



**MINUTES
FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY
PROBATION REFORM & IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
MISSION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MANDATE OF
PROBATION OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (POC)**

**Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 374A
Los Angeles, California 90012**

**Wednesday, December 12, 2018
2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

Members Present: Chairman Saul Sarabia, Member Cyn Yamashiro, Member Jose Osuna, Member Dr. Sheila Balkan, Member Mack Jenkins, Member Tiana Murillo, Member Sheila Williams

Absent: Member Alex Sanchez and Member Carrie Clarke

Others Present: Max Huntsman, Inspector General, County of Los Angeles
Ricardo D. Garcia, Public Defender, Law Office of the Los Angeles County
Susan Burton, Commissioner, Sybil Brand Commission for Institutional Inspections
Allison Ganter, Deputy Director, Board of State and Community Corrections

I. Welcome and Overview of Objectives

Chairman Sarabia called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. and welcomed the Probation Reform & Implementation Team (PRIT) members and constituents. Chairman Sarabia provided a brief overview from the previous PRIT meetings and highlighted the objectives of this meeting.

Additionally, Member Osuna encouraged the community to provide input in defining the Probation Oversight Commission's (POC) role, if any, in handling and tracking complaints. Member Osuna emphasized that this is an opportunity for the community to hear from experts that can clarify what recommendations are needed to prioritize complaints and the level of authority the POC may have involving complaints and other issues.

II. Subject Matter Experts and Dialogue: Complaints

Chairman Sarabia introduced Max Huntsman, Inspector General, County of Los Angeles. Mr. Huntsman provided a brief history of how the Office of Inspector General was created and the role of the Inspector General. Mr. Huntsman

explained that complaints received in his office may be divided into three categories: service complaints; misconduct complaints; and system complaints. He concluded his presentation by providing a description of the three categories and the processes within his office.

Ricardo D. Garcia, Public Defender, County of Los Angeles, introduced himself and provided background information on the role of the Public Defender. In addition, he explained the process of how the Public Defender handles various scenarios with their clients, including client interaction as a juvenile in a housing facility; monitoring and assistance of clients in a program; entering a program; or in re-entry to the community.

Mr. Garcia mentioned complaints are reviewed and separated by: service; juvenile/adult that probation is not providing guidance; parent calling on behalf of the juvenile/adult that medical services are not being provided; family member's concern that the juvenile's status is constantly being altered. Mr. Garcia concluded that communication is crucial to collaboratively work together for a solution. Chairman Sarabia thanked the presenters and encouraged the community to consider the information presented for discussion on the POC powers.

Chairman Sarabia mentioned that Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas and Supervisor Janice Hahn introduced a motion pertaining to the use of pepper spray and the Board of Supervisors (Board) requested a report back on its findings within 45 days. Chairman Sarabia posed that presenters suggest ideas of how PRIT members can incorporate certain powers to the POC to minimize delays on requests from the Board; and if the POC could be useful in resolving these types of matters before they are escalated to the attention of the Board.

Mr. Huntsman expressed that a functioning oversight body can speed up processes if the oversight is functioning properly and receiving up-to-date information of whatever is occurring at the time; therefore, the POC will be placed in a position to make decisions and provide solutions.

Member Jenkins questioned if the Office of Inspector General has subpoena power and how often is it being used. Mr. Huntsman responded that he does not have subpoena power, and if he had subpoena power, it could only be used to reach out to third parties. He further informed that any information needed is being supplied by the agency he is working with at the time.

Members of the Public provided their input and concerns before the PRIT.

III. Subject Matter Experts and Dialogue: Inspections

Susan Burton, Commissioner, Sybil Brand Commission for Institutional Inspections (SBC), and founder of New Way of Life Re-Entry Project, introduced herself. Ms. Burton commented that as a SBC Commissioner, she has observed all aspects of Probation camps and facilities while conducting inspections. She expressed that problems identified in the inspections, were not taken seriously and were informed that commissioners have no authority to resolve any issues. Ms. Burton further commented that the Probation Department should be reorganized to address their problems

Allison Ganter, Deputy Director, Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), introduced herself. Ms. Ganter shared that she will be addressing some of the opportunities the POC may have and the models that BSCC has seen in other juvenile justice commissions. Ms. Ganter emphasized that BSCC's goal is to identify problems as early as possible and inspect juvenile detention facilities every two years to ensure they are in compliance. She further informed that BSCC's inspection reports are available online: <http://www.bscc.ca.gov/> and can be requested via email: BSCC.PRACoordinator@bscc.ca.gov.

Ms. Ganter further explained that inspection reports from various agencies are reviewed to ensure there is no repetition of an inspection. She further commented that agencies can formulate their own check lists that may be used to connect an action/implementation for an area of improvement Member Jenkins highlighted some recommendations that POC may consider for implementation, such as check lists for inspections, reviewing applicable policies ahead of the inspections and inquired about unannounced inspections. Ms. Ganter clarified that the BSCC does not conduct unannounced inspections; however, pre-briefings are conducted months ahead of the inspections.

Member Osuna requested information pertaining to facilities that have not maintained compliance with the required standards. Ms. Ganter responded that notices are provided addressing any violations, which includes a timeline to comply. If the violation is not addressed or resolved, a county representative will have to explain to the BSCC why facilities are not in compliance.

Chairman Sarabia thanked the presenters for their input and experience on this topic and reminded the public of the PRIT's tasks since September 15, 2018.

Members of the public provided their input and concerns before the PRIT.

IV. Review/Discussion of PRIT Deliberations of POC Powers

This item was not discussed.

V. Closing and Next Steps

Chairman Sarabia announced that the PRIT will host its next community dialogue on Wednesday, January 9, 2019 at 2:00 p.m. at the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 374A and thanked the PRIT members and the community for participating in today's activities.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.