

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Senator Nancy Skinner, Chair  
2019 - 2020 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 524                      **Hearing Date:** June 11, 2019  
**Author:** Bigelow  
**Version:** May 6, 2019  
**Urgency:** No                              **Fiscal:** No  
**Consultant:** GC

**Subject:** *Peace Officers: Deputy Sheriffs*

## HISTORY

**Source:** Mono County Sheriff's Office  
San Mateo County Sheriff's Office

**Prior Legislation:** AB 574 (Villaraigosa), Ch. 950, Stats. of 1996  
SB 1762 (Alpert), Ch. 61, Stats. of 2000  
AB 2346 (Dickerson), Ch. 185, Stats. of 2002  
AB 1254 (La Malfa), Ch. 70, Stats. of 2003  
AB 1931 (La Malfa), Ch. 516, Stats. of 2004  
AB 272 (Matthews), Ch. 127, Stats. of 2005  
AB 151 (Berryhill), Ch. 84, Stats. of 2007  
AB 2215 (Berryhill), Ch. 15, Stats. of 2008  
AB 1695 (Beall), Ch. 575, Stats. of 2010  
SB 1254 (La Malfa), Ch. 66, Stats. of 2012

**Support:** California State Sheriffs' Association; National Peace Officers & Fire Fighters Benefit Association; Peace Officers' Research Association of California (PORAC)

**Opposition:** None known

**Assembly Floor Vote:** 74 - 0

## PURPOSE

*This bill adds Del Norte, Mono and San Mateo Counties to the list of specified counties within which deputy sheriffs assigned to perform duties exclusively or initially relating to specified custodial assignments are peace officers whose authority extends to any place in California while engaged in the performance of the duties of his or her respective employment.*

*Existing law* provides that any deputy sheriff of the Counties of Los Angeles, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, Glenn, Humboldt, Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Plumas, Riverside, San Benito, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Shasta, Siskiyou, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Tulare, Tuolumne, and Yuba who is employed to perform duties exclusively or initially relating to custodial assignments with responsibilities for maintaining the operations of county custodial facilities, including the

custody, care, supervision, security, movement, and transportation of inmates, is a peace officer whose authority extends to any place in California only while engaged in the performance of the duties of his or her respective employment and for the purpose of carrying out the primary function of employment relating to custodial assignments or when performing other law enforcement duties directed by his or her employing agency during a local state of emergency. (Pen. Code, § 830.1 subd. (c).)

*Existing law* provides that all cities and counties are authorized to employ custodial officers who are public officers but not peace officers for the purpose of maintaining order in local detention facilities. Custodial officers under this section do not have the right to carry or possess firearms in the performance of his or her duties. However, custodial officers may use reasonable force to establish and maintain custody and may make arrests for misdemeanors and felonies pursuant to a warrant. (Pen. Code, § 831.)

*Existing law* provides that notwithstanding existing law, law enforcement agencies in counties with a population of 425,000 or less and the Counties of San Diego, Fresno, Kern, Napa, Riverside, Santa Clara, and Stanislaus may employ custodial officers with enhanced powers. The enhanced powers custodial officers are empowered to serve warrants, writs, or subpoenas within the custodial facility and, as with regular custodial officers, use reasonable force to establish and maintain custody. (Pen. Code, § 831.5, subd. (a).)

*Existing law* provides that prior to the exercise of peace officer powers, every peace officer shall have satisfactorily completed the Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) course. (Pen. Code, § 832 subd. (b).)

*Existing law* provides that the enhanced powers custodial officers may carry firearms under the direction of the sheriff while fulfilling specified job-related duties such as while assigned as a court bailiff, transporting prisoners, guarding hospitalized prisoners, or suppressing jail riots, escapes, or rescues. (Pen. Code, § 831.5 subd. (b).)

*Existing law* provides that enhanced powers custodial officers may also make warrantless arrests within the facility. (Pen. Code, § 831.5 subd. (f).)

*Existing law* requires a peace officer to be present in a supervisory capacity whenever 20 or more custodial officers are on duty. (Pen. Code, § 831.5 subd. (d).)

*Existing law* provides that custodial officers employed by the Santa Clara County, Napa County, and Madera DOC's are authorized to perform the following additional duties in the facility:

- 1) Arrest a person without a warrant whenever the custodial officer has reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a misdemeanor or felony in the presence of the officer that is a violation of a statute or ordinance that the officer has the duty to enforce;
- 2) Search property, cells, prisoners, or visitors;
- 3) Conduct strip or body cavity searches of prisoners as specified;
- 4) Conduct searches and seizures pursuant to a duly issued warrant;
- 5) Segregate prisoners; and,

- 6) Classify prisoners for the purpose of housing or participation in supervised activities. (Pen. Code, § 831.5 subds. (g), (h) & (i).)

*Existing law* states that it is the intent of the Legislature, as it relates to Santa Clara, Madera, and Napa Counties, to enumerate specific duties of custodial officers and to clarify the relationship of correctional officers and deputy sheriffs in Santa Clara County. And, that it is the intent of the Legislature that all issues regarding compensation for custodial officers remain subject to the collective bargaining process. The language is, additionally, clear that it should not be construed to assert that the duties of custodial officers are equivalent to the duties of deputy sheriffs or to affect the ability of the county to negotiate pay that reflects the different duties of custodial officers and deputy sheriffs. (Pen. Code, § 831.5 subd. (j).)

*Existing law* provides that every peace officer shall satisfactorily complete an introductory course of training prescribed by POST and that, after July 1, 1989, satisfactory completion of the course shall be demonstrated by passage of an appropriate examination developed or approved by POST. (Pen. Code, § 832 subd. (a).)

*Existing law* provides that prior to the exercise of peace officer powers, every peace officer shall have satisfactorily completed the POST course. (Pen. Code, § 832 subd. (b).)

*Existing law* provides that a person shall not have the powers of a peace officer until he or she has satisfactorily completed the POST course. (Pen. Code, § 832 subd.(c).)

*Existing law* provides that any person completing the POST training who does not become employed as a peace officer within three years from the date of passing the examination, or who has a three-year or longer break in service as a peace officer, shall pass the examination prior to the exercise of powers as a peace officer. This requirement does not apply to any person who meets any of the following requirements (Pen. Code, § 832 subd. (e)(1).):

- 1) Is returning to a management position that is at the second level of supervision or higher (Pen. Code, § 832 subd. (e)(2)(A).);
- 2) Has successfully requalified for a basic course through POST (Pen. Code, § 832 subd. (e)(2)(B).);
- 3) Has maintained proficiency through teaching the POST course (Pen. Code, § 832 subd (e)(2)(C).);
- 4) During the break in California service, was continuously employed as a peace officer in another state or at the federal level (Pen. Code, § 832 subd. (e)(2)(D).); and,
- 5) Has previously met the testing requirement, has been appointed a peace officer under Penal Code Section 830.1(c), and has continuously been employed as a custodial officer as defined in Penal Code Section 831 or 831.5 since completing the POST course. (Pen. Code, § 832 subd. (e)(2)(E).).

*This bill* adds Del Norte, Mono and San Mateo Counties to the list of specified counties within which deputy sheriffs assigned to perform duties exclusively or initially relating to specified custodial assignments are peace officers whose authority extends to any place in California while engaged in the performance of the duties of his or her respective employment.

## COMMENTS

### 1. Need for This Bill

According to the author:

Correctional officers are public safety officers who are already in uniforms and occasionally have assignments that take them out of the jail setting, but they have limited abilities in their capacity to protect the public than peace officers.

### 2. Effect of Designating Custodial Deputy Sheriffs

Penal Code § 830.1 subd. (c) custodial deputy sheriffs classification is part of a continuum of classifications of custodial officers in county jails and other local detention facilities. Custodial officers under Penal Code §§ 831 and 831.5 are not peace officers, whereas a Penal Code § 830.1 subd. (c) custodial deputy sheriff is a peace officer, “who is employed to perform duties exclusively or initially relating to custodial assignments.” (Penal Code § 830.1 subd. (c).) One of the most significant differences between the Penal Code § 830.1 subd. (c) custodial deputy sheriffs and Penal Code §§ 831 and 831.5 custodial officers is that as “peace officers” the Penal Code Section 830.1(c) custodial deputy sheriffs are granted all the rights and protections contained in the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act. (Government Code § 3301 et seq.)

Madera and Yuba – and all counties – may utilize Penal Code § 831 non-peace officer custodial officers; however, these officers may not carry firearms. (Penal Code § 831 subd. (b).) However, there are limitations on the authority and use of Penal Code Section 831.5 custodial officers. For example, Penal Code § 831.5 custodial officers may not perform strip searches (unless they are employed in Santa Clara County, Napa County, or Madera County), have limited arrest powers, and are limited in their “armed duty” roles. Another limitation on the use of both Penal Code § 831 and 831.5 non-peace officer custodial officers is that whenever 20 or more of such officers are on duty there must be at least one Penal Code § 830.1 peace officer, who has received the full 664-plus hour basic training for Penal Code § 830.1(a) deputy sheriffs, on duty at the same time to supervise the custodial officers. (Penal Code §§ 831 subd. (d) and 831.5 subd, (d).)

### 3. Expansion of Officers Covered by the Peace Officer Bill of Rights (POBOR)

POBOR provides peace officers with procedural protections relating to investigation and interrogations of peace officers, self-incrimination, privacy, polygraph exams, searches, personnel files, and administrative appeals. When the Legislature enacted POBOR in 1976 it found and declared “that the rights and protections provided to peace officers under this chapter constitute a matter of statewide concern.”

The POBOR provided law enforcement officers with a variety of procedural protections. *Binkley v. City of Long Beach* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 1795, explains that:

[T]he Act: (1) secures to public safety officers the right to engage in political activity, when off duty and out of uniform, and to seek election to or serve as a member of the governing board of a school district; (2) prescribes certain

protections which must be afforded officers during interrogations which could lead to punitive action; (3) gives the right to review and respond in writing to adverse comments entered in an officer's personnel file; (4) provides that officers may not be compelled to submit to polygraph examinations; (5) prohibits searches of officers' personal storage spaces or lockers except under specified circumstances; (6) gives officers the right to administrative appeal when any punitive action is taken against them, or they are denied promotion on grounds other than merit; and (7) protects officers against retaliation for the exercise of any right conferred by the Act. [Citations omitted.]

In *County of Riverside v. Superior Court (Madrigal)* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 793, the California Supreme Court summarized the purpose of the Act:

[POBOR] declares "that effective law enforcement depends upon the maintenance of stable employer-employee relations, between public safety employees and their employers." Among other things, the Act guarantees public safety officers the right to view any adverse comment placed in their personnel files and to file, within 30 days, a written response, which will be attached to the adverse comment. These provisions reflect the public's interest in good relations between peace officers and their employers, including protecting peace officers from unfair attacks on their character. Peace officers, in particular, must confront the public in a way that may lead to unfair or wholly fabricated allegations of misconduct from disgruntled citizens. Law enforcement agencies must take these citizen complaints seriously but at the same time ensure fairness to their peace officer employees. The Bill of Rights Act therefore gives officers a chance to respond to allegations of wrongdoing. [*Id.* at 799, citations omitted.]

Furthermore, in his veto message of AB 2893 (Montanez), of the 2003-04 Legislative Session, Governor Schwarzenegger stated:

[POBOR] was intended to provide an additional layer of protection to peace officers due to the unique circumstances that they face while enforcing California's laws. Their job leads to a variety of public interactions and requires split-second decision making that could mean life or death for the officer or members of the community. While I recognize the vital service that coroners provide to the citizens of California, their job duties do not generally place them in situations that would necessitate the protections provided in this Act.

In addition, as public employees, coroners already have significant civil service protections. Mandating that they be covered by the Act would simply remove local decision making and increase State costs without providing a significant benefit to the public. [Governor's veto message to Assem. on Assem. Bill No. 2893 (Sept. 15, 2004) 6 Assem J. (2003-2004 Reg. Sess.) p. 8133.]

Under current law the custodial officers of Del Norte County, Mono County, and San Mateo County are not included in scope of POBOR protections. This bill would include those officers designated under the provisions herein as protected by the provisions of POBOR.

### 3. Prior Expansions

AB 574 (Villaraigosa), Chapter 950, Statutes of 1996, added Penal Code Section 830.1(c), which allowed the Los Angeles County Sheriff to hire a "second tier" of sheriff's deputies who "are employed to perform duties exclusively or initially relating to custodial assignments with responsibilities for maintaining the operations of county custodial facilities, including the custody, care, supervision, security, movement, and transportation of inmates."

SB 1762 (Alpert), Chapter 61, Statutes of 2000, and SB 926 (Battin), Chapter 68, Statutes of 2001, amended Penal Code Section 830.1(c) to provide peace officer status while on duty only to Riverside County and San Diego County deputy sheriffs employed to provide custodial care and supervision of inmates in the county jail and related facilities.

AB 2346 (Dickerson), Chapter 185, Statutes of 2002, extended the same provisions of SB 1762 to deputy sheriffs in Kern, Humboldt, Imperial, Mendocino, Plumas, Santa Barbara, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Sutter, and Tehama Counties.

AB 1254 (La Malfa), Chapter 70, Statutes of 2003, and SB 570 (Chesbro), Chapter 710, Statutes of 2003, extended the same provisions of SB 1762 to deputy sheriffs in Shasta and Solano Counties.

AB 1931 (La Malfa), