because Lisa WILL retaliate in one way or another. Lisa Proft favors the Public Administrator and she shields them from competing priorities and the toxicity. This is a department that can do a lot of great things, but it is rotting from the inside. Sincerely, A concerned employee
Kwai Khang Kaine	As someone witnessing this from the outside over many years, I see how demoralized and angry the attorneys at the Office of the County Counsel have become. It is a travesty. Due to the micromanaging of supervisors under the leadership of this County Counsel, they are being treated below their status as legal professionals. They have worked hard to get to this level of profession and continue to work hard every day. All they are trying to do is have a good working environment. They feel they need to have union support because there is a lack of support from the Board of Supervisors and their chosen management. I cannot believe how much public money has been wasted trying to defeat unionization even though most other counties and Los Angles county departments are unionized. This begs the question of what management, under the leadership of the current County Counsel, is afraid of. Considering your responsibility as stewards of the County of Los Angeles,

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	you need to do better.
Minority Report Back	County Counsel Dawyn Harrison's continued appointment as head of County Counsel does not align with the Board's mission of uplifting community members, especially community members of color, and supporting the rights of workers to union organize. Harrison has spent the past nine months and taxpayer resources to vigorously oppose the County Counsel attorneys' efforts to unionize. Harrison has hired at taxpayer expense an expensive 1000 dollar per hour law firm to author 100+ page oppositions to the unionizing effort and pressure supervising attorneys to sign declarations in support of her opposition efforts. The Board must address Harrison's questionable actions, especially when the attorneys are minority majority and seek to restore a professional dignified work environment. A dignified work environment includes one where the appointed head of the department does not call the attorneys "babies" to other department representatives. Harrison holds herself out as a DEI ARDI champion; however, her actions again and again reveal otherwise unfortunately.
No Name	Dear Board of Supervisors, TTC, the department that collects and processes the $28B in annual property taxes, is imploding. The Chief Deputy, Ms. Lisa Proft, is the source and the Department Head, Ms. Elizabeth Ginsburg is the enabler. Please take this seriously and take proper action to hold them both accountable. Thank you
Principal Deputy County Counsel	Moral is at an all-time low at of the Office of County Counsel. The BOS should request a copy of the Expectation Memo all attorneys were forced to sign in fall 2025, which inaccurately describes our scope of work to include supervising duties in an attempt to block a unionization effort. We are expected bill for substantive legal work for every minute of the work day, totaling 8 hours and 40 hours a week. We were told we are not allowed to bill to administrative, non-file time. Rather that time should be allocated to Departments to be billed against their budget. This is not ethical. We are required to submit a time-off request for 15 minute increments. We are told we should not bill travel time for mandatory, off-site meetings. Our workloads have increased 2-5X due to employee early retirements and departures due to oppressive workplace policies. Our client departments and middle managers have been asked to testify against their own attorneys to support management's union blocking efforts.
Retired Retired	This is to report the toxic environment at TTC due to the leadership under EBG and Lisa Proft. Employees have been sounding alarms for 2 years and nothing happened. And this is the department that has the responsibilities of

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	collecting and processing $28 billion of property taxes! Good luck!
Scared of Retaliation At TTC	TTC is a department that if you tell the Chief Deputy, Lisa Proft, that there are so many priorities that staff needs clear direction on what to focus on because we are so short staffed, then Lisa will accuse you of not knowing your job. She expects staff to work on 20 projects simultaneously and gets mad when something doesn't progress the way she wants it. Lisa doesn't know the first thing about how to manage and TTC is suffering.
Thirty-year County Counsel Attorney	Supervisors, As you prepare to evaluate County Counsel as a Department Head, I respectfully request that you consider the following: County Counsel are sworn attorneys, yet we are infantilized by our Department Head and upper management. The degree of micromanagement is overwhelming. This is evidenced by the fact that for the first time in 113 years, we are making all efforts to Unionize. I have worked in County Counsel's office for 30 of those years and the past 5 years are the worst it has ever been. We have a culture of control rather than professional trust. There is a difference between ensuring that attorneys meet their obligations and managing them as though they cannot be trusted to think for themselves or use their time responsibly. The focus should be on the quality, timeliness, and reliability of our work. Our Department's leadership does not support our attorneys' ability to do their jobs—it unnecessarily restricts it. I am submitting this anonymously because I am concerned about the consequences of speaking candidly. Thank you for considering this comment.
TTC SUCKS	Dear Esteemed Board of Supervisors, We are residents of Los Angeles and we are also the committed public servants working at the TTC. We feel compelled to submit this anonymous comment because it is critical for you, the Board, to know what is taking place at TTC. The biggest difference between TTC and the Department of Economic Opportunity is the TOXICITY. Not only do we have to navigate through competing priorities as the Chief Deputy demands progress despite very limited resources, but Ms. Proft creates an environment so toxic that anything we say can be weaponized against us later on. In addition, Ms. Proft is often dismissive, belittling, and disrespectful during meetings. Ms. Proft has her favorites, and if you are one of her favorites then you would be spared from the wrath. We find it appalling that our Department Head, Ms. Ginsburg, claimed that she is the type of leader who "motivates" and "inspires", and that she's the member of the "team". When she has witnessed the unacceptable behaviors of Ms. Proft and did nothing. We urge the Board to launch an investigation into the behaviors of Ms. Proft for breaking the County's Policy of Respect in the Workplace. TTC has become a toxic workplace and we are crying out for help. Respectfully, Committed but Hopeless

