

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



ITEM: 3.4
(ID # 31385)

MEETING DATE:

Tuesday, September 15, 2026

FROM : EXECUTIVE OFFICE

SUBJECT: EXECUTIVE OFFICE: Approval of the Response to the 2025-2026 Grand Jury Report 'After a Decade of Record Deaths in County Jails: The Community Deserves Transparency through Oversight'

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Approve, with or without modification, the attached response to the 2025-26 Grand Jury Report: After a Decade of Record Deaths in County Jails: The Community Deserves Transparency through Oversight; and
2. Direct the Clerk of the Board to immediately forward the Board's finalized responses to the Grand Jury, the Presiding Judge, and the County Clerk-Recorder.

ACTION:Policy


Jeff Van Wagenen, County Executive Officer 9/10/2026

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Medina, seconded by Supervisor Gutierrez and duly carried by unanimous vote, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended.

Ayes: Medina, Spiegel, Washington, Perez, and Gutierrez
Nays: None
Absent: None
Date: September 15, 2026
xc: EO, Sheriff, Grand Jury, Presiding Judge, Recorder

Kimberly A. Rector
Clerk of the Board
By: 
Deputy

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost
COST	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NET COUNTY COST	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SOURCE OF FUNDS: N/A			Budget Adjustment: No	
			For Fiscal Year:	

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: Approve.

BACKGROUND:

Summary

On June 12, 2026, the Riverside County Civil Grand Jury publicly released the report titled *After a Decade of Record Deaths in County Jails: The Community Deserves Transparency through Oversight*. The report reviews issues related to Riverside County jail operations, in-custody deaths, transparency, independent oversight, public reporting, long-term planning, and the Sheriff's Advisory Committee.

The report requests responses from both the Riverside County Sheriff and the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. The Sheriff's Office has submitted a separate response as the elected department responsible for jail operations. This item presents the Board's response to the findings and recommendations directed to the Board.

The attached Board response recognizes that every in-custody death is a serious matter. The County acknowledges the profound impact of these deaths on families, people in custody, Sheriff's Office personnel, County medical and behavioral health partners, and the broader community. The Board is committed to lawful, safe, transparent, and accountable jail operations, while also recognizing the independent constitutional and statutory role of the elected Sheriff.

The attached response also places the Civil Grand Jury report within the context of the Board's existing Sheriff oversight Ad Hoc Committee process. The Board has already established an Ad Hoc Committee to review Sheriff's Office oversight and accountability issues, including existing oversight mechanisms, comparative models, legal authority, operational impacts, fiscal considerations, stakeholder input, and potential recommendations to the full Board.

The Board's response should not be interpreted as predetermining the Ad Hoc Committee's final recommendations. Instead, the response preserves the Board's ability to evaluate the legal, operational, fiscal, labor, confidentiality, privacy, and community considerations before deciding whether and how to exercise its statutory authority.

The attached response agrees that Riverside County has not established a sheriff oversight board or office of inspector general pursuant to Government Code section 25303.7, which was enacted through AB 1185. The response clarifies, however, that state law authorizes but does not require a county to establish either entity and does not mandate any particular oversight model.

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

The response disagrees with certain broad conclusions in the report, including the conclusion that the report establishes systemic deficiencies across all identified areas of jail operations, that existing investigative and regulatory review processes cannot support accountability or corrective action, or that public statements by Sheriff's Office leadership caused, delayed, or limited the Board's decisions regarding independent oversight.

At the same time, the response recognizes that the issues raised by the report warrant structured Board review. The response acknowledges the importance of public trust, meaningful transparency, accurate data, appropriate oversight, trend evaluation, and interagency coordination.

In response to the Civil Grand Jury's recommendations, the Board's response states that several recommendations require further analysis through the Ad Hoc Committee process. Those recommendations include whether to establish an independent civilian oversight body or other oversight model; whether to retain an independent correctional health and custodial operations expert; whether to publish a five-year strategic plan for jail operations; and whether to develop a countywide RSO oversight and accountability framework.

