

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

## CEO\_BoardFeedback

---

**From:** infoqst@mailfence.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2024 7:52 PM  
**To:** CEO\_BoardFeedback  
**Cc:** decision.makers@change.org  
**Subject:** As a decision maker, your action can drive change on this petition

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.

Dear San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

I'm reaching out to you regarding the 'Preserve Redwood House, San Mateo County's Lifeline for Crisis Mental Health' petition, which has garnered significant community support with 1,267 signatures.

Click here to learn more about this petition:

[https://www.change.org/p/preserve-redwood-house-san-mateo-county-s-lifeline-for-crisis-mental-health?utm\\_source=supporter\\_emails\\_dm](https://www.change.org/p/preserve-redwood-house-san-mateo-county-s-lifeline-for-crisis-mental-health?utm_source=supporter_emails_dm)

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response.

Best, Supporter

## CEO\_BoardFeedback

---

**From:** Altaf Bhimji <altaf.bhimji@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 21, 2024 8:58 PM  
**To:** CEO\_BoardFeedback  
**Cc:** decision.makers@change.org  
**Subject:** As a decision maker, your action can drive change on this petition

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.

Dear San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

I'm reaching out to you regarding the 'Preserve Redwood House, San Mateo County's Lifeline for Crisis Mental Health' petition, which has garnered significant community support with 1,275 signatures.

Click here to learn more about this petition: [https://www.change.org/p/preserve-redwood-house-san-mateo-county-s-lifeline-for-crisis-mental-health?utm\\_source=supporter\\_emails\\_dm](https://www.change.org/p/preserve-redwood-house-san-mateo-county-s-lifeline-for-crisis-mental-health?utm_source=supporter_emails_dm)

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response.

Best, Supporter

## CEO\_BoardFeedback

---

**From:** Jacob Johnson <jpj2109@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 27, 2024 5:36 PM  
**To:** CEO\_BoardFeedback  
**Subject:** Statement from Psychiatry Residents on Redwood House Closure

**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.

---

Dear San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

We are psychiatry residents who serve the people of San Mateo County. We are writing to express our profound concerns about the impending closure (on 12/31/24) of Caminar's Redwood House acute psychiatric residential program.

The closure of this program, the only program in our county that provides voluntary, step-down residential care for publicly insured patients who discharge from psychiatric hospitals, poses an imminent threat to the lives and welfare of our public. We already witness first-hand patients who are stuck in hospitals at great cost waiting for beds in step-down facilities; we regularly see people who want more care and need more care, who choose to leave the hospital without adequate outpatient support.

As physicians, we are ethically bound to provide our patients with the least restrictive form of care that is appropriate to their needs, and in many cases, we will no longer be able to do so without Redwood House. **San Mateo County will no longer be able to provide adequate mental healthcare to the public, potentially increasing rates of suicide, homelessness, and grave disability.**

We demand intervention on the part of the Board of Supervisors to protect our most vulnerable community members and prevent the loss of this critical healthcare infrastructure.

Sincerely,

Jacob Johnson, MD  
Erica Cao, MD, PhD  
Shruti Rajan, MD  
Ben Burton, MD  
Tanya Ngo, MD  
Karina Barretto, MD  
Vincent Nocera, MD  
Shelley Chen, MD, MS  
Kara Wang, MD  
Zane Adam Davis, MD  
Alfonso Parocua, MD  
Alice Dong, MD  
Jar-Yee Liu, MD  
Andrew Chang, MD  
MegAnn McGinnis, DO  
Kika Kauai, MD

## CEO\_BoardFeedback

---

**From:** Shannon B <shannonbenner1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2024 8:42 AM  
**Subject:** Redwood House

**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.

---

Hello,

I work in a library in San Mateo County, and I recently became aware of Redwood House and how important they are to the community. I ask that you please work to keep them open.

Thank you,  
Shannon Benner-Boxer

Written Public Comment(s)  
for **Item No. 10**



# SHERIFF

# CHRISTINA CORPUS

**SAN MATEO COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE**

330 Bradford Street, Redwood City, CA 94063

Telephone: (650) 363-4911

December 2, 2024

Board of Supervisors

Re Agenda Item #10

This letter is in opposition to Agenda Item #10 which seeks special legislation directed at me, and only me, to remove me from office through a Charter Amendment.

The record is very clear about the harm that the Board and County Staff is doing to me, my team and the people of San Mateo County through this unprecedented attack on the independence of the Sheriff's Office. I urge you to not place this on the ballot.