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			TTC TTC	We respectfully ask the Board for the removal of Elizabeth Buenrostro Ginsburg for enabling the Chief Deputy, Lisa Proft, in creating an environment that is so hostile and toxic. They don't understand any of the departments operations, and yet they issue directives that only benefit themselves, they only want to look good in front of the Board and they don't care about the staff that's carrying out the directives that are unrealistic and impossible to achieve given a useless IT section and a skeleton crew. Board, please take immediate action to launch a full investigation into how the department is being run. Thank you
			X Principal Deputy County Counsel	The degree of micromanagement in the Office of County Counsel—particularly the focus on tracking attorneys' time minute by minute—undermines the professional trust our responsibilities require. We are entrusted with consequential legal decisions, and our day-to-day treatment should reflect that responsibility. Accountability matters. But recording precisely when someone arrives and leaves tells us little about the quality of their legal work, whether they meet deadlines, or how effectively they serve their County clients. With our Department Head's evaluation pending, we ask that you consider replacing her with someone that values and respects the California State Bar Card.
		Other	Anon Anon	Dear Members of the Board: If today's numerous public comments regarding County Counsel produce no meaningful change, the problem extends beyond County Counsel's management to the adequacy of this Board's oversight. A slap on the wrist will not restore employee and public confidence. It will tell management that it can continue—and double down—without consequence. For years, concerns about representing clients with conflicting interests have persisted without an alternate County Counsel structure outside dependency. Cost has been cited as an obstacle. Yet the office has found resources to retain outside counsel to oppose our efforts to unionize. The Board should demand a full public accounting of that spending and an explanation of these priorities. The handling of the $4 billion sexual abuse settlement raises even more consequential questions about judgment and accountability. Under the leadership of this County Counsel and management, your Board agreed to the settlement of sex abuse cases without taking plaintiffs' depositions or knowing the identities of thousands of claimants. What verification occurred before that commitment? What safeguards did County Counsel recommend, and what was this Board told about the risk of fraudulent claims? Was DA Hochman the only attorney who took Evidence in Law School? Was Stanford

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Correspondence Received

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

					Law the only law school that taught Evidence? Survivors deserve compensation. They AND THE PUBLIC also deserve a process that distinguishes legitimate claims from fraudulent ones, from the start. Those responsibilities reinforce each other. County Counsel blaming AB 218 for lacking safeguards does not answer the central question: what safeguards did the County's own lawyers establish? The absence of protections in legislation is no excuse for failing to insist on appropriate protections in a settlement. Add to all of the above, the covert attempt to pay out our previous CEO, Fesia Davenport. An office entrusted with protecting the County (particularly public funds) must be accountable for how it exercises that trust. This Board must make that accountability real.
				Anonymous Anonymous	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
				Anonymous Anonymous	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. Due to all these delays, county counsel has taken advantage of the delay to implement more restrictive telework policies, which has resulted in me spending hours of time in a basement checking emails then sitting in traffic for hours later, instead of taking care of these items in my home office. The resulting loss of productivity and unnecessary time in traffic has been devasting to my morale. I have brought this issue to management several times and no one ever considers implementing anything else but what they want.

