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# Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACLU</td>
<td>American Civil Liberties Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALADS</td>
<td>Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDCR</td>
<td>California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCJV</td>
<td>Citizens’ Commission on Jail Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAB</td>
<td>Internal Affairs Bureau (Sheriff’s Department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCB</td>
<td>New York City (Board of Commissioners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIR</td>
<td>Office of Independent Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, one of the largest policing agencies in the nation, has been the subject of media and public criticism for decades. Despite numerous attempts at reform over the past twenty years, the Department continues to exhibit numerous problems, ranging from excessive use of force to personnel corruption. In 2011, the Board of Supervisors formed the Citizens’ Commission on Jail Violence in hopes of creating a better Sheriff’s Department. In its report, the Commission called for the creation of an Office of the Inspector General (OIG) – an agency that would attempt to remedy the deficiencies present in the Sheriff’s three current oversight entities.

Special Counsel, the Office of Ombudsman, and the Office of Independent Review handle current Sheriff’s Department audits, complaints, and investigations, respectively. They operate largely independent of one another and lack the coordination necessary for effective oversight. Thus, our analysis offered a design for a consolidated Office of the Inspector General.

We relied on expert interviews, comparisons of other oversight bodies, internal LA County documents, financial review of County and external budget documents, and previous findings and literature for the majority of our data and information.

We used these data to identify a combination of common elements and functions shared by oversight bodies: agency independence, investigative authority allowing for initiation of case investigations and policy audits, jail monitoring, reviewing of complaints, quality assurance/risk management, and communication & public engagement.

Identifying these key elements allowed us to analyze the design of an OIG by considering the presence or absence of these elements. This discussion led us to consider three policy options for potential OIG models:

- An Expert-Informed model that was constructed by the common views and opinions of industry experts on what elements and functions constitute an “ideal” OIG.

- A Client-Preference model that captures the County’s current preferences and its preliminary ideas of the structure and function of the OIG.
And a Hybrid model, which we propose that seeks to moderate the extremes of the previous two models.

In evaluating these options, we considered the degree of oversight provided, political feasibility, and ease of implementation. Based on our analysis, we provided two recommendations for the design of an LA County Office of the Inspector General:

- **Short-term Recommendation:** Due to the difficulties associated with pursuing statutory authority\(^1\) at the current time and because of the deficiencies in oversight present in the client’s current preferences, we recommend that LA County pursue the Hybrid model. This model provides a fairly high level of oversight (even with the lack of statutory authority) and faces no significant barriers to implementation.

- **Long-term Recommendation:** The County should adopt the Expert-Informed model by pursuing an amendment to the California Constitution in order to establish an OIG that has statutory authority and can compel the Sheriff to action.

In addition, we evaluated the funding and staffing needs for the Hybrid model based on the assumption that the County must at least maintain the current staffing levels for the current three oversight bodies. At a minimum, the OIG will need to be staffed by twenty-five individuals led by an Inspector General. Their combined salaries, pension, and benefits, would cost the County approximately $3.5 million per year. Approximately another $1.1 million would be needed for annual operation costs for a total OIG budget of approximately $4.8 million per year.

Los Angeles County has a unique opportunity to improve oversight of the Sheriff’s Department. Various County stakeholders need to ensure that the Office of the Inspector General takes a leading role in this task. By identifying, correcting, and preventing issues, the OIG will begin to restore public trust in the Sheriff’s Department.

---

INTRODUCTION

The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD or the Department) has long been criticized for excessive use of force, personnel corruption, substandard jail conditions, lack of oversight, and a refusal to adopt much-needed reforms. In 1991, increased awareness of policing entities in the wake of the LAPD Rodney King beating thrust Los Angeles’ policing agencies into the media spotlight - including the Sheriff’s Department. Under the direction of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (the Board), Judge James G. Kolts was appointed as Special Counsel with the purpose of investigating accusations of excessive force, community insensitivity and failure to monitor inmate complaints. Judge Kolts immediately began his investigations, and subsequently produced the now widely-cited Kolts Report. Published in July 1992, the report offered 180 recommendations for improvement and detailed “deeply disturbing evidence of excessive force and lax discipline”.

In order to implement Kolts’ recommendations, the Board appointed Merrick Bobb as Special Counsel. Bobb spent the next three years working on implementing those recommendations, and continued his service to the Board by issuing his own semi-annual recommendations that expanded on Kolts’ report. He would remain in that position for nearly two decades. Despite Bobb’s numerous recommendations throughout the remainder of the ‘90s and into the new millennium, the Department continued to exhibit patterns of abuses and failures with little media attention. It was not until late 2011, with the release of a report by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and a similarly jarring editorial by the Los Angeles Times, that the Department was pushed back into the media’s attention.

The Board of Supervisors, in response, formed the Citizen Commission on Jail Violence (CCJV or the Commission) in October 2011 with the sole intent “to conduct a review of the nature, depth and cause

---

of the problem of inappropriate deputy use of force in the jails, and to recommend corrective action as necessary". In September of 2012, the CCJV issued their findings and sixty-three recommendations, one of which called for “the formation of a single watchdog entity [to] strengthen civilian oversight”.

The CCJV recommendation specifically calls for the creation of an Office of the Inspector General (OIG) – an agency that seeks to remedy the deficiencies currently present in the Sheriff’s oversight systems. Defined by the Inspector General Act of 1978, an IG’s role is to “conduct, supervise, and coordinate audits and investigations relating to programs and operations of [establishments]”. To the County and the public’s benefit, the Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff’s Department (including Sheriff Lee Baca) are in complete agreement regarding the need for an OIG. The process has now been turned over to the County’s Chief Executive Office (CEO), the government’s administrative and budgetary arm, to offer a design and implementation plan for the Office of the Inspector General.

SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

The CCJV spent an entire year on a fact-finding mission to investigate and shed light on issues facing the Department. Their sixty-three recommendations provided a holistic roadmap toward building a better Sheriff’s Department. The recommendations spanned six subject areas: use of force, management, culture, personnel, discipline, and oversight. Each of these areas had, on average, ten individual action steps that the Sheriff and County could implement to improve the Department.

Our project focuses on one of those subject area recommendations: the creation of an Office of the Inspector General. The creation of the OIG has been tasked to the Chief Executive Office while other departments, including the Board of Supervisors and Sheriff, are concurrently working toward effective
There is not one single solution or policy that will be the “silver bullet” to solving all of these problems.

implementation of the other CCJV recommendations. While the oversight proposals in our analysis will help to address some of the problems in the Department, they may not target the root causes of those problems. Other issues identified by the CCJV, such as a disregard for inmates, a culture that devalues the work of jail deputies, and poor executive leadership will also need to be corrected. Changes within the Department will not happen overnight and there is not one single solution or policy that will be the “silver bullet” to solving all of these problems. We recognize that institutional change happens incrementally over time and will take the cooperation of many stakeholders in the County government to implement the CCJV’s recommendations.

Our report offers a framework for Los Angeles County to design and implement an Office of the Inspector General. First, we use data and expert interviews to inform our views on the common elements and functions of organizational oversight. We then use those elements and use construct an Expert-Informed OIG model. Second, we offer two additional models - a Client-Preference model and a Hybrid model that borrows elements from each of the other models. Third, we evaluate these three models and make a recommendation for LA County. Fourth, we offer a design and staffing plan for our recommended model. Finally, we explore implementation considerations and possible future enhancements.

THE CLIENT

Ms. Georgia Mattera, the Senior Assistant CEO for Public Safety for the Chief Executive Office, enlisted us to provide policy analysis for the design of an office of the Inspector General. Mr. Dardy Chen and Mr. David Turla, both employees within the CEO, also provided
direction and assistance. For the rest of this report, these individuals and their interests will be collectively referred to as “the Client”.

**THE PROJECT**

The first step in offering recommendations for the design of an OIG was to identify the nature of the policy problem and the intended goal of our recommendations.

**Goal:** To provide Los Angeles County with a design for a single, effective oversight body that identifies, corrects, and prevents issues within LASD such as deputy on inmate violence and excessive use of force. An effective oversight entity will have access to the Sheriff’s Department, maintain public visibility and awareness, and operate as an agency independent from the Sheriff and the Board of Supervisors.

**Policy Problem:** The three current Sheriff’s Department oversight entities, Special Counsel, Ombudsman, and the Office of Independent Review, operate largely independent of one another (explained in further detail below). The entities have historically been able to identify problems within the Sheriff’s Department, but failed to correct and prevent issues from occurring.

**SIGNIFICANCE**

LASD is the largest sheriff’s department in the world. The Department provides contract law enforcement and safety services for 2.9 million citizens in 40 of the 88 cities in Los Angeles County. The six county jails house an average daily inmate population of 18,500 persons. The operations of the Sheriff’s Department have a profound effect on the lives of people in this County and deputies have a sworn obligation to ensure that their conduct is ethical and in alignment with Department values.