There has been much stated publicly and in the media about Judge Cordell's report and the so-called review by this "independent" jurist. It is clear, from her own report, that this review had no semblance of due process, open and transparent actions or an opportunity for the public to weigh in. To overturn the will of the voters, one would think that every effort would be made to create an environment based upon facts and legal protection, not a salacious broadcast of unfounded allegations.

It's ironic that in commissioning the report to investigate my Chief of Staff and any retaliation allegations against the County, the County did not insist that Judge Cordell, regardless of her prior record as a jurist, following basic best practices of a public investigation.

The Board of Supervisors and the County Executive Team has appointed itself judge, juror, advocate and executioner for a point of view not supported by any sense of due process, or even the process that the Charter Amendment would seek to establish. This is not the time to argue why the County has done this.

If the County truly believes that this was an independent review seeking to find the facts, it would have given me the opportunity to review the report before it was released. It would have insisted that the Judge give me more than 2- hours' notice of her interest in interviewing me on the same day (and two subsequent days). Her request to interview me came 30 days before the report was released; so clearly there would have been time left to accommodate my schedule that week.

Would the County have, in essence, taken a legal position regarding retaliation (an incorrect position) before review by legal counsel for the Sheriff's Office and a full internal investigation of any legitimate reasons that I chose to end the at-will, unclassified, employment of anybody on my team?



# SHERIFF

# CHRISTINA CORPUS

**SAN MATEO COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE**

330 Bradford Street, Redwood City, CA 94063

Telephone: (650) 363-4911

Would the County have hired a company to trace a text to my phone that one former employee claims came from me? (that I did not send) Why did the County release the findings in a press conference (again without consulting anyone in my Office)?

There are so many questions as to how the County went about this despicable chapter. There will be a chance for these questions and more to come out in the public, but for now, the real question is whether the County's actions to date and the proposed Charter Amendment can be a good justification to take away the voter's choice.

I was elected by a large margin of voters, because the voters demanded change. This process undermines the will of the voters and gives four individuals the role of judge and jury. This is not democracy!

Regards,

Sheriff Christina Corpus



## OPPOSITION TO BOS AGENDA ITEM 10 (24-923) COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENT TO REMOVE SHERIFF CORPUS

Judge Cordell's *Investigative* Report commissioned by the BOS to look into the basis for the Unions' votes of No Confidence in her leadership (*This took the Judge 60 hours and must have cost at least \$45,000 if she billed at around \$750/hour which is a normal rate for private judges.*) This report, in heavily redacted format, was made public and spawned a dangerous Blitzkrieg of virulent hate in social media, and condemnation on the part of several elected officials.

### Problems with that report:

Judge Cordell was **NOT** acting in a Judicial capacity. If that were the case, both sides would have been represented, court reporters would have transcribed the proceedings with the parties sworn, and the rules of evidence applied.. ***None of this occurred.***

Instead:

- ***she phoned 40 anonymous individuals, most of whom were the original complainants from the union;***
- ***the ex-president of one of those unions was featured prominently in the Carryn Barker complaint for sexual battery that cost the county \$8 million to settle;***
- ***nobody "interviewed" was under oath;***
- ***the criteria for their selection was not revealed;***
- ***only one interview was recorded and transcribed;***
- ***multiple pages and exhibits were missing or redacted;***
- ***the hearsay allegations of homophobic language apparently (according to research by TV's investigative reporter, Dan Noyes) emanated from just one unnamed individual in the Millbrae office.***

One exhibit: a text with an unusual homophobic term was apparently sent by the County to Cellebrite, an Israeli firm that is able to recover information from cell phones. All that this firm concluded was that it appeared the statement emanated from what was alleged to be Sheriff Corpus' phone. However, the web is chockablock with phony text and phone message attributions, something prevalent in the recent national political skirmishes. That is not proof that Sheriff Corpus sent it. Some of the alleged acts of "retaliation" are ridiculous and puerile such as "turning the back on," "grasping a hand" or stating that a seated 6' 4" tall man was intimidated by another man standing next to him so that his groin was near his face! This is all kindergarten nonsense

The sum total of this report is that it is unsubstantiated hearsay that does not constitute reliable evidence. It certainly does not warrant the hysterical and scurrilous response by the BOS: a couple of whom even endorsed the prior Sheriff who was responsible for thoroughly reprehensible behavior. After one particularly abhorrent event, the D.A. even wrote a letter of support and commiseration with Bolanos! There was never any investigation or call for his removal: multiple County attorneys (including the D.A.) and Supervisors even endorsed his re-election, despite the turmoil, corruption, anonymous e-mails, alleged payment for promotion, alleged payment for concealed weapon permits, fraud involving false unemployment payments to jail inmates, violence against citizens involving at least 3 deaths, *etc. ad infinitum.*

Two new members of the current BOS, clamoring for attention, have been inordinately vocal in the news media in denouncing the Sheriff, giving the impression that they are using the opportunity to seek constituent support for their re-election. Since two of the current BOS (one of whom is most often featured in the media) are members of the California Bar Association, it is particularly disturbing that they are so dismissive of the due process rights of the Sheriff.