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Correspondence Received

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

	In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
Anonymous Anonymous	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
Anonymous Anonymous	Greetings to the Board, I am writing in response to agenda item CS-2, Public Employee Performance Evaluations, All Department Heads, including Dawyn Harrison. I am submitting this comment anonymously as an attorney for the Office of County Counsel who fears retaliation. As you are aware, in January of this year Teamsters, on behalf of County Counsel attorneys, submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. County Counsel has delayed these proceedings for nearly 9 months, despite clear communication from multiple hearing officers that their claims have no merit. During last week's public hearing, many of the points made by the Supervisors apply directly to County Counsel attorneys, but we have not been given a change to present like the County's other labor partners.

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	Someone coming to work for the Office of the County Counsel after a 4-year hiatus would find it unrecognizable. The Office has created a depressed culture with low morale. The Office has taken full advantage of the County Counsel classification of non-salaried/exempt to treat professions like hourly employees when it wants to (attorneys may not work before 7:00 am) and salaried when it wants to (attorneys are required to regularly review their electronic mail and telephone calls during the week and on weekends). The Office has banned employees from eating at their desks and has tried to force attorneys to take lunch breaks instead of providing a workspace where employees can both work and eat. Any challenge to these absurd policies is met with scorn. Ms. Harrison has been clear in her communications to the attorneys that she is not open to any suggestions or comment. The message is: if you don't like it, leave. And people are. At the September 22, 2026 hearing, the Board emphasized the importance of County benefits. As you know, those of us who were employed full time by the County after pension reform do not have the same pension as our colleagues. We will never make a percentage of our actual salaries, but a percentage of the salary cap determined by the State which is significantly lower than what an attorney at their retirement should make. There are very few opportunities to promote within County Counsel and once we reach the top (10th) step of Senior Deputy we will not receive any additional compensation for the rest of our careers, aside from cost-of-living increases and bonuses negotiated by the unions. The draw to continue to work for the County has decreased significantly in comparison to the private sector where salaries are significantly higher. The Board also discussed the burden on employees of doing more with less. County Counsel has lost many employees, some to retirement, and some to the private sector or other government agencies, because of the policies that have been put in place by Ms. Harrison. Pursuant to County Counsel policy, attorneys are expected to bill 40 hours per week, totaling 2,080 hours per year. According to a 2024 article from Legal News Feed, this is 80 hours more per year than Sheppard Mullin, the law firm representing County Counsel in its opposition to allowing employees to unionize, where, in addition to their private firm salary, they earn 10-20% bonuses for billing over their minimum hours. To have a conversation with a colleague we are required to take vacation time. Just recently, the Office of the County Counsel asked our client departments to write declarations to assist in its mission to deny our legal right to unionize. This has caused irreparable harm in the relationship between counsel and client departments and has politicized our attorney-client relationship. I am deeply disappointed by this decision. Please take these thoughts into consideration when reviewing item CS-2.
Anonymous	I am a County Counsel attorney submitting this comment anonymously for

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Anonymous	item CS-2. I ask the Board to look closely at how the office is being managed and why so many attorneys are unhappy. Attorneys are required to clock in and out. That was not always the practice here, and I am not aware of any other lawyers who have to clock in and out as we do. This requirement conveys that management does not trust experienced attorneys to use their time responsibly. If particular attorneys have attendance or performance problems, management should address those problems individually rather than impose rules that treat the entire office as though it cannot be trusted. We are accountable for consequential legal work and for serving our clients well. The way management communicates compounds the problem. In late 2025, management pressed attorneys to sign an expectations memo that did not accurately describe our roles. It attributed supervisory responsibilities to senior deputies that they do not actually have. As attorneys seek to unionize, management is arguing that many senior deputies and some deputies should be excluded from the proposed bargaining unit because they advise on policy. The Board should ask how much public money management has spent on outside counsel this year to oppose the unionization effort, and why. Morale is very low. Recent early retirements and departures from County service warrant attention. Management's approach is a significant reason people are leaving. Attorneys have been seeking to unionize since January 2026. Management's repeated challenges have delayed the process for months, based on arguments that I believe lack merit. Its vigorous opposition to attorneys' effort to unionize, while failing to address the concerns that led to that effort, further erodes trust. Please seek candid input from staff attorneys and ask County Counsel what she will do differently to retain the people who provide the County's legal services.
Anonymous Anonymous	I am submitting this anonymously because employees have concerns about retaliation. There is a real morale and retention problem in County Counsel. Turnover is high, institutional knowledge is being lost, and it has become difficult to recruit attorneys. People who used to enjoy working here and took pride in serving the County are frustrated with the direction of the Office. Attorneys are expected to work hard and be available when the job requires it, but at the same time there is more monitoring and more micromanagement. There is very little opportunity for attorneys to have a say in these changes. That is why having a union and a voice matters. Instead of sitting down with its attorneys, County Counsel is spending County resources fighting their

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	efforts to unionize. The Board should ask why morale has gotten this low and why people no longer want to stay or come work here.
Anonymous Anonymous	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
Anonymous County Counsel	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
Anonymous County Counsel Employee	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize.

