## **RECEIVED**

JUN 22 2020

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS** 6-22-20 Re: Non agenda public comments for your regular meeting on 6-23-20 at 9 AM. Jam funious with the Grand July report 2018-2019 final report summary. Furios they didn't interview me? hast March atthe regular Sottum school Bd. Don Boyd with charges against 4 board members, Don Boyd, Ischool employee Hary Eagles & Chris Hartley. To this date of haven theard from them since. I am not allowed to call of go to their district office even when I was a board member, I a couldn't call as go there. meetings while I had appointments attack. A. from 7 Board members to 5. also the selling of the Ettersburg school to the Ettersburg fire dept. I voted no This should havetigged a public sale. Corruption? It epotism was a big problem for years. Loadership was a joke. Management Take. Openness of public meetings? Brown att = Toke. It amazes me what goes ont in closed session meetings. Decline in will bouldruft SHUSD this year. Maybe some could money will help? Curriculum = No money for it also none for advanced placement courses. My charge as a Private citizen have been ignored long enough In my request of charges I said I would drop the charges

From:

Caroline Griffith

To:

COR

Subject:

public comment on non-agenda item 6/23

Date:

Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:28:58 AM

## Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to add my voice to the chorus of people who are concerned about the Sheriff Department's use of the for-profit company Lexipol for its Use Of Force policy. The ACLU of Northern California has recently brought it to our attention that this policy is not in compliance with AB 392, which went into effect on January 1, 2020 and changes the legal standard of deadly force allowable by law enforcement. One of the main issues with the Lexipol policy and the training associated with it is the assertion by Lexipol that the legal standard for the police use of force is "the exact same thing we've had for the last 50 years." This is entirely untrue, as the law changed 6 months ago to create a higher legal standard for use of force. The policy fails to instruct officers on the statutory duty to use alternatives to deadly force. This is concerning because Lexipol claims to craft its policy language not to protect the community, but to protect officers and agencies from liability, and this use of force policy appears to do neither of those things. At a time when law enforcement agencies around the country are under increased scrutiny for their use of force, we need to look closely at the policies that are being used by our sheriff's department. According to the ACLU of Northern California, Lexipol has placed litigation risks above what a wide range of policy experts have declared is good policy to reduce police killings. I am opposed to our public funds being used to shield law enforcement from liability rather than protect the public.

I ask the Board of Supervisors to please:

Examine the Sheriff Department's Use of Force Policy, end our involvement with Lexipol and craft a use of force policy that is in compliance with the law and fits our community.

Ban chokeholds and strangleholds.

Require and enforce a use of force continuum.

Require implicit bias testing for all new hires.

End qualified immunity.

Make officer misconduct records available to the public and a citizen oversight committee.

Now is the time to examine what our law enforcement can do better and how we can better allocate funds to serve the community. I understand that the budget for 2021 is already on its way to approval, but there are many of us who will be coming back throughout the year and working to craft a budget for 2022 that serves the community by broadening our definition of "public safety" by reallocating funds from Law Enforcement to Community Services.

Thank you,

Caroline Griffith

District 1