All of this is set to unfold when two new supervisors take office. At the very least Jackie Speier will bring some dignity and maturity to the Board: as an attorney and someone who has spent her whole life committed to the public good, and who has risen above near death experience and other hardships.

**At the very least this matter should be tabled until the new board is installed.**

**Content of the Proposed Amendment to the Charter (copied verbatim from Los Angeles' Measure A in 2022)**

*Shall the measure amending the San Mateo County Charter to grant the Board of Supervisors authority until December 31, 2028 to remove an elected Sheriff from office for cause, including for violation of law related to a Sheriff's duties, flagrant or repeated neglect of duties, misappropriation of public funds, willful falsification of documents, or obstructing an investigation, by a four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors, after written notice and an opportunity to be heard, be adopted?*

**Problems with the Proposed San Mateo Amendment:**

- It sunsets immediately after the next election, so it is **only** directed at Christina Corpus, which smacks of blatant discrimination.
- "For Cause" is very loosely defined to "include" certain ill-defined criteria
- Is to be implemented by 4 individuals, two of whom have yet to be sworn in, have not been involved in the present or past situation, and some of whom may have their own agendas.
- It is undemocratic for 4 individuals to negate the votes of almost 800,000 constituents of San Mateo County.
- Cost: A special election will cost taxpayers hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars.
- Public Participation: The general public has little interest in special elections and it could be that those "with an axe to grind" would hold sway over the wishes of the majority of the population.

**Contrast the Allegations Against Corpus With Those **Proven** Against Sheriff Villanueva of Los Angeles that triggered their Charter Amendment:**

The Los Angeles Sheriff's Dept. was rife with incidents involving violence in the jails, and multiple incidents of violence against citizens including many fatalities. Below are items listed in support of the Los Angeles Measure A:

- "defying subpoenas and refusing to appear at [Civilian Oversight Commission] meetings,"
- "refusing to cooperate with the [Office of Inspector General's] attempts at independent investigations and monitoring,"

- “intimidating and harassing individuals who are tasked with oversight,”
- “failing to comply with federal court orders to provide information on deputy misconduct,”
- “litigating with the County to rehire deputies whose employment was terminated due to misconduct

### **Other Means to Remove a Duly Elected Sheriff**

1. A voter recall
2. A misconduct **conviction by a court** following an accusation by a civil grand jury
3. **Conviction in a trial** requested by the state Attorney General challenging a sheriff’s right to continue to hold office after that sheriff has been convicted of certain crimes, such as bribery

**Voter Recall:** Apparently Ray Mueller has already started canvassing and soliciting funds for a Voter Recall which would require about 45,000 signatures: a formidable task. This would also cost a massive amount of money and mean that Supervisor Mueller *et al.* would be spending even less time attending to the business for which they were elected to do. Also, a Recall would not occur for many months. A lot of elected officials appear, from local media, to be jumping on this bandwagon as an alternative to the Charter Amendment, and as a likely means for self-promotion.

**Misconduct Conviction:** This would require sworn testimony and valid, **proven**, evidence before a sitting judge and possibly a jury

**Conviction in a trial requested by the State Attorney General:** This seems unlikely given the paltry “evidentiary” showing so far.

### **Comparison with Santa Clara County’s Action Regarding their Sheriff:**

Following multiple scandals, after she served six terms in office, Santa Clara County finally managed to get their Sheriff, Laurie Smith, to retire (with her pension) after:

- a corruption trial involving pay-to-play bribes for concealed carry permits (*something Bolanos was alleged to have done*);
- police brutality (*something Bolanos was also accused of*);
- jail guard misconduct;
- a 2018 in-custody case in which a mentally unstable inmate suffered brain damage and for which Smith was accused of shutting down an Internal Affairs Investigation into the case. Santa Clara County paid that family \$10 million in addition to absorbing all the costs of the investigations and trial. (*As I recall at least 3 people suffering a mental health crises were killed by San Mateo deputies during Bolanos’ tenure*)

Dan Noyes investigated the Santa Clara case: <https://abc7news.com/santa-clara-county-sheriff-laurie-smith-andy-hogan-case-jail-amy-le/12343440/> and is presently reporting on the current case.