Approval of this item will authorize submission of the Board's response in accordance with Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05 and Board Policy A-75.

Approval of this item does not establish a sheriff oversight board, create an office of inspector general, approve new positions, authorize new appropriations, or direct implementation of any specific oversight model at this time. Any future recommendations involving staffing, contracts, consultant services, technology, reporting systems, or other fiscal impacts will return to the Board for consideration through the regular Board and budget processes.

ATTACHMENTS:

- ATTACHMENT A. 2025-26 Civil Grand Jury Report: After a Decade of Record Deaths in County Jails: The Community Deserves Transparency through Oversight**
- ATTACHMENT B. Board of Supervisors & Executive Office Response to the 2025-2026 Civil Grand Jury Report: After a Decade of Record Deaths in County Jails: The Community Deserves Transparency through Oversight**
- ATTACHMENT C. Sheriff's Office Response to the 2025-2026 Civil Grand Jury Report: After a Decade of Record Deaths in County Jails: The Community Deserves Transparency through Oversight (Informational Copy)**


Minh C. Tran, County Counsel 9/10/2026

2025-26 Grand Jury Report
After a Decade of Record Deaths in County Jails: The Community
Deserves Transparency through Oversight
September 15, 2026
Board of Supervisors & Executive Office

The Board of Supervisors appreciates the Civil Grand Jury's service and its attention to the safety, accountability, and transparency of Riverside County's jail system. Every in-custody death is a serious matter. The County recognizes the profound impact of these deaths on families, people in custody, Sheriff's Office personnel, County medical and behavioral health partners, and the broader community.

The Board is committed to lawful, safe, transparent, and accountable jail operations, while also recognizing the independent constitutional and statutory role of the elected Sheriff. These responses address the findings and recommendations directed to the Board. The Sheriff's Office has submitted a separate response as the elected department responsible for jail operations.

These responses were prepared by the Executive Office, with input from other County departments as appropriate. Agreement or disagreement with a particular finding or recommendation does not diminish the importance of the issues raised or the County's commitment to the safety and well-being of people in custody, Sheriff's Office personnel, County employees, and the public.

The Board has established an Ad Hoc Committee to review Sheriff's Office oversight and accountability issues, including existing oversight mechanisms, comparative models, legal authority, operational impacts, fiscal considerations, stakeholder input, and potential recommendations to the full Board. The Board's response to this report should be read in light of that ongoing process and should not be interpreted as predetermining the Ad Hoc Committee's final recommendations.

GRAND JURY FINDINGS:

Grand Jury Finding #1:

The County of Riverside has not established an independent oversight entity, as authorized under California Government Code Section 25303 and AB 1185 (2020), with clearly defined authority, investigative powers, reporting requirements, and structural independence from the sheriff's chain of command.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #1:

Respondent agrees with finding.

The County agrees that it has not established a sheriff oversight board or office of inspector general pursuant to Government Code section 25303.7, which was enacted through AB 1185. Government Code section 25303.7 authorizes, but does not require, a county to establish a sheriff oversight board, an office of inspector general, or both.

The Board has not yet elected to establish either entity. However, the Board has established an Ad Hoc Committee to review Sheriff's Office oversight and accountability issues, including whether any oversight structure authorized by state law is appropriate for Riverside County, and if so, what scope, authority, staffing, reporting obligations, budget, confidentiality safeguards, appointment procedures, and operational boundaries should apply.

The Board's agreement with this finding is limited to the fact that the County has not established the specific independent civilian oversight entity described in the finding. The Board does not agree that Government Code section 25303.7 mandates such an entity or requires any particular oversight model.

Grand Jury Finding #2

Based on Grand Jury visits to five jails, the frequency and circumstances of in-custody deaths in Riverside County reflect systemic deficiencies in intake screening, staffing, medical and mental health care access, supervision protocols, documentation practices, and emergency response procedures. The absence of independent review mechanisms prevents full identification of root causes and corrective action.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #2:

Respondent disagrees wholly with finding.

The County agrees that in-custody deaths warrant serious review, trend evaluation, public accountability, and continuous operational improvement. The County also agrees that questions regarding transparency, independent review, and oversight deserve structured consideration through the Board's Ad Hoc Committee process.

The County disagrees, however, that the report establishes systemic deficiencies across each operational area listed in the finding. An in-custody death, standing alone, does not establish a systemic deficiency. Each death must be evaluated based on its specific facts, applicable custodial standards, medical and behavioral health factors, emergency response actions, investigative findings, and legal requirements.

The Sheriff's Office advises that in-custody deaths are reviewed through established investigative, administrative, medical, regulatory, and reporting processes, and that corrective action is taken when warranted. The County also recognizes that existing review mechanisms do not resolve the broader public-policy question of whether

additional independent review or reporting mechanisms would improve transparency, public trust, and systemic learning.

Accordingly, the County disagrees with the finding to the extent it concludes that the Grand Jury report establishes systemic deficiencies across all listed operational categories or that corrective action cannot occur absent a civilian oversight entity. The County agrees that the Board should continue evaluating whether additional oversight, reporting, auditing, or independent review tools would improve transparency, accountability, and public confidence.

Grand Jury Finding #3:

Internal investigations into in-custody deaths and critical incidents in Riverside County jails lack structural independence, and standardized documentation protocols, limiting accountability and systemic risk identification.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #3:

Respondent disagrees wholly with finding.

The County agrees that Sheriff's Office investigations are internal to the Department and therefore are not structurally independent in the same manner as a review conducted by an outside entity. The County disagrees, however, that this fact alone establishes a lack of accountability, a lack of standardized documentation, or an inability to identify systemic risk.

The Sheriff's Office advises that in-custody deaths and critical incidents are investigated through established investigative processes, including review by specially trained units, management review, and referral to the District Attorney where appropriate for consideration of potential criminal charges. The Sheriff's Office also advises that it maintains documentation and reporting processes applicable to in-custody deaths, critical incidents, and related reviews.

The County also recognizes that the Grand Jury's concern about structural independence raises a legitimate governance question. The Board's Ad Hoc Committee may consider whether certain categories of incidents should be subject to additional independent review, auditing, reporting, or oversight mechanisms, and how any such mechanisms would interact with existing criminal, administrative, medical, civil, and regulatory processes.

Accordingly, the County disagrees that the report establishes the absence of standardized documentation or accountability. The County agrees that the issue of structural independence is appropriate for further Board review through the Ad Hoc Committee process.

Grand Jury Finding #4:

The Riverside County Sheriff's Office does not maintain consistent, comprehensive public reporting on jail operations, in-custody deaths, use-of-force incidents, or compliance with mandated standards, limiting transparency and public trust.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #4:

Respondent disagrees wholly with finding.

The County agrees that the Sheriff's Office does not currently publish all categories identified by the Grand Jury in one comprehensive, recurring public dashboard or report. The County also agrees that clear, accurate, and lawful public reporting can support transparency and public trust.

The County disagrees to the extent the finding suggests that underlying information is not maintained or that required reporting is not performed. The Sheriff's Office advises that it maintains data and submits reports to applicable state and federal regulatory agencies as required by law and regulation.

The County also notes that any expansion of public reporting must account for data accuracy, consistent definitions, medical privacy, personnel-record protections, active investigations, security-sensitive information, litigation, privilege, and system limitations. Certain data categories may be appropriate for public reporting, while others may require aggregation, delay, redaction, or exclusion depending on law and operational needs.

The County supports further evaluation of a public dashboard or recurring reporting mechanism and addresses that issue in response to Recommendation #4.

Grand Jury Finding #5:

Operational improvements undertaken by the Riverside County Sheriff's Office are reactive, fragmented, and not part of a coordinated long-term strategy for jail oversight, data transparency, or interagency collaboration.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #5:

Respondent disagrees wholly with finding.