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Correspondence Received

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

					In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
				Anonymous Person	Dear Members of the Board of Directors: I am submitting this anonymously as part of the Board's evaluation of the County Counsel. I respectfully ask that the concerns raised in this letter be considered as part of that evaluation and that the anonymity of employees providing this feedback be protected. The Office of County Counsel is currently in the midst of efforts to unionize. The desire of employees to unionize did not arise in a vacuum. It is the result of an increasingly contentious workplace environment in which many employees believe management has repeatedly failed to listen to employee concerns, meaningfully address workplace issues, or act in what employees perceive to be the best interests of the attorneys and staff they manage. There is a significant level of mistrust within the Office, and several attorneys have resigned amid concerns regarding management practices, including concerns about retaliation. The events surrounding the Office's Senior Deputy County Counsel hiring and promotional processes have further contributed to that mistrust. In September 2025, the Office conducted an examination for promotion and/or appointment to Senior Deputy County Counsel. A substantial number of current County Counsel attorneys participated in that process, and a qualified eligibility list was established. Shortly thereafter, management became aware of employees' efforts to unionize. Despite having conducted the examination and established a qualified list, promotions to Senior Deputy County Counsel did not occur for nearly a year. In September 2026, approximately one year after the examination and while litigation and other proceedings concerning the employees' efforts to unionize remained ongoing, the Office finally promoted Senior Deputy

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

				County Counsel attorneys from within. The timing of these promotions has understandably raised questions among employees, particularly because the qualified list had existed for nearly a year. More concerning was the Office's decision during this period to characterize the hiring of additional Senior Deputy County Counsel attorneys as an "emergency" hiring process. Rather than utilizing the existing qualified list of County attorneys who had already demonstrated their qualifications through the examination, the Office proceeded to hire attorneys from outside the County. This decision is difficult for employees to understand. There were reportedly more than 100 qualified individuals already on an eligibility list for the very position the Office characterized as requiring emergency hiring. If the County had already completed an examination, determined which candidates were qualified, and maintained an existing eligibility list, it is difficult to reconcile the characterization of the subsequent hiring need as an emergency with the decision to bypass that list. The fact that the Office chose to bring in attorneys from outside the County, individuals who did not have the institutional knowledge or experience of existing County Counsel attorneys, while declining to utilize an existing pool of qualified County attorneys, has further damaged employee trust. The timing and circumstances have also caused employees to question whether the decision was influenced by the ongoing unionization efforts. I recognize that management may have legitimate operational reasons for its hiring and promotional decisions. However, the concern is not limited to any single hiring decision. Rather, these events are part of a broader pattern that has contributed to a serious deterioration in employee trust and morale. Employees should not have to fear that exercising their workplace rights, raising concerns, or participating in efforts to improve working conditions will negatively affect their opportunities for advancement. Nor should qualified existing employees reasonably question whether promotional opportunities are being withheld or whether hiring processes are being structured in a manner that disadvantages them. I respectfully ask the Board to look closely at the management practices within the Office of County Counsel, including the circumstances surrounding the September 2025 Senior Deputy examination, the subsequent delay in promotions, the emergency hiring process, the decision to bypass the existing eligibility

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Correspondence Received

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

					list, and the timing of the eventual September 2026 promotions. Most importantly, I ask the Board to consider why so many employees have reached the point of believing that unionization is necessary to have their concerns heard and addressed. The existence of an effort to unionize should not itself be viewed as the problem. It should prompt an examination of the workplace conditions and management practices that caused employees to believe collective representation was necessary in the first place. Thank you for taking these concerns seriously and for considering them as part of your evaluation of the County Counsel and the management of the Office. Respectfully, An Anonymous County Counsel Employee
				Anonymous Person	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
				Anonymous Person	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
Concerned Employee	Dawyn Harrison has demonstrated deeply troubling leadership. Despite touting diversity and inclusion, she has fostered an environment of toxic competition, where loyalty appears to matter more than competence, silence is valued over dissent, and managers are protected while the attorneys doing the actual work are disregarded. Her leadership has been marked by questionable judgment, from the Measure G debacle and AB 218 mishaps to her current fight against her own employees' effort to unionize. Rather than respect their right to organize, she has spent tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars opposing them, while minimizing their legitimate concerns before the Board of Supervisors. Public-sector attorneys have every right to unionize, as demonstrated by the many public law offices throughout California that already have collective bargaining units. Dismissing and disparaging the reasons her own employees are seeking a union is petty, counterproductive, and an abuse of leadership. An office of this size and importance deserves leadership that respects its employees, welcomes accountability, and puts competence and public service ahead of personal grievances.
County counsel Anonymous	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
County Counsel Employee anonymous	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards

PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
Dawyn Harison	Please don't fire me. All the dumb legal advice your Board receives is really from Nicole Davis Tinkham. Measure G/Measure J that was her. Illegally paying Fesia millions of dollars that was Nicole too. I am telling you this in Public Comment only because I know Nicole does not read them. Fire Nicole and I promise I can do better.
Dewey Cheatum-Howe	Fire County Counsel Dawyn Harrison and Deputy Nicole Davis Tinkham! Here is a list of their stunning legal incompetence that has wasted resources and squandered public funds: - Measure G/Measure J ballot idiocy - $5 billion payout to ambulance chasers for fraudulent claims of sex abuse - illegal $2 million payout to Fesia Davenport - clear conflicts of interest involving Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission
Edwin A Lewis	I think any evaluation of the performance of Dawyn Harrison in particular and the management of the office of County Counsel in general should include information based on my experience as a former long-term employee. I am a 45 year practicing lawyer and a 19 year employee of the county of Los Angeles. During my 19 years I've seen the office of County Counsel slowly degrade until this point where it is hit what I believe to be rock bottom. The draconian measures taken by management to control the lawyers and "manage" their performance are ridiculous and unprofessional. They have professionals clocking in and out as if they were making french fries at McDonald's. I have never worked anywhere in my career where I had to clock in and out as a professional. In addition, Miss Harrison and her management team exhibit favoritism for employees who fit within their definition as promotable. They have promoted to management positions attorneys who have never tried a case, never appeared in court and have no experience as a real lawyer. I urge you to inquire of Ms. Harrison and her management team to expound upon the trial experience of their divisions heads and assistant and senior assistant County Counsel, I think you'll be surprised who's running the Office.

				On the other side of the coin people that they don't like they treat like garbage. I was forced to take a disability retirement because my medical condition did not allow for me to come into the office. For six years I telework and my performance evaluations were all acceptable with no complaints about the quality or quantity of my work, but I was told that coming in two days a week was an essential function of the job and that if I could not do that, I was unable to work. Today I sit as a patient at UCLA hospital awaiting an organ transplant. I don't know if the conditions of the Office caused my medical condition but they sure didn't help. I urge you for the sake of not only the taxpayers of the county of Los Angeles, but the reputation of the office that you make serious demands for changes in the management.
			Fesia Davenport	Feel free to fire Dawyn Harrison. She is incompetent and wastes County resources. For example, she messed up Measure G/MeasureJ, advised billion dollar payouts on fraudulent sex abuse settlements, and illegally pay out the former CEO 2 million dollars in tax payer monies. The current leaders of County Counsel only make embarrassing headlines in newspapers and give bad advice. Time to clean shop.
			Jane Doe	Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize. In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation. We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.
			John Doe	Need a new County Counsel that understands the employees and is not heavy handed.
		Item Total	**84**	
Grand Total			**84**	

As of: 9/29/2026 3:00:12 PM

Dear Members of the Board of Directors:

I am submitting this anonymously as part of the Board's evaluation of the County Counsel. I respectfully ask that the concerns raised in this letter be considered as part of that evaluation and that the anonymity of employees providing this feedback be protected.

The Office of County Counsel is currently in the midst of efforts to unionize. The desire of employees to unionize did not arise in a vacuum. It is the result of an increasingly contentious workplace environment in which many employees believe management has repeatedly failed to listen to employee concerns, meaningfully address workplace issues, or act in what employees perceive to be the best interests of the attorneys and staff they manage. There is a significant level of mistrust within the Office, and several attorneys have resigned amid concerns regarding management practices, including concerns about retaliation.

The events surrounding the Office's Senior Deputy County Counsel hiring and promotional processes have further contributed to that mistrust.

In September 2025, the Office conducted an examination for promotion and/or appointment to Senior Deputy County Counsel. A substantial number of current County Counsel attorneys participated in that process, and a qualified eligibility list was established. Shortly thereafter, management became aware of employees' efforts to unionize. Despite having conducted the examination and established a qualified list, promotions to Senior Deputy County Counsel did not occur for nearly a year.

In September 2026, approximately one year after the examination and while litigation and other proceedings concerning the employees' efforts to unionize remained ongoing, the Office finally promoted Senior Deputy County Counsel attorneys from within. The timing of these promotions has understandably raised questions among employees, particularly because the qualified list had existed for nearly a year.

More concerning was the Office's decision during this period to characterize the hiring of additional Senior Deputy County Counsel attorneys as an "emergency" hiring process. Rather than utilizing the existing qualified list of County attorneys who had already demonstrated their qualifications through the examination, the Office proceeded to hire attorneys from outside the County.

This decision is difficult for employees to understand. There were reportedly more than 100 qualified individuals already on an eligibility list for the very position the Office characterized as requiring emergency hiring. If the County had already completed an examination, determined which candidates were qualified, and maintained an existing eligibility list, it is difficult to reconcile the characterization of the subsequent hiring need as an emergency with the decision to bypass that list.

The fact that the Office chose to bring in attorneys from outside the County, individuals who did not have the institutional knowledge or experience of existing County Counsel attorneys, while declining to utilize an existing pool of qualified County attorneys, has further damaged employee trust. The timing and circumstances have also caused employees to question whether the decision was influenced by the ongoing

unionization efforts.

I recognize that management may have legitimate operational reasons for its hiring and promotional decisions. However, the concern is not limited to any single hiring decision. Rather, these events are part of a broader pattern that has contributed to a serious deterioration in employee trust and morale.

Employees should not have to fear that exercising their workplace rights, raising concerns, or participating in efforts to improve working conditions will negatively affect their opportunities for advancement. Nor should qualified existing employees reasonably question whether promotional opportunities are being withheld or whether hiring processes are being structured in a manner that disadvantages them.

I respectfully ask the Board to look closely at the management practices within the Office of County Counsel, including the circumstances surrounding the September 2025 Senior Deputy examination, the subsequent delay in promotions, the emergency hiring process, the decision to bypass the existing eligibility list, and the timing of the eventual September 2026 promotions.

Most importantly, I ask the Board to consider why so many employees have reached the point of believing that unionization is necessary to have their concerns heard and addressed. The existence of an effort to unionize should not itself be viewed as the problem. It should prompt an examination of the workplace conditions and management practices that caused employees to believe collective representation was necessary in the first place.

Thank you for taking these concerns seriously and for considering them as part of your evaluation of the County Counsel and the management of the Office.

Respectfully,
An Anonymous County Counsel Employee

Due to concerns of retaliation, I am submitting an anonymous public comment to the Board of Supervisors regarding County Counsel's performance evaluation. I want to bring to the Board's attention County Counsel's waste of County resources for the sole purpose of opposing County employee's statutory right to unionize.

In January of 2026, County Counsel attorneys submitted authorization cards to the County's Employee Relations Commission in support of our right to unionize. In response, County Counsel has opposed and delayed, without legal grounds every effort of the attorneys to unionize. County Counsel is wasting tax payer dollars by hiring outside counsel to fight and oppose County employee's right to unionize. Under State law, County employees have a right to form and join a union, as many other County Counsel attorneys in California have done, free from employer coercion and intimidation.

Gas is $6.00 per gallon and yet the staff and attorneys need to be in the office twice per week to foster comraderies. The attorneys have no assigned offices are required to haul their heavy computers. We are treated like hourly employees and nit professionals by needing to clock in and out and when we are late or need to tend to a personal appointment, we must take time off. But we must be available by phone 24/7 but can only clock in by our allotted time.

We are not treated as professionals. There is no fostering of community. We are written up for missing two office days.

We ask the Board of Supervisors to direct County Counsel to immediately stop wasting tax dollars to delay and oppose County employee's statutory right to form a union.