### **The Argument that Sheriff Corpus is Compromising Public Safety is Bogus.**

Prior to her election the office was riddled with scandal and many members of disadvantaged communities, or those with mental health issues were victimized and fearful.

Now people in North Fair Oaks and coastal areas have expressed opposition to this proposed amendment and are in support of Sheriff Corpus because they feel safer. She has initiated many reforms both inside the office and jail and within the community.

**The Jail:**

- Medical Observation Center served 797 in the detox facility and 722 had not re-entered
- The Behavioral Health facility where inmates get medicine to reduce cravings served 224 and 99 inmates were successfully treated
- There is a free Narcan dispenser for everyone in the community to access
- Maple Street Center has a women's self empowerment facility to reduce recidivism
- Inmates can participate in a dog training class in collaboration with Underdogs Rescue

**The Staff:**

- There is now a Wellness Initiative offering free body scans to detect disease
- There is a new meal system offering healthier meals for employees
- There is a gym and 24/7 access to mental health sources
- She tried to get a child care center available for staff

**The Public: Crime is down in 2024 over many categories:**

- As of September there were no homicides
- Rapes were down 26%
- Aggravated assaults were down 40%
- Simple assaults were down 23%
- Burglary was down 23%
- Larceny/theft was down 12%
- Stolen property was down 38%
- 2 suicides were prevented

Sheriff Corpus has "hired" 3 therapy dogs to assist children in stress and also for staff. She has also instituted a report card system whereby members of the public interacting with deputies can input their feelings on the interaction. Anyone following the Arrest Reports on the CrimeGraphics site are aware that arrestees are no longer virtually all Hispanic or other minorities. Many "white" people are now getting arrested.

**CONCLUSION:**

**This is a classic Rush to Judgment. Sheriff Corpus has tried to initiate much needed reforms, neutralize the misogynistic culture, and hire qualified personnel. She has experienced resistance from many Bolanos hold-overs, and after all the present hysteria could be in physical danger.**

**The vote on amending the Charter is premature given that two new Supervisors will be seated in less than four weeks. Jackie Speier has had a long and respected political career during which she has devoted herself to the public good. Unlike some of the present BOS, she has no need to self-promote or use the BOS as a stepping stone to higher office. She is also a member of the State Bar and given her many years of service will be respectful of due process with respect to Christina Corpus' rights.**

## CEO\_BoardFeedback

---

**From:** Eric Sapp <eric.sapp@aya.yale.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 2, 2024 7:00 AM  
**To:** CEO\_BoardFeedback  
**Cc:** Kimberly Marlow; Tara Heumann; John Nibbelin  
**Subject:** Public Comment

**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.

---

TO: Bd. of Supervisors,  
CC: Deputy County Attorneys T. Heumann, K. Marlow; County Atty J. Nibbelin,

This public comment relates to the Dec. 3rd agenda item of the **ordinance to place a charter amendment on the March ballot enabling the Board to remove a sheriff for cause.**

“Two wrongs don’t make a right, but they make a good excuse,” wrote the critical psychiatrist Thomas Szasz.<sup>[1]</sup> In this light one may make sense of the scandal upon scandal whereby the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors aims to correct the Sheriff’s alleged misconduct by means of a flagrantly illegal expansion of its own authority.

The county Charter lacks any provision for removing a sitting Sheriff, which it is mandated (“shall”) to have by Article XI, Section 4, subdivision (c) of the state constitution.<sup>[2]</sup> In the absence of a charter provision, state laws govern. California law supplies three avenues for unseating an elected officer. *Recall elections* are structured by Elections Code §11000 et seq. *Vacancy* of office by operation of law is defined by Government Code §1770, the most pertinent subdivisions of which for our purposes are (c), resignation, and (h), conviction of felony or of misdemeanor involving violation of official duty. Lastly, Government Code §3060 et seq. establishes a process of *removal* from office for willful or corrupt misconduct after a grand jury’s accusation and trial by (petit) jury. None of these processes countenance action by the decision of a board of supervisors. Instead, they vest authority for an adverse decision either in the electorate or in a jury of one’s peers pursuant to judicial safeguards identical or equivalent to that of criminal proceedings.

Creatively choosing none of the above, the Board’s pending ordinance would place before the voters in March a charter amendment *giving itself the power* to remove the sheriff. Given the context and preambular bluster, one cannot but assume the supervisors intend to apply the process, if approved, *retroactively* to depose Sheriff Corpus.<sup>[3]</sup> In order to curb “wrongdoing” alleged (but *not* hitherto proven in any adversarial adjudication with fair procedural safeguards) to involve obstruction/retaliation, use of discriminatory slurs, and an inappropriate relationship giving rise to conflicts of interests, the Board wants the voters to cede to it the prerogative of evading existing law.

It may well be that altering the balance of power between the Board and the Sheriff’s Office in the way the amendment proposes would be a wiser institutional design. If the electorate were to approve such an amendment for prospective application, it would satisfy state legal requirements. Applied *ex post facto*, however, it would unlawfully evade the procedural protections of the aforementioned statutes. Having the equivalent, or actuality, of criminal indictment and trial (for removal or vacancy by conviction) written into the Government Code would be meaningless if a board can arbitrarily flout the statutes as well as existing local law. Recall, moreover, that a *recall* under the Elections Code, and pursuant to Art. II, Section 13 of the CA

Constitution, is a power of the electorate itself, not its representatives. The proposed amendment, applied to prior conduct, cheats<sup>[4]</sup> not only the Sheriff but the voters out of the full term for which they elected her to provide for their public safety.

To soften the blow of this middling *soft coup*, the amendment would sunset at the end of 2028. Seeing as this matter falls within the symbolic terrain of the English Magna Carta of the year 1215 – albeit inverted, and scrambled such that it is hard to tell whether the supervisors are playing the role of King John while the Sheriff plays that of a lone baron, or *vice versa* – it may not be too much of a stretch to say that due process of “the law of the land” in San Mateo County will be threatened with a sunset of its own in 2025.

Respectfully,

Eric Craig Sapp, Esq.  
*resident of Redwood City*

---

<sup>[1]</sup> *The Second Sin* (1973), cited in Susan Ratcliffe (ed.), *Oxford Essential Quotations*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Oxford UP (2016).

<sup>[2]</sup> That the “Batmobile” saga under the former sheriff didn’t motivate the Board to revise the Charter in 2022 can perhaps be attributed to a then-existing faith in ordinary electoral democracy.

<sup>[3]</sup> If not, why take the costly measure of calling a special election?

<sup>[4]</sup> I use this term advisedly. For “cheating” is an apt word to describe attempting to alter the rules in the middle of play. An alternative, no less apt, would be to describe the Board’s plan as an illegal *purge*.

## CEO\_BoardFeedback

---

**From:** Cindy <cynmc110@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 1, 2024 10:58 PM  
**To:** CEO\_BoardFeedback  
**Subject:** 12-3-2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting Agenda Item 10

**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.

---

December 3, 2024, Meeting Agenda Item 10 Comments.

I'm writing in protest to the Board of Supervisors power grab over the voting power given to the residents of San Mateo county to elect a sheriff. This attempted power grab by the Supervisors is an attack on our voter rights guaranteed in the US and CA constitutions and the Elections code. I ask the Board of Supervisors to stand down from taking the voice of the people away by concocting a personal campaign to slander and attempt to recall our elected sheriff. All five supervisors are asked to stop using an underhanded attack on residents to sidestep the established process for the voters where we decide if we want to do a recall. It's very suspicious to see an elected board that should guarantee and protect our constitutional rights to be on the other side of the law. I don't trust 5 people who want to tear down voter protections for 760,000 people. This reminds me of the 1946 voter interference in the Battle of Athens, TN, referred to as government tyranny.

The power grab for three years to December 31, 2028, is a slap in the face to our liberty and rights. San Mateo county voters also have the right to elect a new sheriff if one is recalled and to recall that official according to the Elections code. The Board of Supervisors are overstepping their authority by stealing our voter rights to recall a sheriff and suppressing our votes for over 3 years. We have the right to elect Sheriff Corpus again and the right to recall a Sheriff like Bolanos. Sheriff Bolanos committed actual crimes and was arrested in a brothel and wasn't removed by some of these same supervisors which is questionable. The Supervisors also haven't commended the people that exposed crimes committed by Moniot and the \$8million sexual harassment settlement or the wage theft by Deputy Carlos Tapia. Yet they give plenty of praise to themselves and their staff. The California government code requires that top funders be disclosed and we have the right to know who is funding this attack on our voter rights and Sheriff Corpus who we elected. There's been almost daily front page news advertisements slandering Sheriff Corpus for weeks, who paid for these ads? Who is funding this recall campaign?

Cynthia McReynolds

## CEO\_BoardFeedback

---

**From:** Caroline Cecconi <cecconicc@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 24, 2024 1:32 PM  
**To:** CEO\_BoardFeedback  
**Subject:** Proposed amendment permitting BOS to remove Sheriff

**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.

---

Recall belongs to the voters, not BOS, and it should remain with the voters. Period.

Thank you.

C. Cecconi