

Written Comments for
Public Comment Section
-Non-Agenda Items
- Regular Agenda Items

Non-Agenda Items

CEO_ICACFeedback

From: Eliot Storch <storch@mydsa.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025, 1:32 PM
To: ICACFeedback@smcgov.org, aely@smcgov.org, ELGonzalez@smcgov.org,
jrigoni@smcgov.org, mdurani@smcgov.org, mgosch@smcgov.org, theumann@smcgov.org
CC: tapia@mydsa.com
Subject: Letter to the Board of Supervisors

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached letter from the Deputy Sheriff's Association (DSA) and the Organization of Sheriff's Sergeants (OSS) expressing our opposition to the proposed Inspector General. Please contact the DSA and OSS if you have questions.

Thank you,

Eliot Storch
Secretary
Deputy Sheriff's Association



To the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

Re: Opposition to Establishing an Inspector General for the Sheriff's Office

The removal of Sheriff Christina Corpus followed an exhaustive and transparent process that confirmed accountability within San Mateo County's existing systems. As part of this process, retired Judge James Emerson served as an independent hearing officer and recommended her removal after determining she had engaged in retaliation, abuse of authority, and the unlawful arrest of Deputy Sheriff's Association President Carlos Tapia. His findings were reinforced by the earlier independent investigation led by retired Judge LaDoris Cordell, which documented patterns of favoritism, misuse of power, and the elevation of her associate Victor Aenlle into positions for which he was unqualified. The District Attorney's Office reviewed the Tapia arrest and concluded that it lacked probable cause and warranted no criminal charges. Finally, the County's civil grand jury issued an accusation under Government Code Section 3060, charging Sheriff Corpus with willful and corrupt misconduct in office. Together, these actions show that San Mateo County's current oversight and disciplinary mechanisms functioned as they were designed to.

The recent calls to establish a permanent Inspector General's Office to oversee the Sheriff's Office are misguided. They assume the department itself is fundamentally broken, when the truth is far simpler. The misdeeds under Sheriff Corpus were not systemic and did not reflect a culture of corruption throughout the agency. They were the failures of one person who misused her authority and ignored checks and balances. The deputies and command staff who continued to serve during this period maintained professionalism and steadiness even while leadership faltered. The fact that the sheriff was removed through existing legal and administrative processes proves that accountability already exists and works.

The Sheriff's Office already operates under multiple levels of scrutiny and internal control. Internal Affairs investigates misconduct and policy violations. The County's

Human Resources and Controller's Offices review personnel matters and fiscal compliance. The Civil Grand Jury conducts independent investigations into County departments and publishes public reports. The District Attorney has the authority to investigate and prosecute wrongdoing by any employees of the Sheriff's Office. And under Measure A, this Board holds direct oversight and removal authority over the elected sheriff. These checks and balances are comprehensive and effective.

Creating an Inspector General would add yet another layer of bureaucracy at a time when what the department truly needs is clarity, direction, and decisive leadership. Every new oversight office requires staffing, funding, and administrative power. It invites delays, conflicting jurisdiction, and uncertainty about who holds final accountability. Oversight that becomes permanent and detached from operational realities tends to drift into interference rather than support. What the Sheriff's Office needs now is strong leadership, clear standards, and focused reform, not another layer of government authority standing in the way of progress.

The experiences of San Francisco and Oakland serve as cautionary examples. In San Francisco, voters approved Proposition C in November 2024 to create an Inspector General within the Controller's Office to investigate fraud, waste, and abuse. Nearly a year later, the position remains vacant. The Controller's Office continues to hire staff only to plan and research what the office will eventually do. Despite broad public support, no oversight has yet occurred, and no measurable benefit has been realized. The effort has become a symbol of slow government expansion rather than effective reform.

In Oakland, the oversight story is even more instructive. After the Riders police misconduct scandal in 2000, the city entered a federal consent decree that placed the Oakland Police Department under court supervision. Twenty years later, Oakland remains under federal oversight. The process has consumed millions of dollars, involved multiple compliance monitors, and produced years of shifting reform goals. While well-intentioned, the structure has slowed decision making, eroded morale, and created constant tension between management, rank-and-file officers, and outside monitors. The City Auditor has described the oversight framework as both costly and difficult to unwind, proving that more bureaucracy does not necessarily create better outcomes.

These two examples make clear that while oversight can sound appealing, it often produces little change at significant cost. New bureaucratic offices tend to expand over time, creating inefficiency, duplication, and blurred accountability. The goal should be to empower leaders and existing mechanisms to function more effectively, not to bury them under another layer of government that promises more than it delivers.

San Mateo County has already proven that its institutions work. Measure A gave this Board the authority to remove an elected sheriff for cause, and it was used successfully. The tools are in place, and the community has seen accountability in action. The focus moving forward should be on selecting a sheriff who can restore integrity, rebuild trust, and strengthen the professional culture of the department. Targeted audits, transparent reporting, and continued Board engagement will ensure ongoing accountability without the burden of creating an entirely new office.

In the aftermath of a leadership crisis, there is always a temptation to respond by building something new, to create another office, another oversight body, or another visible safeguard. But good governance is not measured by the number of agencies it creates. It is measured by whether leaders have the courage to fix what went wrong while preserving what already works. The Sheriff's Office is not beyond repair. It simply needs principled leadership and the continued vigilance of this Board to keep it on course.

For these reasons, the San Mateo County Deputy Sheriff's Association and the Organization of Sheriff's Sergeants respectfully urge the Board of Supervisors to reject the proposal to establish an Inspector General for the Sheriff's Office. The County's existing systems of accountability have proven effective. The solution now lies not in building another layer of oversight but in renewing leadership, integrity, and trust in the people who have continued to serve honorably through adversity.

Respectfully submitted,

San Mateo County Deputy Sheriff's Association
Organization of Sheriff's Sergeants

Regular Agenda Items

CEO_ICACFeedback

From: Nancy Gooban <nancy.goodban@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2025, 9:22 PM
To: ICACFeedback@smcgov.org, ksalahuddin@icacommissioner.org, wmcclore@icacommissioner.org, smelnicoe@icacommissioner.org, rsilano@icacommissioner.org, jimmons@icacommissioner.org, rcarabez@icacommissioner.org, alewis@icacommissioner.org, rduhe@icacommissioner.org
CC: jtlawrence94404@gmail.com, aely@smcgov.org, ELGonzalez@smcgov.org, theumann@smcgov.org
Subject: Item 4, October 20 agenda - Fixin' SMC recommends an appointment

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Chair Salahuddin, Vice Chair McClure, and Honorable Commissioners:

I am writing on behalf of Fixin' San Mateo County to recommend that the Board appoint an interim sheriff rather than waiting for a special election, and involve the community deeply in this process. Here's why:

1. An appointment by our democratically elected representatives would be complete in less than three weeks. The alternative is to leave the sheriff's role vacant and allow the duties of the sheriff to be performed by someone who was not elected by the people, potentially as long as January of 2027. The organization is in crisis and our public and community safety cannot wait.
2. An appointment will allow the organization to move forward with new leadership, without waiting for many months or potentially more than a year for a new sheriff to be sworn in.
3. As our elected representatives, the supervisors are our proxy, and their votes represent the people. An appointment by our representatives is more democratic than leaving the sheriff's office in the hands of someone not selected by the voters.
4. A short runway to an election will give an unfair advantage to people who are well connected or have access to more money. An appointment allows the Board to consider people with good ideas who may lack money and political connections.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy

CEO_ICACFeedback

From: Clara Jaeckel <claraejaeckel@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025, 3:45 PM
To: ICACFeedback@smcgov.org
Subject: public comment for 10/20/2025 meeting agenda item 4

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

My name is Clara Jaeckel and I'm a resident of Redwood City. I urge the commission to recommend that the Board of Supervisors appoint an interim sheriff so that we can have someone in place sooner and begin bringing some stability back to the role. Of course community involvement should be central to the supervisors' selection process. But waiting to hold a special election could leave a long gap where the sheriff's duties are carried out by someone whom the community had no role in selecting. So please recommend that the Board of Supervisors proceed to appoint an interim sheriff.

Thank you,

Clara Jaeckel