The County disagrees that operational improvements undertaken by the Sheriff's Office are merely reactive, fragmented, or lacking coordination. The Sheriff's Office advises that it maintains ongoing operational review, policy, training, compliance, and quality-assurance processes. The County also has regular interaction with the Sheriff's Office and multiple County departments and partners, including Riverside University Health

System, Behavioral Health, Human Resources, Risk Management, County Counsel, the District Attorney, the Public Defender, Probation, Fire, and the courts.

The County agrees that a more consolidated long-term planning framework for jail oversight, data transparency, and continued interagency coordination may improve public understanding and Board-level policy review. Existing operational plans, budgets, policies, audits, and interdepartmental processes may not be presented in a single public-facing strategic plan. The question of whether to consolidate these materials, add measurable benchmarks, and strengthen public reporting is appropriate for further review.

Accordingly, the County disagrees with the Grand Jury's broad characterization of existing efforts as reactive and fragmented, but agrees that long-term planning, transparency, and interagency coordination should be evaluated as part of the Ad Hoc Committee's work.

Grand Jury Finding #6:

The County of Riverside has not established a unified, strategic plan to address persistent deficiencies in jail operations, oversight, and accountability, despite repeated findings from prior Grand Jury reports and investigations.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #6:

Respondent disagrees wholly with finding.

The County agrees that it has not adopted a single countywide document identified as a unified strategic plan for jail oversight and accountability. The County disagrees that this establishes an absence of planning, an absence of operational improvement, or a failure to respond to prior reports.

The County and Sheriff's Office have responded to prior Civil Grand Jury reports, made significant operational and budgetary investments, adjusted to major changes in state law, and participated in regulatory, legal, medical, and operational review processes. The County also recognizes that jail operations have been shaped by significant external changes, including the long-term effects of state public safety realignment, changing jail populations, medical and behavioral health complexity, staffing challenges, litigation, regulatory requirements, and evolving public expectations.

The County disagrees with characterizing all remaining concerns as "persistent deficiencies" without distinguishing among resolved, ongoing, disputed, and newly emerging issues. At the same time, the County agrees that a more unified framework for oversight, accountability, performance review, transparency, and interdepartmental coordination may assist the Board and the public. That issue is addressed further in the responses to Recommendations #5 and #6.

Grand Jury Finding #7:

The Sheriff's Advisory Committee has not demonstrated measurable advisory output. The committee failed to produce meeting minutes, written findings, formal recommendations, or documentation of deliberative processes, and members were unable to articulate specific, significant policy impacts resulting from its work.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #7:

Respondent disagrees partially with the finding.

The County agrees that the Sheriff's Advisory Committee has not produced the type of formal meeting minutes, written findings, formal recommendations, or public documentation described in the finding. The County disagrees that those measures, standing alone, are the only appropriate standard for evaluating the committee's output because the Sheriff's Advisory Committee was not established as an independent investigative or civilian oversight body.

The Sheriff's Advisory Committee has served as an advisory forum connected to the Sheriff's Office. It was not structured as an AB 1185 oversight board, an office of inspector general, or a public accountability body with independent investigatory authority, formal reporting obligations, or Board-established duties.

The County agrees that the Sheriff's Advisory Committee's purpose, governance, documentation practices, public engagement, and relationship to any future oversight model should be reviewed.

Grand Jury Finding #8:

The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement has published widely recognized guidelines describing the essential elements of effective civilian oversight of law enforcement agencies. Riverside County and the Riverside County Sheriff's Office have not incorporated these guidelines or comparable best-practice standards into the structure or function of jail oversight mechanisms.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #8:

Respondent agrees with finding.

The County has not formally adopted the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement's standards as the governing framework for jail oversight or Sheriff's Office oversight. The County also has not adopted a comparable external best-practice framework as the formal structure for civilian oversight.

The County notes, however, that NACOLE's standards are nonbinding and do not prescribe a single required oversight model. The standards may provide useful guidance

as one source among several that the Board and Ad Hoc Committee may consider, together with California law, models used in other counties, Riverside County's operational and governance needs, fiscal capacity, labor and privacy requirements, confidentiality obligations, and community input.

Grand Jury Finding #9:

Public statements by the leadership of the Riverside County Sheriff's Office characterizing civilian oversight authorized under AB 1185 as political rather than operational may influence Riverside County's implementation approach and have contributed to delayed or limited development of independent oversight structures.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #9:

Respondent disagrees wholly with finding.

The County does not dispute that public statements by elected officials may inform public debate. The County disagrees, however, that the report establishes that statements by Sheriff's Office leadership caused, delayed, or limited the Board's decisions regarding independent oversight.

Government Code section 25303.7 gives the Board discretion to establish a sheriff oversight board, an office of inspector general, or both. It does not mandate independent oversight or require a particular model. The Board must exercise its discretion through its own public deliberative process, considering legal authority, operational impacts, cost, confidentiality, labor issues, privacy, community input, and the relationship between the Board's responsibilities and the Sheriff's independent functions.

The Board's establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee demonstrates that the Board is actively reviewing oversight and accountability issues. The County disagrees that the Grand Jury report establishes improper influence, causation, or delay attributable to statements by the Sheriff's Office.

GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Grand Jury Recommendation #1:

The Riverside County Board of Supervisors shall, within eighteen months from July 1, 2026, establish an independent civilian oversight body pursuant to AB 1185 with: Subpoena authority or equivalent investigatory access; Independent budget and staffing; Authority to review critical incidents and in-custody deaths; Public reporting requirements; Defined appointment and vetting procedures; Protection from removal without cause.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #1:

Recommendation requires further analysis or study. The time frame is noted in the response, which shall not exceed six-months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.

Government Code section 25303.7 authorizes, but does not require, a county to establish a sheriff oversight board, an office of inspector general, or both. The Board has established an Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate whether either model, or another oversight approach, is appropriate for Riverside County.

The scope of the analysis will include whether to establish a sheriff oversight board, office of inspector general, hybrid model, advisory model, or other accountability framework; the legal authority for any model; access to records; confidentiality safeguards; subpoena or equivalent investigatory access; public reporting; appointment and vetting procedures; removal standards; staffing and budget; labor implications; fiscal impact; relationship to existing review processes; interaction with pending litigation or investigations; and the relationship between any oversight structure and the Sheriff's independent investigative functions.

The Ad Hoc Committee will return to the Board in January 2027 with an interim report, options framework, or status report addressing the scope of analysis identified above. The Ad Hoc Committee may return with final recommendations thereafter, consistent with the Board's prior direction and any additional Board guidance.

Grand Jury Recommendation #2:

Within eighteen months of July 1, 2026, the Riverside County Sheriff's Office shall retain an independent correctional health and custodial operations expert to conduct a comprehensive audit of intake screening, medical and mental health services, supervision protocols, and emergency response procedures related to in-custody deaths. The audit findings and corrective action plan shall be publicly reported within ninety days of completion.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #2:

Recommendation requires further analysis or study. The time frame is noted in the response, which shall not exceed six-months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.

The County recognizes the potential value of an independent operational and correctional health review. The recommendation requires further analysis because the proposed audit would involve multiple legal, operational, fiscal, medical, privacy, and governance considerations.

The analysis will include the recommended audit scope; estimated cost; procurement method; access to records; medical and mental health confidentiality requirements; personnel-record protections; security-sensitive information; litigation and privilege considerations; relationship to existing inspections and reporting requirements from

Board of State and Community Corrections, the United States Federal Court pursuant to the *Gray* lawsuit; relationship to Department of Justice review or other external review processes; relationship to San Bernardino County Coroner death investigations; Riverside University Health System correctional health responsibilities; Risk Management and County Counsel considerations; public reporting options; and the Board's authority to fund, request, or structure such a review without interfering with the Sheriff's independent investigative functions.

The Ad Hoc Committee will return to the Board in January 2027, with a report, options framework, or status report addressing this recommendation. The Ad Hoc Committee may return with final recommendations thereafter, consistent with the Board's prior direction and any additional Board guidance.

Grand Jury Recommendation #3:

Within eighteen months of the creation of independent oversight per AB 1185, all in-custody deaths and critical incidents shall be reviewed by an independent entity separate from the Riverside County Sheriff's Office, with written findings issued and publicly released in compliance with applicable privacy laws.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #3:

Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.

The County does not support a blanket requirement, as written, that every in-custody death and every "critical incident" be reviewed by an independent entity. The recommendation does not define "critical incident," does not address how such a review would relate to existing criminal, civil, administrative, medical, coroner, regulatory, or litigation processes, and does not address confidentiality, privilege, privacy, personnel-record protections, medical information, or available resources.

The County also cannot commit to a requirement that depends on the creation of an AB 1185 oversight structure before the Board completes its Ad Hoc Committee review and public deliberation regarding whether such a structure should be established.

The Ad Hoc Committee may separately consider whether certain categories of in-custody deaths or critical incidents should be subject to independent review under a legally authorized oversight model. However, the County will not implement the blanket requirement as written.

Grand Jury Recommendation #4:

Within eighteen months as of July 1, 2026, the Riverside County Sheriff's Office shall implement a publicly accessible quarterly reporting dashboard that includes: In-custody deaths (with classification); Use-of-force incidents; Suicide attempts

and medical emergencies; Grievance volume and disposition; Staffing levels; Compliance status with Title 15 and Title 24 standards.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #4:

Recommendation requires further analysis or study. The time frame is noted in the response, which shall not exceed six-months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.

The County supports meaningful public reporting and transparency regarding jail operations. The Sheriff's Office has advised that it will develop a quarterly public dashboard containing information responsive, subject to the limitations below, to the Grand Jury's recommendation within eighteen months of July 1, 2026.

Implementation must be in modified form because each proposed category must be evaluated for data accuracy, consistent definitions, system availability, privacy, medical confidentiality, personnel-record protections, active investigations, safety and security concerns, pending litigation, privilege, and applicable law. Some categories may be appropriate for direct publication, while others may require aggregation, redaction, delayed publication, limited categorization, or exclusion where public release would be unlawful or operationally inappropriate.

The County will work with the Sheriff's Office, County Counsel, and other relevant departments to evaluate the specific data categories identified by the Grand Jury and determine which information can be published lawfully, accurately, and responsibly.

Grand Jury Recommendation #5:

Within eighteen months as of July 1, 2026, the Riverside County Sheriff's Office shall publish a five-year strategic plan for jail operations that includes measurable performance benchmarks, data transparency goals, compliance auditing procedures, and interagency coordination protocols.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #5:

Recommendation requires further analysis or study. The time frame is noted in the response, which shall not exceed six-months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.

The Sheriff's Office has existing operational plans, budgets, policies, procedures, training, quality-assurance practices, compliance processes, and interagency relationships. The County has not yet determined whether those materials should be consolidated into a publicly issued five-year strategic plan, whether such a plan should be a Sheriff's Office operational document, whether it should be a Countywide jail-system coordination document, or whether it should be part of a broader oversight and accountability framework developed through the Ad Hoc Committee process.

The analysis will include existing plans and gaps; appropriate performance measures; public reporting goals; compliance auditing procedures; data-transparency objectives; interagency coordination protocols; roles of partner departments; fiscal and staffing implications; operational feasibility; security-sensitive information; and the relationship between any strategic plan and the Sheriff's independent operational authority.

The Ad Hoc Committee will return to the Board in January 2027 with an interim report, options framework, or status report addressing this recommendation. The Ad Hoc Committee may return with final recommendations thereafter, consistent with the Board's prior direction and any additional Board guidance.

Grand Jury Recommendation #6:

Within eighteen months as of July 1, 2026 the Riverside County Board of Supervisors shall develop and adopt a countywide RCSO oversight and accountability framework defining: Oversight authority boundaries; Reporting obligations; Data transparency requirements; Budgetary review standards; Interdepartmental coordination roles.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #6:

Recommendation requires further analysis or study. The time frame is noted in the response, which shall not exceed six-months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.

The elements identified in this recommendation overlap substantially with the Ad Hoc Committee's assigned work. The Board agrees that any oversight or accountability framework must clearly define authority, reporting, transparency, budgetary review, and interdepartmental coordination. The Board has not yet determined whether to adopt a countywide oversight and accountability framework, what form such a framework should take, or how it should interact with any AB 1185 structure or other accountability mechanism.

The analysis will include the legal boundaries established by Government Code sections 25303 and 25303.7; the Sheriff's independent investigative functions; the Board's budgetary authority; reporting obligations; confidentiality and privacy requirements; data transparency; public reporting; existing oversight and accountability mechanisms; interdepartmental roles; labor and personnel implications; fiscal impact; and the relationship between any new framework and existing Sheriff's Office, County, state, federal, court, medical, and regulatory review processes.

The Ad Hoc Committee will return to the Board in January 2027, with a report, options framework, or status report addressing this recommendation. The Ad Hoc Committee may return with final recommendations thereafter, consistent with the Board's prior direction and any additional Board guidance.

Grand Jury Recommendation #7:

The RCSO shall dissolve the Sheriff's Advisory Committee and replace it with a formally authorized civilian oversight body meeting the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement's best-practice standards within twelve months of July 1, 2026.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #7:

Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.

The Sheriff's Advisory Committee and an oversight body authorized by Government Code section 25303.7 are different entities with different purposes. Dissolving the Sheriff's Advisory Committee is not a legal prerequisite to establishing a civilian oversight body, and the report does not establish that the community-advisory function must be eliminated in order for the Board to consider, establish, or improve oversight mechanisms.

The County will not implement the recommendation as written because it assumes that the only appropriate course is to dissolve the Sheriff's Advisory Committee and replace it with a NACOLE-based oversight body before the Board completes its Ad Hoc Committee review. That would predetermine the outcome of the Board's ongoing public process.

Separately, the Ad Hoc Committee may review the Sheriff's Advisory Committee's purpose, governance, documentation, public-engagement practices, and relationship to any future oversight model.

Grand Jury Recommendation #8:

The County of Riverside shall formally review and adopt the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement's best-practice standards as the operational framework for civilian oversight, incorporating independence, authority, transparency, community engagement, and investigatory capacity principles within eighteen months as of July 1, 2026.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #8:

Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.

The Board will not commit in advance to adopting NACOLE standards as the County's required operational framework. NACOLE's standards are nonbinding and may provide useful guidance, but they must be evaluated together with California law, local governance requirements, labor and privacy obligations, confidentiality requirements, existing oversight mechanisms, fiscal capacity, operational needs, community input, and the Sheriff's independent statutory and constitutional responsibilities.

The County agrees that NACOLE's principles may be reviewed as one source of guidance. The Ad Hoc Committee may consider NACOLE standards, other county models, California legal requirements, local operational needs, public input, fiscal impact, and other relevant sources when developing options for Board consideration. However, the County will not implement the recommendation as written because wholesale adoption of one organization's standards before completion of the Ad Hoc Committee process is not warranted or reasonable.

Grand Jury Recommendation #9:

The Board of Supervisors shall exercise its statutory authority under AB 1185 to implement independent oversight of all RCSO operations, irrespective of policy disagreements, and shall publicly affirm its governance responsibility for accountability of said operations within eighteen months as of July 1, 2026.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #9:

Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.

Government Code section 25303.7 grants discretionary authority; it does not mandate independent oversight or require a particular oversight model. Government Code section 25303 preserves the Sheriff's independent investigative functions and prohibits the Board from obstructing those functions, while preserving the Board's budgetary authority.

The Board cannot appropriately commit to a governance structure "irrespective of policy disagreements" or before completing public deliberation regarding the legal, operational, fiscal, labor, confidentiality, privacy, and community considerations involved. Policy disagreements are part of the Board's deliberative process and must be considered openly and responsibly, not disregarded.

The Board acknowledges its governance responsibilities and has established the Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate oversight and accountability issues. The Board will complete that review before deciding whether and how to exercise its statutory authority under Government Code section 25303.7.