---

14 Ibid
15 Ibid
16 Client provided information.
17 Ibid
The issue of oversight is now especially important in light of California’s prisoner realignment goals. In response to a court order, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill 109 in an effort to balance the state budget and reduce state prison populations. In effect, this law redistributed nearly 30,000 inmates from severely overcrowded state prisons to county jails or other forms of corrections or rehabilitation. One year after realignment began, the population of the LA County jails increased by 1,154. As of December 2012, the state had sent 11,136 people back to LA County to serve their probation under the supervision of the County’s Probation Department. There are currently arrest warrants for 3,200 of these probationers released back into the community. Realignment will both directly and indirectly impact the daily inmate population of the LASD jails and problems will be intensified as more inmates entered the already crowded jails.

The OIG also seeks to address the lack of citizen confidence in LASD. The Board created the CCJV to “restore public confidence in the constitutional operation of our jails.” An effective oversight body can help to supervise the implementation of CCJV recommendations and to provide for continuous public assurance that the Board is taking a proactive role in ensuring LASD’s quality service to the public. Most importantly, recognizing problems and working to address those problems before they become endemic is crucial for inmate safety. As a further benefit, an effective OIG would decrease the negative press that the Board and LASD receive as issues are resolved. A robust and effective oversight body that

---

identifies issues and offers corrective actions will help to guarantee that citizens’ and inmates’ rights are upheld by LASD.

WHAT IS OVERSIGHT?

Oversight is a concept that has multiple meanings in different contexts and applications. Defined generally, it is “the ability to conduct, supervise, and coordinate audits and investigations relating to programs and operations of [establishments]”.22 From this broad concept, and for the scope of this project, we have defined oversight as the ability for the OIG to identify, correct, and prevent problems within LASD.

WHY OVERSIGHT, WHY OIG?

Oversight is essential to maintaining public trust and ensuring ethical conduct in policing agencies and facilities. In a Pace Law Review article that addresses prison oversight, Barbara Attard discusses oversight for patrol stations and jails stating, “oversight has emerged as one of the checks and balances to ensure that our police, sheriffs, and correctional institutions do not exceed or abuse the authority granted to them”.23 Similarly, Richard Wolf asserts, “the fact that correctional facilities are ‘closed worlds’ is the compelling argument for outside, independent scrutiny”.24 He goes on to state that the public has a right to knowledge of the facilities and the activities that occur within them because taxpayer dollars fund these expensive institutions.25

 Critics of independent oversight often state that policing agencies already have internal review units and that there is no need for independent oversight. Michele Deitch, a nationally expert on oversight, commented that internal review bodies are not sufficient and “do not provide for public accountability” because they are designed for more internal management and not “public transparency”.26

25 Ibid
There are many different ways of providing organizational oversight and nearly as many opinions as to the trade-offs and comparative effectiveness of each of them. John Brickman, former Executive Director of the New York City Board of Corrections, has argued that the mere presence of any form of oversight matters more than the type of oversight.\(^{27}\) Unfortunately, the presence of oversight has not been sufficient in LA County as the problems facing the Sheriff’s Department have repeated for decades. One model of oversight is a citizen-led review board. Brickman identifies the strengths of citizen-led oversight bodies stating that the member’s reputations can allow them to raise awareness, and are less likely to be swayed by changing political climates.\(^{28}\)

Experts also identified deficiencies with civilian-led oversight bodies. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights concluded that civilian review boards are often unsuccessful due to limited resources, inadequate staffing, ill-defined authority, lack of subpoena power, and lack of authority to impose discipline.\(^{29}\) In a report for the Eugene, Oregon Police Commission, Merrick Bobb states that civilian review boards often lack sufficient knowledge of “police tactics, strategy, and policy,” and thus cannot provide “meaningful insight or oversight”.\(^{30}\)

In addition, the CCJV’s report called for a single entity, specifically an Office of the Inspector General, to centralize and improve oversight. In light of expert opinions regarding the ambiguous long-term success of civilian review boards, recommendations from the previous CCJV to form an OIG, and the high level of political will and momentum in LA County for the creation of an OIG, we focus our analysis on the design of an Office of the Inspector General.

**CURRENT LA COUNTY OVERSIGHT ENTITIES**

CCJV was critical of Los Angeles County’s three current oversight entities – the Special Counsel, the Office of Ombudsman, and the Office of Independent Review. Currently, these three separate agencies

---


\(^{28}\) Ibid pp. 1568-1569.


perform distinct but related functions with little communication amongst themselves. The Commission found that “these oversight bodies suffer from too many gaps...to be able to effectuate comprehensive and lasting changes in the Department”.

**Special Counsel to the Board of Supervisors:** Merrick Bobb, the Special Counsel, was appointed by the Board of Supervisors in 1993 with the task of “monitoring implementation of the Kolts Report”. Bobb’s role has grown since that initial task and is now focused on auditing general trends and problems facing the Sheriff’s Department. He does not investigate individual cases and his audits are advisory only. Bobb’s findings are presented in a semi-annual report and have issued more than thirty reports to date. Since the Special Counsel is a lawyer, he can maintain attorney-client privilege with the Board and Sheriff.

**The Office of Ombudsman:** The Office of the Ombudsman was created in 1993 as a result of a recommendation in the Kolts Report and called for the creation of an independent complaints investigation body specifically for the Sheriff’s Department. Nearly two decades later, the Ombudsman continues to receive citizens’ complaints and retains a team of retired superior court judges to investigate accusations of mishandled or incomplete investigations conducted by LASD. The Ombudsman reviews allegations previously investigated by the Sheriff’s

---

32 See Appendix F for Special Counsel, Ombudsman, and Office of Independent Review caseload information.
Internal Affairs (IAB), but can only initiate these investigations within ten days of the close of an IAB investigation.36

The Office of Independent Review: Created in 2001 as a response to an idea from Sheriff Lee Baca, the Office of Independent Review (OIR) is currently staffed by six sworn attorneys who maintain a contract with the Board of Supervisors to “ensure that the allegations of intradepartmental misconduct in the County of Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department, including those which constitute criminal conduct, are investigated and reviewed in a fair, thorough, and impartial manner”.37 OIR acts as an independent check on the Sheriff’s Department, and investigates allegations of officer abuse and misconduct referred to them by the Department’s own Internal Affairs Bureau, something that the Ombudsman and Special Counsel never did. In addition, OIR offers advisory deputy disciplinary recommendations for findings of wrongdoing. OIR & IAB investigate the cases concurrently, but separately from each other. OIR’s findings and recommendations are used by the Sheriff for internal information purposes only, but are advisory, and not binding. OIR currently has access to all personnel files and records. This access was established through a non-legal agreement between OIR and the Sheriff’s Department. This system has allowed for unimpeded investigations over the past decade due to OIR’s working relationship with the Sheriff, but is not guaranteed through any County law.

PROBLEMS WITH THE CURRENT SYSTEM

The three current oversight bodies each have their own deficiencies, which have aggravated the lack of thorough organizational oversight.38 Additionally, there is an absence of coordination among the three oversight entities to identify overlapping patterns and trends between individual level investigations, citizen/inmate complaints, and policy level reviews. Moreover, the three current bodies cannot compel the Sheriff to follow up on their recommendations due to the lack of statutory authority.

Special Counsel to the Board of Supervisors: For decades, Special Counsel has produced reports detailing problems in and recommendations for the Department. Despite sound analysis and problem identification, Special Counsel’s ability to improve LASD has been limited by lack of resources and has

38 A positive aspect of the current decentralized system is that it safeguards against common criticisms of strong centralized oversight including reduced managerial control, a loss in operational effectiveness for the agency, and decreased employee morale resulting from fear of unfair retribution.
not had the capacity to address all issues facing the Department. In addition, he has not had the capacity to track previous recommendations and whether or not the Department addressed the issues. Lack of resources and presence of attorney-client privilege that prohibits the release of information relating to the investigations have limited Special Counsel’s ability to maintain a spotlight and public awareness of issues facing the Department.

The Office of Ombudsman: The Ombudsman’s mandate is severely limited. They can only submit comments to the Sheriff on previous investigations and cannot re-open cases for investigations. The Ombudsman can only review cases in instances where citizens are dissatisfied with the complaint resolutions they receive from the Department. The Ombudsman does not provide the Board or the Department with analysis of the complaints it receives in order to identify patterns or trends with other Department issues. In addition, the Ombudsman does not have a system to track the complaints through the investigation and resolution process.

The Office of Independent Review: OIR is not independent of the Department so the objectivity of their work has been questioned. OIR receives its budget from the Sheriff’s Department, is physically located in a leased building occupied by and paid for by Sheriff personnel, maintains attorney-client confidentiality with the Department, and was an idea proposed by Sheriff Lee Baca. Even the Office’s public web page touts the Office’s ties to the Sheriff: “OIR work[s] with LASD on a daily basis… [and] has a close working relationship with LASD's Internal Affairs Bureau and Internal Criminal Investigations Bureau.”

**Methodology**

The majority of our data comes from examination of currently existing documents and findings as reported by the County CEO, the CCJV, public information provided by other oversight bodies, internal

---

40 Expert Interview. (2013, February 15). Personal Interview
41 Ibid pp. 182
42 Ibid pp. 186
43 Retrieved from a personal interview with ACLU staff members (2013, February 15).
County memorandums, County budget documents, and LASD publications. In addition, we interviewed experts and key stakeholders to help us identify key elements and functions of an oversight body.

**Literature review and oversight model comparison:** We reviewed literature on oversight entities, including articles written by national experts, proposals for the design of OIGs in other jurisdictions, as well as authorizing legislation of oversight bodies. Through our literature review, we identified common elements and functions that lead to effective oversight. We also researched the organizational structure, functions, and reporting processes of similar oversight entities, and subsequently identified common elements, functions, and barriers to effective oversight.

**Expert interviews:** In addition to discovering common elements among oversight entities, we interviewed field experts, both inside the County government and from other jurisdictions nationwide. These individuals included heads of other oversight bodies, oversight researchers and academics, County officials, and various other related stakeholders. These interviews allowed us to identify elements and functions essential to oversight and helped inform political feasibility and implementation considerations.

**CURRENT LEGAL CONSTRAINT**

**LASD cooperation with the OIG is not mandatory:** The California Constitution established the Sheriff’s Department as a mandated County function, one that operates independently, has an elected head, and cannot be compelled to action by other County departments. This is true for all fifty-eight counties in the state. Policing agencies in many other jurisdictions are led by appointed officials, legally obligating them to follow orders from their chief executive officer such as mayor or governor. On the other hand, the LA County Sheriff is an elected official and the Board cannot legally mandate access.

State Code also prevents the Board from manipulating the Sheriff’s budget. This law was further affirmed in the Fourth Appellate District Court of Appeals case Hicks v. Board of Supervisors (1977)

---

46 For example, the Los Angeles Police Department is led by a police chief appointed by the Mayor and the Secretary of the California Department of Corrections is appointed by the Governor.
which states that “a board of supervisors cannot use its budgetary power to control employment in or operation of the sheriff’s office”.48 Simply, The Board lacks the constitutional and statutory authority to interfere with the constitutionally mandated Sheriff’s Department, even using budgetary means. Establishing this OIG’s statutory authority over LASD requires a change to the California Constitution, which needs statewide voter approval. Therefore, an OIG with statutory authority for LA County is nearly impossible in the short term as it is not feasible to pass a voter-approved amendment. In the long term, however, with additional time and resources, the County could possibly overcome this constraint by pursuing a change to the state constitution.

Overview of Policy Options

Our literature review and interviews led us to identify six key elements and functions that contribute to creating an organization that provides effective oversight. The different policy options combine all of these elements, some in varying degrees. The six key elements and functions are 1) agency independence, 2) investigative authority allowing for case investigations and policy audits, 3) jail monitoring, 4) addressing citizen complaints, 5) risk management, and 6) communications & public engagement which led us to propose three policy options.

The Expert-Informed model captures the goals of identifying, correcting, and preventing problems by combining key elements and functions in their most effective capacity. Each of these will be elaborated on and discussed in the Expert-Informed model section below. We also consider two alternative policy options, a Client-Preference model that summarizes

our client’s stated partiality and a Hybrid model that borrows elements from these two extremes and seeks to provide a possible third alternative.

**EVALUATIVE CRITERIA**

**Oversight Effectiveness:** Oversight has been described as “umbrella concept”\(^{49}\) that contains “distinct functions”\(^{50}\) which, when combined, allow oversight to be effective in achieving its goals of identifying, correcting and preventing problems.\(^{51}\) We evaluate our options on the OIG’s oversight effectiveness. The combination of the interviews and research led us to define the individual elements captured in the Expert-Informed model. The Expert-Informed model is the one by which the other two models are evaluated on and would secure the best oversight under the ideal elements described in that model. The other two models deviate from this Expert-Informed model and thus are likely to produce less effective oversight. For illustrative purposes only, one can conceive the effectiveness of each model as not measured from the traditional baseline of “0”, but rather starting from a baseline of “100”. The Expert-Informed model would be the “100” baseline, and the other two models are evaluated on their decreased capacity to achieve effective oversight as compared with the Expert-Informed model.

**Political Feasibility:** We also evaluate our options on the likelihood of political support from various stakeholders and key players. For example, within the County of Los Angeles, the major political concerns arise from the support (or lack thereof) of members of the Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff.

The Board, being both the executive and legislative body of the County, would be unwilling to support any policy change that limits its authority and discretion over the OIG. The Client also expressed a preference for minimal public reporting in order to maintain confidentiality and discretion with any sensitive information the OIG might uncover. An Inspector General who takes too public of a role would not likely receive a high level of support from the Board. To facilitate this confidentiality and to increase cooperation from the Sheriff’s Department, the Client prefers the OIG be staffed with attorneys who

---


\(^{50}\) Ibid

\(^{51}\) Ibid pp. 1433-1434.
could offer attorney-client privilege between the Board and the OIG staff. A high level of political feasibility would result from having support from both the Board and the Sheriff.

**Ease of Implementation:** Lastly, we also evaluate our options on the likelihood that they could be easily implemented. Administrative implementation of a policy relies on a variety of factors including: the time and manpower involved, financial and staffing resources that would need to be devoted to the project, hiring processes, and deviation from the current organizational structure. An OIG that is relatively easy to implement would utilize current resources and staff, would minimally disrupt the work of the three current oversight bodies, and would have a budget that is similar to the current oversight funding levels. On the other hand, it would be difficult to successfully implement an OIG that needs a large increase in staff and funding, and disrupts current oversight efforts.

**Policy Options**

For each of the three policy options below, we present 1) an overview table summarizing the six design elements and functions, 2) a discussion and detailed analysis of that table, and 3) a discussion of how that option relates to each of the three evaluative criteria.

**Policy Option A: Expert-Informed Model**

The Expert-Informed model, defined by our data collection and interviews with experts, outlines common elements and functions of oversight bodies nationwide. We identify the general “best practices” of organizational oversight and build a model that encompasses these six items:
We also illustrate these design elements in the subsequent pie charts by comparisons with other oversight bodies. Through literature review and expert interviews, we collected data on oversight bodies in fourteen jurisdictions: the cities of New York, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Jose, Albuquerque, Long Beach, Berkeley, Portland, and Minneapolis and the counties of Sacramento, Cook, Broward, Orange, and Harris.

Our client requested that we use other oversight bodies in order to form a holistic picture of oversight. Out of the many jurisdictions with oversight agencies we researched, these fourteen entities included the most information about the oversight elements we identified: statutory independence, unrestricted access to necessary information, management of citizen complaints, issuing of public reports, and holdings of public meetings.

It is important to note that the fourteen comparative jurisdictions do not identically mirror Los Angeles County. They differ in size, authority, and structure. Some jurisdictions only preside over patrol or jails. However, these bodies do offer common design elements necessary for an oversight body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under the Expert-Informed model, the Office of the Inspector General would:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Securing Agency Independence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Have statutory, fiscal, and physical separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Report only to a chief executive body and not to the agency head it oversees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The IG should be appointed and only removable for just cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Receive its budget through direct appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigative Authority (Investigations, Audits)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Be able to compel cooperation and subpoena documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Be able to initiate its own investigations without prior approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jail Monitoring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conduct regular and unannounced visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Speak with inmates and deputies and track grievances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure inmate complaints boxes are accessible and complaints reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressing Citizen &amp; Inmate Complaints</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Have multiple and multilingual methods to receive complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prioritize complaints based on severity of the allegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Follow-up with complainants about investigation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance &amp; Risk Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Set mandatory timeframes for implementation of recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enforce penalties and disciplinary measures for inaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication &amp; Public Engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Publish regular, detailed reports about its investigations and findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintain a strong community presence and public engagement through town hall meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Securing Agency Independence: An Office of the Inspector General is most effective when it can operate as an independent body that is not subject to the demands or wills of the agency it oversees.\(^\text{52}\)

To this effect, it is crucial to ensure that the OIG is insulated from the agency that it is overseeing. Insulation is achieved through three means as explained below: statutory separation, fiscal separation, and physical separation.\(^\text{53}\)

An OIG needs to be removed from the target of its oversight responsibilities and not held under the chain of command of the agency it is overseeing. These findings are supported by research of other oversight bodies as illustrated by the chart below.\(^\text{54}\)

Often, a chief executive officer directly appoints an inspector general. An OIG would report and be held responsible only to that executive officer. The NYC Board of Correction illustrates this observation and even expands upon direct appointment by having multiple bodies select the board members.\(^\text{55}\)

At the same time, only the chief executive officer should have the ability to remove the IG from office. A removal of an IG would only occur for just cause and not “at will”. This allows for an office with the administrative and political leverage to function independently and not fear repercussions for thorough investigations.

Fiscal separation is also necessary for an independent agency. The OIG would receive its budget directly from the chief executive body it reports to. If the OIG is not fiscally independent, then the agency that


\(^{54}\) See Appendix B for organizational charts. Note: Highlights added to showcase separation of oversight body with the agency it oversees.

\(^{55}\) Three of the board members are appointed by the Mayor, three by the New York City Council, and three from a joint selection by state Supreme Court justices and the Mayor.
the OIG oversees could reduce the effectiveness of the OIG by shrinking its budget. Putting the power to cripple an OIG in the hands of the agency it oversees could be problematic as an agency will do what it can to protect its own reputation.

Finally, an OIG needs to be physically located in “neutral” facilities, separate from the agency it oversees. This separation reduces the possibility of any overlap in personnel and resources. If there is no separation, then personal interactions could create an environment in which an employee inadvertently leaks information to another office.

2) Investigative Authority: Experts in custody oversight advise that an OIG needs to have “unfettered” access to necessary information in order for oversight to be effective. The agency that the OIG oversees should not restrict the OIG from accessing personnel records, investigation files, security footage, and other information necessary for conducting a thorough investigation. In addition, a current oversight head supported the claim that an OIG needs to have the legal authority to obtain documents and information pertinent to investigations. The LAPD OIG currently has the authority under Los Angeles City Charter “to initiate any audit or investigation pertaining to the Police Department, without the prior approval, [and grants] guaranteed access to all information and documents of the Police Department, to the same extent as the Police Commission itself.”

![Jurisdictions with Unrestricted Access](image)

---

57 Ibid.
58 A downside of physical separation, however, is the increased travel time between facilities for any field work (interviews, investigations, monitoring) conducted by OIG staff.
In addition, an OIG would have the ability to initiate its own investigations and audits without prior approval from the agency that it is overseeing. In almost all instances, a policing agency has an internal affairs unit to conduct investigations - our data show that this model is not sufficient and there is an additional need for an independent investigative body.63, 64

3) Jail Monitoring: The primary purpose of jail monitoring is to observe jail conditions and misconduct. Many experts provided evidence in support of regularly scheduled and unannounced monitoring.65, 66 Perhaps one of the strongest forms of jail monitoring observed is in England’s oversight agency: Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons. The Inspectorate General is required by law to inspect every prison and report on the conditions of confinement. The inspectors have full access to all parts of the jail including prisoner cells. The Inspectorate administers a randomized survey to inmates in order to gather statistically significant findings on the conditions inside the jails. These data are then used to compare conditions over time.67 Other oversight bodies such as the NYC Board of Correction and the Sacramento OIG already employ representatives to conduct unannounced jail visits.68

Jail monitoring serves a dual function - not only does it allow monitors to observe issues in the jails, but it serves a prevention function as well. The mere presence of a jail monitor can influence the behavior of jail guards. The OIG representatives, through their visits, can prevent deputies from engaging in activities that are against policy, such as the use of excessive force. During interviews, a former NYC Board of Correction Chair and Michele Deitch, a national expert on prisons, confirmed the importance of field representatives supervising jail conditions. She stated that jail monitoring and inspections “is an essential part of effective prison oversight, ‘keeps staff on their toes’ and helps them avoid complacency, even when everything is going well”.

64 The past chair of NYC Board of Correction also emphasized the importance of allowing the Board investigate its own cases.
67 Ibid
Speaking to inmates and checking inmate complaint boxes is another key function of jail monitoring. Hearing inmates’ unfiltered thoughts is essential to forming a complete picture of jail operations. While some inmates could potentially fabricate stories, it is still important to hear and investigate all complaints. Furthermore, speaking to inmates yields balanced and thorough investigations. Inmates may be more comfortable speaking with a jail monitor in person rather than submitting a complaint in writing.

4) **Addressing Citizen and Inmate Complaints:** Due to the diversity of audiences that an OIG encounters, it needs to have multiple methods to receive citizen and inmate complaints. These methods would include phone, fax, traditional mail, in person, online, and email, and should be made available in multiple languages. The OIG should not be limited to investigating allegations that occurred within a reasonable timeframe.

![Jurisdictions Addressing Citizen Complaints](image)

The OIG will have to consider prioritizing its cases. Cases that are more serious such as ones involving excessive force and death of inmates should be investigated first. Prioritization will allow the OIG to minimize its case backlogs and correct the problems that have the most serious implications first. Following up on complaints will help maintain the public trust in the government and hold the agency accountable.

5) **Quality Assurance & Risk Management:** Investigations, following up with complaints, and observing the conditions of jails are crucial, but mean little if an OIG cannot improve upon and correct the problems it observes. Thus, it is necessary for an OIG to be able to recommend and enforce corrective actions. This ability to turn the OIG’s findings into actual improvements is part of the reason why an OIG exists. Prison experts praise England’s Inspectorate General and its mandatory duty to follow through on
its recommendations.\textsuperscript{70,71,72} In England, this legal requirement to follow through on recommendations has led to implementation of about seventy percent of the recommendations.\textsuperscript{73}

The OIG needs to be able to set a mandatory timeframe as agencies could potentially subvert OIG recommendations by stalling implementation of those recommendations. Mandatory timeframes and corrective actions will push reforms to take place in a timely manner - ideally before those problems grow. Additionally, this OIG would set penalties for inaction as a means to urge cooperation. Examples of these penalties could include: budget cuts, fines, and the power to subpoena and bring the agency head in front of a judge or executive board.

\textbf{6) Communication & Public Engagement:} Industry experts agree that communications and public engagement are key elements of oversight.\textsuperscript{74} A Pace Law Review article emphasizes the importance of maintaining a public presence: “By shining a light on these hidden corners of our society, we can go a long way towards eliminating abuses”.\textsuperscript{75} A current oversight head stated that publishing reports is necessary to maintain visibility on issues.\textsuperscript{76} Almost all oversight bodies, including local entities such as OIR and Special Counsel Merrick Bobb, produce public reports to inform key stakeholders and the public of issues facing the departments they oversee.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Jurisdictions Issuing Public Reports}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{City} & \\
\hline
City of New York, NY & Yes \\
City of Los Angeles, CA & Yes \\
Sacramento County, CA & Yes \\
City of San Diego, CA & Yes \\
Harris County, TX & Yes \\
City of Albuquerque, NM & Yes \\
Broward County, FL & Yes \\
Orange County, CA & Yes \\
City of Long Beach, CA & Yes \\
City of Berkeley, CA & Yes \\
City of Portland, OR & Yes \\
City of Minneapolis, MN & Yes \\
Cook County, CA & No \\
City of San Jose, CA & No \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{70} Expert Interview (2013, February 22). Personal Interview
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid pp. 1396
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid pp. 1442-1443
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid pp. 1384
\textsuperscript{76} Expert interview (2013, February 1). Personal Interview.
A current oversight head similarly agreed that holding regular town hall meetings for citizens to voice complaints and concerns about the LAPD has proved to be an effective way to build public trust in the LAPD.\textsuperscript{77} Many other jurisdictions, shown in the chart below, hold public meetings to allow for the public to comment and raise awareness of issues in corrections.\textsuperscript{78}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTIONS HOLDING PUBLIC MEETINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF NEW YORK, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOK COUNTY, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWARD COUNTY, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SAN JOS, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF BERKELEY, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF PORTLAND, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIS COUNTY, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE COUNTY, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation: Policy Option A, the Expert-Informed model, must be evaluated on each of the three criteria below.

Oversight Effectiveness: Field experts affirm that an OIG that incorporates all of the elements defined above would provide the ability to identify, correct, and prevent problems in the agency it oversees. The ability to review complaints, initiate its own cases, and monitor the jails would allow the OIG to identify problems within LASD. In addition, the ability to set a mandatory timeframe for implementation of recommendations, the ability to set penalties/discipline for inaction, and the presence of a robust public reporting function would likely lead to the ability to correct and prevent problems in the agency.

Political Feasibility: This model is not currently feasible because it would require statutory authority in order to have legal power over the Sheriff’s Department. However, the option to create an OIG with statutory authority could be explored in the long run as it would take time and resources to pursue a change in the state constitution. Also, this model is not currently feasible due to a client preference for limited reporting and public visibility. The Board wants the OIG to function in more of an advisory role and not as a public vocal “watchdog”. The Sheriff would not likely support a communication &

\textsuperscript{77} Expert interview. (2013, February 1). Personal interview.
\textsuperscript{78} Expert Interview. (2013, February 22). Personal interview.
engagement function as the Department has an interest in keeping matters internal and away from public view - a belief that is most likely shared by the sheriff deputy union ALADS.79

**Ease of Implementation:** This model cannot be implemented at the current time due to legal and political constraints as explained above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Takeaway Point:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Expert-Informed model achieves the most effective level of oversight and has the greatest opportunity to identify, correct, and prevent problems within LASD. However, it cannot be adopted for Los Angeles County at the current time as political and legal barriers (including the need to change the California Constitution) render this option unattainable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY OPTION B: CLIENT-PREFERENCE MODEL**

The Client-Preference model was constructed by the Chief Executive Office. This model merely transfers the functions of the three current oversight bodies to a centralized OIG and adds jail monitoring.

**Under the Client-Preference model, the Office of the Inspector General would:**

| Securing Agency Independence | - Be an independent body that directly reports to the Board  
| - The IG would be appointed by a majority vote of the Board  
| - Be statutorily separated from the Sheriff’s Department  
| - Have an office physically separate from the Sheriff facilities |

| Investigative Authority (Investigations, Audits) | - Establish a Memorandum of Understanding with the Sheriff's Department defining roles & responsibilities  
| - Only be able to investigate cases concurrently reviewed by the Sheriff’s Internal Affairs Bureau |

| Jail Monitoring | - Conduct regular and unannounced visits  
| - Speak with inmates and deputies and track grievances  
| - Ensure inmate complaints boxes are accessible and complaints reviewed |

| Addressing Citizen & Inmate Complaints | - Have multiple and multilingual methods to receive complaints  
| - Prioritize complaints based on severity of the allegation  
| - Follow-up with complainants about investigation results |

| Quality Assurance & Risk Management | - Be able to inform the Board as to the status of recommendation implementation in private closed sessions |

| Communication & Public Engagement | - Publish a semi-annual report  
| - Yield the communication & public engagement function to the Board |

79 For more information, visit: The Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriff, see: http://www.alads.org/version2_0/news.aspx
1) **Securing Agency Independence:** The OIG would have statutory separation and operate as an independent body, and report directly to the Board. The Inspector General would be appointed by a majority vote of the Board, but would be removable at will. The OIG would receive its funding through regular departmental allocation from CEO and its headquarters would be located on County owned or leased property, separate from any Sheriff’s facilities.

2) **Investigative Authority:** The OIG would establish a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) through which LASD could freely share its personnel and sensitive information files. This MOU would clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the OIG. The OIG would maintain attorney-client privilege. Sheriff Baca has publicly stated his approval for the creation of an OIG and its ability to investigate the Department. The OIG would leverage its relationship with the Sheriff and Board to ensure that it has continual access and the ability to investigate cases thoroughly. An interview with OIR Head Mike Gennaco revealed that OIR has maintained access to LASD’s files because of its MOU and the long standing working relationship between Gennaco and the Sheriff. We expect this formal and informal relationship to continue with the new Inspector General.

In the past, this working relationship and MOU have been effective in allowing the oversight entities access to the Sheriff’s Department. However, if the Sheriff decided to deny an OIG such access in an attempt to protect LASD’s interests, the only safeguard to guarantee access would be statutory authority, which is absent from this model.

3) **Jail Monitoring:** The OIG would monitor the status and conditions of jails by conducting regular and unannounced visits and speaking with inmates and guards. The OIG would check to see that inmate complaint boxes are accessible and regularly reviewed and responded to in a timely manner. In the summer of 2012, OIR implemented a short-term pilot program using six law school students as jail monitors and the ACLU has also previously monitored the jails as well. In its 10th Annual Report, OIR acknowledged the success of the program, stating “the eight-week intern project provided OIR with valuable feedback it would not normally have had”. This external model would be expanded to a full time, County-staffed program.

---

4) **Addressing Citizen and Inmate Complaints:** The OIG would have multiple and multilingual methods to receive complaints and have the ability to prioritize those complaints and inform the complainants of the result of that investigation. As mentioned previously, the Ombudsman currently handles citizen and inmate complaints and the functions of these offices would be directly transferred to a new OIG in their current state.

5) **Quality Assurance & Risk Management:** The OIG would utilize the Board’s publicity to compel the Sheriff to follow through on its recommendations. The OIG’s ability to follow up on its recommendations with the help of the Board will provide an avenue to keep the Sheriff accountable and reduce the amount of administrative oversight required of the Board. Allowing the OIG to have the ability to follow up on its recommendations is also important as it will help keep the Board informed about the progress of the Sheriff’s Department in addressing issues. The OIG would also be responsible for monitoring court-ordered corrective action plans resulting from lawsuit settlements. Currently, the Board oversees these plans, but incorporating this function under a unified OIG would centralize all components of investigations, recommendations, and implementation.

6) **Communication & Public Engagement:** The OIG would report directly to the Board of Supervisors with status updates on investigation and recommendations on a semi-annual basis. The IG would also meet privately with the Board to discuss important, ongoing cases. The Board’s preference is that the OIG would be limited on what it can report publicly. The Inspector General will act as more of an investigative attorney for the Board and not play the highly public role often associated with IGs. The Board’s preference is due to the sensitive nature of the cases and their Board’s desire for internal management over external pressure as a means for corrective actions. Therefore, the OIG would have a moderate level of access to the Sheriff’s Department but a low level of visibility.

**Evaluation:** The Client-Preference model must also be evaluated on each of the three criteria below.

**Oversight Effectiveness:** An OIG that incorporates all the elements above would achieve a moderate level of oversight and would likely be able to identify, correct, and prevent problems in the Sheriff’s Department. The ability to review complaints and monitor jails would allow the OIG to identify problems in the Sheriff’s Department. However, the Sheriff could easily prohibit the OIG from initiating cases due
to the lack of statutory authority. The OIG’s ability to raise Board’s awareness through private meetings will not necessarily correct the problem. Without a robust public communication function that sheds a spotlight on the Department, the OIG would not be able to use public awareness as a means to hold the Sheriff accountable and correct issues within the Department. In addition, the OIG’s ability to monitor jails would prevent deputies from conducting themselves in ways that are not aligned with the Department’s values. The attorney-client relationship allows LASD to feel secure in freely sharing investigation information, knowing that there is level of protection from public scrutiny as pertinent information cannot be released.

The significant trade off with attorney-client privilege is that it would decrease the transparency of LASD and not allow for the public scrutiny called for by the CCJV. Transparency is important because it would allow the OIG to act as “eyes and ears” to the public and help restore trust in the Sheriff’s Department. Sheriff Baca has expressed his full support for the creation of an OIG. Due to the lack of statutory law, however, changes in the Department (whether by Sheriff Baca or a future Sheriff) could easily limit or prevent the OIG from accessing his department. The next best alternative to compel the Department to action is to use the Board’s pulpit to draw attention to issues publicly. Compared to the Expert-Informed model, the Client-Preference model would achieve less effective oversight as it compromises robust public reporting to satisfy the preferences of political feasibility and ease of implementation.

**Political Feasibility:** The Client-Preference model is currently feasible in LA County because all its functions were informed and requested by client preferences. This model would easily garner support from the Board, Sheriff, and CEO as it maintains the current functions and centralizes them under one office. Though this model is politically feasible and has the greatest chance of successful implementation, it significantly trades off ease of creation with improving oversight of LASD.

**Ease of Implementation:** This model would be fairly easy to implement as it simply transfers the functions of the three current oversight entities. Except for hiring additional staff, the County wishes to incorporate OIR, the Ombudsman, and Special Counsel under the OIG. Because various County stakeholders are aware of this design, it would require the least disruption to the status-quo.82

---

82 Upon creation of the OIG, the County, would need to formulate how it will handle the rare instances when OIR and the Ombudsman handle non-Sheriff cases (i.e.: Probation Department, Department of Children and Family Services).
Takeaway Point:

The Client-Preference model achieves a moderate level of oversight but has the least opportunity to identify, correct, and prevent problems within LASD because of inherent problems with the model. This model does not significantly bolster oversight as it mostly translates the functions of the current oversight bodies under a unified OIG. However, this model is highly politically feasible and easy to implement because the Client requested this general design of an OIG.

POLICY OPTION C: HYBRID MODEL

Operating under the assumption that there is an opportunity for compromise between the extremes of the Expert-Informed and Client-Preference models, we propose a “Hybrid” model that incorporates elements of both. This model mimics the Client-Preference model, but seeks to bring it closer to the Expert-Informed model. We highlighted the differences between the Client-Preference model and Hybrid model in bold. We believe these changes between the models to be extremely significant.

Under the Hybrid model, the Office of the Inspector General would:

| Securing Agency Independence | - Have statutory, fiscal, and physical separation  
| - Report only to the Board  
| - The IG should be appointed by the Board and only removable for just cause  
| - Have an office physically separate from the Sheriff facilities |
| Investigative Authority (Investigations, Audits) | - Establish a Memorandum of Understanding with the Sheriff’s Department defining roles & responsibilities  
| - Be able to initiate its own investigations without prior approval |
| Jail Monitoring | - Conduct regular and unannounced visits  
| - Speak with inmates and deputies and track grievances  
| - Ensure inmate complaints boxes are accessible and complaints reviewed |
| Addressing Citizen & Inmate Complaints | - Have multiple and multilingual methods to receive complaints  
| - Prioritize complaints based on severity of the allegation  
| - Follow-up with complainants about investigation results |
| Quality Assurance & Risk Management | - Be able to inform the Board as to the status of recommendation implementation publicly at Board meetings |
| Communication & Public Engagement | - Publish regular, detailed reports about its investigations and findings  
| - Maintain a strong community presence and public engagement through town hall meetings |

1) Securing Agency Independence: Under the Hybrid model, the OIG would have similar functions to the Client-Preference model, including statutory separation, independence, and direct reporting to the
Board. Also identical to the Client-Preference Model, the OIG would have a head appointed by a majority vote of the Board, receive its funding through regular departmental allocation from CEO, and have facilities separate from the Sheriff. Due to geographic spread of the County jails and Sheriff’s stations, this model additionally calls for the creation of OIG branch or field offices that would be geographically dispersed across the County.\footnote{See Appendix C for map of County jails and Sheriff Stations.}

2) Investigative Authority: Like the Client-Preference model, the OIG would establish a Memorandum of Understanding, maintain attorney-client privilege, and continue to leverage its relationship with the Sheriff and Board to continual access and the ability to investigate cases thoroughly. Additionally, under this model the OIG would be able to investigate cases regardless of whether or not there is a current Internal Affairs Bureau investigation.

3) Jail Monitoring: The Hybrid model is identical to the Client-Preference model: the OIG would monitor the status and conditions of jails by conducting regular and unannounced visits and speaking with inmates and deputies, would check to see that complaint boxes are accessible and regularly reviewed, and would track inmate grievances.

4) Addressing Citizen and Inmate Complaints: The Hybrid model is nearly identical to the Client-Preference model: the OIG would have multiple and multilingual methods to receive complaints, prioritize those complaints, and inform the complainants of the result of that investigation. The Hybrid model would extend the window in which to review investigations to be longer than the current ten day limitation.

5) Quality Assurance & Risk Management: The OIG would utilize the Board and its publicity to compel the Sheriff to follow through on its recommendations. The OIG’s ability to follow up on its recommendations by publicly reporting at Board meetings regarding the status of recommendation implementation acts as an avenue to keep the Sheriff accountable and reduce the amount of administrative oversight required of the Board. With the Board’s constant pressure on the Sheriff to implement the OIG’s recommendations, the Sheriff will be more likely to implement those recommendations in the future.
6) Communication & Public Engagement: By itself, public communications (or the lack thereof) could determine the success or failure of the organization. The continual public spotlight will, over time, increase public confidence in the Sheriff’s Department and in the Board’s ability to oversee and manage LASD. A robust public communication & engagement function increases visibility, but could possibly decrease access if the Sheriff withdrew cooperation from the OIG. The Hybrid model seeks to thoroughly expand upon the Client-Preference model by incorporating regular public reporting and robust community engagement. Currently there is no way for the Board to compel the Sheriff’s Department to action; this constraint would not change under this model. Therefore, vocal public reporting is the next best alternative to help compel responsiveness.

Evaluation: Policy Option C, the Hybrid model, must be evaluated on each of the three criteria below.

Oversight Effectiveness: An OIG that incorporates all of the elements mentioned above would achieve a moderately high level of effective oversight and would likely be able to identify, correct, and prevent problems in the Sheriff’s Department. The ability to review complaints, monitor jails, and initiate its own cases would allow the OIG to identify problems within the Sheriff’s Department. However, similar to the Client-Preference model, the Hybrid model would not allow the OIG to compel the Sheriff to take action on its recommendations. The OIG would still have a robust public function that engages the community through town hall meetings, which could encourage the Sheriff to correct problems knowing that the public is knowledgeable and involved. Jail monitoring and the ability to initiate investigations would allow an OIG to prevent problems from becoming more serious. Although this model has a moderately high level of effective oversight, the tradeoff is that it has somewhat lower political feasibility as compared to the Client-Preference model. The Hybrid model achieves less effective oversight as compared to the Expert-Informed model, but more effective oversight as compared to the Client-Preference model.

Political Feasibility: This model would have a moderate level of political feasibility. This model adheres to many of the preferences of the Client, except for the expanded reporting function, the public tracking of previous recommendations, and the ability to initiate its own case investigations. These differences lead us to believe that the Board would likely be hesitant with their full support of this model. The Client has indicated that a strong reporting function would make the Board apprehensive and that the Board would prefer the OIG to act as an internal advisor instead of a public reporter. The expanded
reporting function contained in this model would also likely be opposed by the Sheriff who has a vested interest in keeping issues between his Department and the Board and out of the public spotlight.

**Ease of Implementation:** This model would be moderately difficult to implement. It would face all the same issues as the Client-Preference model because a new headquarters would need to be established and the current oversight bodies in the County would be dismantled. In addition, the OIG would need a method for tracking recommendations and patterns of inmate complaints.

**Takeaway Point:**

The Hybrid model achieves a moderately high level of oversight and has a substantial opportunity to identify, correct, and prevent problems within the Sheriff’s Department. This model improves on the Client-Preference model because it would have greater investigative authority and a more robust communication function. These two key elements contribute significantly to an OIG’s oversight effectiveness. It remains to be seen, however, if the County is willing to relax its preferences and adopt this model.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Elements</th>
<th>Expert-Informed Model</th>
<th>Client-Preference Model</th>
<th>Hybrid Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Securing Agency Independence</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative Authority</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Citizen &amp; Inmate Complaints</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance &amp; Risk Management</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Public Engagement</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Expert-Informed Model</th>
<th>Client-Preference Model</th>
<th>Hybrid Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oversight Effectiveness</td>
<td>Most effective</td>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>Highly effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Feasibility</td>
<td>Not politically feasible</td>
<td>High political feasibility</td>
<td>Moderate political feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Implementation</td>
<td>Difficult to implement</td>
<td>Relatively easy to implement</td>
<td>Moderately easy to implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in the chart, there are tradeoffs associated with each model. In our evaluation of each policy option, we compared the models on oversight effectiveness, political feasibility, and ease of implementation. All of the six design elements and functions are present in each model, but there are significant differences among them. Those differences lead us to recommend two policy options: one for LA County that can be acted upon presently and one for the future.

**Short-term Recommendation:** In the short-term, the Expert-Informed model is not feasible because statutory authority cannot currently be attained. Due to this constraint, we recommend that LA County pursue the Hybrid model at the present time. The Hybrid model has a higher level of oversight effectiveness than the Client-Preference model because the OIG under the Hybrid model has a more substantial communication & public engagement function, has the ability to initiate its own investigations, track patterns and trends, and report publicly to the Board. The Hybrid model is moderately easy to implement and incorporates only a few additional functions as compared to the Client-Preference model. Overall, the Hybrid model maximizes oversight effectiveness within the current constraint while minimizing tradeoffs with political feasibility and implementation challenges.

**Long-term Recommendation:** In the long run, the County should seek to change the state constitution, which would make the Expert-Informed model feasible. This model allows the Board to have more authority over the Sheriff’s Department and would compel the Sheriff to cooperate with investigations and recommendations. In addition, oversight is maximized as the OIG will have a more expanded and active role in monitoring LASD. If a change in the Constitution does happen, political feasibility and ease of implementation will no longer be concerns. Therefore, we recommend the County pursue the Expert-Informed model in the long run because it provides the greatest level of oversight.

This long-term strategy may need to be pursued if the OIG is not effective in preventing further abuses. If new scandals arise and the OIG’s advisory role proves insufficient to force change in LASD, a more drastic, substantive approach may need to be taken. Other opportunities, such as changes in the member of the Board of Supervisors or the election of a new Sheriff, could lead to the pursuit of an OIG with statutory authority if those individuals champion such change.

The California Constitution can be changed relatively easily as compared to the much more complicated process of amending the U.S. Constitution. A two-thirds vote in both the State Assembly and Senate
would pass an amendment, or through the democratic initiative process, regular citizens can add a constitutional amendment to the state ballot. Only 8% of the votes cast in the most recent gubernatorial race are required to place a citizen amendment on the ballot, which then needs a simple voter majority vote to pass and be placed in the Constitution.84,85

For example, in the 2010 gubernatorial election there were roughly 10.1 million votes cast, which would translate to roughly 800,000 signatures needed.86 Each signature has been computed to cost roughly $3.50.87 Approximately 30% of all signatures collected are disqualified, meaning that about 1.05 million signatures would be needed at a cost of about $3.7 million, not including advertising and other administrative costs.

The sheer number of times amendments passed illustrates the ease of the process: the California Constitution has been amended over 500 times in the 133 years it has existed in contrast to the 27 times over 223 years that the U.S. Constitution has been amended.88 With the support and publicity of the Board, amending the California Constitution is possible and would lead to a much stronger, more robust OIG.

**STAFF AND BUDGET**

None of these oversight functions can be accomplished without sufficient staffing and resources. Los Angeles County’s first staffing decision was the choice between hiring contractors or classified employees, meaning that they must be hired and held to the rules and policies of the civil service code. Initial discussions with the client allowed us to evaluate the option between maintaining contract employees or classified employees, but we decided that classified employees would be the optimal choice because 1) civil service rules prevent unwarranted terminations and 2) County employees are usually tasked with one assignment whereas contractors often balance multiple contracts with different clients at one time.

---

86 Official number from the California Secretary of State. See “Statement of Vote” in Bibliography.
When the Board hires the Inspector General, he/she will have the discretion to recruit, hire, and formulate the specific roles within the OIG. We lack the expertise to evaluate the nuances of the civil service process and thus cannot make staffing decisions regarding the County classification or compensation of OIG positions. What we can do, however, is issue recommendations based on our research of comparable agencies - staffing functions, approximate numbers of staff, and average salaries. We have identified the market value of comparable OIG staff positions and we adopt those salaries for our model.

The Client has expressed their desire to model the staffing of its own OIG after that of the LAPD’s. Logically, we believe this direct comparison makes sense. Both agencies have very similar roles, serve comparable populations, and draw applicants from the same pool. We were also advised that Los Angeles County should pay its OIG staff higher salaries than staff salaries within the LAPD OIG in order to attract the most qualified candidates. This would help create a strong organization from its inception. Based on this advice, we evaluated LA County’s current staffing levels and considered how these current positions would transfer to the Hybrid model based on the LAPD OIG. This LAPD OIG currently has 29 employees: 13 investigators, 8 auditors, 6 clerical and administrative staff, a deputy IG, and the head IG.

Our analysis began with the expectation that the current aggregate staffing levels for the three oversight bodies must be maintained because the three current oversight bodies form a baseline staffing number for the new OIG to start with. Our primary concern is to ensure that there is no lapse in oversight and that the new OIG employ, at a minimum, the same number of personnel as the current combined oversight entities employ.

---

89 Retrieved from an Expert Interview (2013, February 1). Personal Interview
oversight entities employ. Collectively, under the current oversight entities there are thirteen staff members devoted to LASD-independent oversight functions, six in the Office of the Ombudsman, six in OIR, and one staff member acting as Special Counsel. To reach what we consider to be the minimal level of staffing, a new OIG must incorporate all of these roles and expand upon any deficiencies. This analysis attempts to build an organizational design of an OIG that staffs the recommended functions of the Hybrid model.

Mirroring the functions we recommend, we believe that the OIG should have four main divisions: investigations, audits & policy, citizen complaints, and jail monitoring. An assistant IG, who reports directly to the IG, will lead each division. The IG’s salary will fall somewhere between $150,000 and $230,000 as set by the Board of Supervisors. Subsequently, we anticipate that the Assistant IGs’ salaries will be set at no more than $150,000, though we recommend that they be paid as close to that number as possible.

---

90 See Appendix F for Special Counsel, Ombudsman, and Office of Independent Review staffing
Investigations Division: OIR currently employs 5 staff attorneys and thus we recommend the IG hire at least 5 staff to investigate individual cases and issue disciplinary recommendations. Investigators for the LAPD OIG earn between $87,000 and $109,000 annually depending on experience and qualifications.\textsuperscript{92} We recommend salaries of no less than $95,000 in order to remain competitive and comparable to LAPD.\textsuperscript{93}

Audits & Policy Division: The Special Counsel is contracted by the Board to conduct audits of LASD. He often employs additional staff to assist with his duties and report production. For example, four additional staff contributed to the 31st semi-annual report.\textsuperscript{94} Acknowledging this staff size, we recommend the IG hire at least 4 staff to audit LASD policy and practices. Auditors for the LAPD OIG earn between $80,000 and $100,000 annually depending on experience and qualifications.\textsuperscript{95} We recommend salaries of no less than $90,000 in order to remain competitive and comparable to LAPD OIG.\textsuperscript{96}

Citizen and Inmate Complaints Division: The Ombudsman currently employs three community service liaisons and thus we recommend the IG hire at least three staff to read and respond to citizen and inmate complaints. The three community service liaisons currently earn between $60,000 and $80,000 annually depending on experience and qualifications.\textsuperscript{97} We recommend salaries of no less than $70,000 in order to remain competitive.\textsuperscript{98}

Jail Monitoring Division: OIR Head Gennaco created a program utilizing six law school interns on a part-time basis to monitor the conditions at one of the LA County jails. Based on the limited scale of this program, we recommend the IG hire considerably more than six monitors. Monitors for the NYC Board of Corrections earn between $60,000 and $74,000 annually depending on experience and qualifications.\textsuperscript{99} We recommend salaries of no less than $67,000 in order to remain competitive.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{92} See “Non-Represented Employees Salary 2011-12 to 2012-13” (n.d.). \textit{City of Los Angeles}. Print.
\textsuperscript{93} Numerical average of $87,000 and $109,000
\textsuperscript{95} See “Non-Represented Employees Salary 2011-12 to 2012-13” (n.d.). \textit{City of Los Angeles}. Print.
\textsuperscript{96} Numerical average of $80,000 and $100,000
\textsuperscript{97} See “Los Angeles County Class and Salary Listing”. (n.d.). In \textit{County of Los Angeles Class Specification}. Retrieved February 13, 2013
\textsuperscript{98} Numerical average of $60,000 and $80,000
\textsuperscript{99} See Board of Correction Citywide Job Vacancy Notice for Field Representative. (n.d.). In NYC Board of Correction Job Opportunities. Retrieved February 17, 2013
\textsuperscript{100} Numerical average of $60,000 and $74,000
We compute a total operating cost of approximately $1.21 million and total OIG budget of $4.86 million per year.

Communication & Public Engagement: Experts overwhelmingly emphasize the importance of communication & public engagement in the role of an OIG. We recommend the IG hire at least one communications specialist to publish reports and engage the public on a consistent, regular basis. According to the County classification, public information representatives earn between $53,000 and $70,000 annually depending on experience and qualifications.\(^\text{101}\) We recommend a salary no less than $61,500.\(^\text{102}\)

Summary: Fulfilling the necessary OIG functions would require nineteen individuals at a minimum. In addition, at least two clerical/admin staff, the four Assistant IGs, and head IG will bring the total staff to twenty-six persons with a total salary budget of approximately $2.51 million. The County projects official budgets by factoring in an additional 45% of the total salary for benefits and pension, which roughly amounts to a total staff budget of $3.65 million.\(^\text{103}\)

We then observed the amount of money dedicated to staffing versus operations for comparable agencies. After analysis of multiple agencies, we concluded that several follow a “75/25” rule - that is, 75% of an oversight agency’s budget goes toward staffing, while 25% of the budget goes to operations and capital costs.\(^\text{104,105}\) Applying this ratio to our Los Angeles County model, we compute a total operating cost of approximately $1.21 million and a total OIG budget of $4.86 million per year. We have noted that these numbers reflect the minimum staffing salary levels. The current level may not be sufficient to provide effective oversight and therefore we strongly advise that the IG hire additional staff beyond those recommend here to increase oversight capacity. Our

\(^\text{102}\) Numerical average of $53,000 and $70,000
\(^\text{103}\) See Appendix E for complete staffing matrix
lack of expertise does not allow us to offer recommendations as to the specific number of additional staff needed.

CONCLUSION

Los Angeles County enlisted us to assist in designing an Office of the Inspector General that provides effective oversight over the Sheriff’s Department. We recommend that at the current time, LA County pursue the Hybrid model due to the legal limitation preventing statutory authority (and thus, the Expert-Informed model). The Hybrid model emphasizes public reporting and an expanded role in investigations and case follow up to increase effectiveness. In the long run though, we recommend that LA County pursue the Expert-Informed model, which does have statutory authority and can compel Sheriff Department cooperation and action. This model achieves the highest level of oversight effectiveness and should be considered a future goal.

It has traditionally taken a vocal, public outcry to force changes in LASD. We observed this in 1992 when public outrage led to the publication of the Kolts Report, and nearly two decades later with the work of the CCJV. It is not in the best interest of the Board, the public, or the inmates to wait until problems accumulate to a point where drastic action is required. This tradition does not have to continue, and can be corrected if the County seizes this opportunity to create and sustain continual oversight and improvement of LASD. Achieving this goal is not difficult – an OIG that communicates openly and engages the public is a significant step forward for oversight and will enable the County to move toward restoring public confidence in the Sheriff’s Department.
APPENDICES
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E. Proposed OIG Staffing Salary Chart
F. Staffing & Caseload for Current Oversight Entities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Securing Agency Independence</th>
<th>Expert-Informed Model</th>
<th>Client-Preference Model</th>
<th>Hybrid Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory, fiscal, and physical separation</td>
<td>Independent body that directly reports to the Board IG appointed by a majority Board vote</td>
<td>Statutorily separated from the Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>Statutory, fiscal, and physical separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports only to a chief executive body</td>
<td>Statutorily separated from the Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>Appointed IG only removable for just cause</td>
<td>Reports only to the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed IG only removable for just cause</td>
<td>Office physically separate from the Sheriff facilities</td>
<td>Office physically separate from the Sheriff facilities</td>
<td>Appointed IG only removable for just cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget allocation through direct appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigative Authority (Investigations &amp; Audits)</th>
<th>Expert-Informed Model</th>
<th>Client-Preference Model</th>
<th>Hybrid Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to compel cooperation and subpoena documents</td>
<td>Establish a Memorandum of Understanding with the Sheriff's Department that defines roles/responsibilities</td>
<td>Establish a Memorandum of Understanding with the Sheriff's Department that defines roles/responsibilities</td>
<td>Establish a Memorandum of Understanding with the Sheriff's Department that defines roles/responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to initiate own investigations without prior approval</td>
<td>Only able to investigate cases concurrently reviewed by the Sheriff's Internal Affairs Bureau</td>
<td>Able to investigations without prior approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts regular and unannounced visits</td>
<td>Conducts regular and unannounced visits</td>
<td>Conducts regular and unannounced visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks with inmates and guards, tracks grievances</td>
<td>Speaks with inmates and guards and tracks grievances</td>
<td>Speaks with inmates and guards and tracks grievances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures inmate complaint boxes are accessible and complaints reviewed</td>
<td>Ensures inmate complaint boxes are accessible and complaints reviewed</td>
<td>Ensures inmate complaint boxes are accessible and complaints reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Expert-Informed Model</th>
<th>Client-Preference Model</th>
<th>Hybrid Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple and multilingual methods to receive complaints</td>
<td>Able to inform the Board as to the status of recommendation implementation</td>
<td>Able to inform the Board as to the status of recommendation implementation</td>
<td>Ability to inform the Board as to the status of recommendation implementation publicly at Board meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizes complaints based on severity of allegation</td>
<td>Prioritizes complaints based on severity of allegation</td>
<td>Prioritizes complaints based on severity of allegation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows up with complainants about investigation results</td>
<td>Follows up with complainants about investigation results</td>
<td>Follows up with complainants about investigation results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance &amp; Risk Management</td>
<td>Expert-Informed Model</td>
<td>Client-Preference Model</td>
<td>Hybrid Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets mandatory timeframes for implementation of recommendations</td>
<td>Able to inform the Board as to the status of recommendation implementation</td>
<td>Able to inform the Board as to the status of recommendation implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforces penalties and disciplinary measures for inaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication &amp; Public Engagement</th>
<th>Expert-Informed Model</th>
<th>Client-Preference Model</th>
<th>Hybrid Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publishes regular, detailed reports about investigations and findings</td>
<td>Publishes annual or semi-annual report</td>
<td>Publishes regular, detailed reports about investigations and findings</td>
<td>Publishes regular, detailed reports about investigations and findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong community presence and public engagement through town hall meetings</td>
<td>Yields communication and public engagement function to the Board</td>
<td>Strong community presence and public engagement through town hall meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight Effectiveness</td>
<td>Expert-Informed Model</td>
<td>Client-Preference Model</td>
<td>Hybrid Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most effective</td>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Feasibility</td>
<td>Expert-Informed Model</td>
<td>Client-Preference Model</td>
<td>Hybrid Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not politically feasible</td>
<td>High political feasibility</td>
<td>Moderate political feasibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Implementation</td>
<td>Expert-Informed Model</td>
<td>Client-Preference Model</td>
<td>Hybrid Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to implement</td>
<td>Relatively easy to implement</td>
<td>Moderately easy to implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Colors are for illustrative purposes only and should not be used to assign values or equal distinctions between them. (Green=Best, Light Green=Good, Yellow=Fair, Red=Poor)*
B2. CITY GOVERNMENT OF PORTLAND, OR
C. MAP OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY JAILS AND PATROL STATIONS
D. OPTIONS NOT FULLY CONSIDERED

Maintaining the status quo: Maintaining the three oversight bodies in their current state with no changes to their roles or functions was not considered an option. Our client informed us that the decision to move toward an OIG model had already been made. In addition, the preliminary preparations had already begun toward moving to a centralized oversight body. We believe the County’s decision to not consider the status-quo an option is the right decision because under the status quo all oversight inefficiencies and staffing shortages would remain. The status-quo as an option would not improve oversight effectiveness and lacks political support.

OIG as a coordinating body: This function would allow the status quo to continue to exist but would create an OIG that would coordinate communications among the current oversight entities to reduce the overlap of functions (documented by the CCJV). The Inspector General would convene all of the current oversight heads and allow them to discuss and identify patterns and trends among them. This option was not considered because it would not address the concerns raised by CCJV sufficiently, especially upon comparison with the other models. It would also maintain the current staff of the oversight bodies and continue to foster the relationship between the oversight body heads and the Sheriff that many believe to be to independence.

Civilian Review Board: When the CCJV issued their report and recommendations, the Commission did not consider the option of a civilian review board as the answer to the deficiencies in LA County oversight. Other jurisdictions, do however, use this model to review their policing agencies. In our research and data gathering, we did not find any information that pointed us toward this model as one significantly better than that of the OIG. Politically, it would be nearly as difficult as creating an OIG that has a strong public function. It would most likely provide far less oversight as the Sheriff would be extremely reluctant to share sensitive information with civilians. Ultimately, a civilian review board would not address issues raised by the CCJV and would most likely fail to fixing problems in LASD.
## E. PROPOSED OIG STAFFING SALARY CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Suggested Salary</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Total Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>$250,000*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>Executive Secretary V (2124)</td>
<td>$88,606</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$88,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant III (0889)</td>
<td>$67,555</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$67,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Inspector General</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Liaison</td>
<td>Community Service Liaison (2706)</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Inspector General</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Monitors</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$402,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Inspector General</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Inspector General</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Auditors</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Representative</td>
<td>Public Information Representative</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                         |                                  |                  |     | $2,514,660   |

Position classification/compensation based on current County classifications & market-value salaries from other oversight agencies (including LAPD OIG). Salaries matched to closest County classifications.
F. **Staffing & Caseload for Current Oversight Entities**

**Staffing**

**Office of Independent Review (Contract employees)**

6 attorneys:
- 1 Chief attorney: $237,634
- 1 Deputy chief attorney: $207,930
- 4 Staff attorney: $178,226

3 support staff:
- 1 Secretary: $60,615.24-$79,495.68
- 1 Operations assistant: $125,080.56
- 1 Clerk/typist: $27,784.32-$37,321.08

**The Ombudsman (Classified County employees)**

6 staff members:
- 1 Ombudsman/assistant director: $116,356.44
- 3 Community services liaison: $61,981-$81,281.40
- 1 Executive secretary: $60,615.24-$79,495.68
- 1 Clerk typist: $27,784.32-$37,321.08

**Special Counsel (Contract employee)**

- 1 attorney and 3-4 additional (not paid by County) staff: $334,500

**Caseload**

**Office of Independent Review**

- 2010-2011: 472 (43 shootings)
- 2011-2012: 372 (39 shootings)
- 2012-2013: 566 (51 shootings)
- 2013-Present: 91 (5 shootings)

**The Ombudsman**

- 2009-2010: 2267 complaints
- 2010-2011: 1768 complaints
- 2011-2012: 2312 complaints
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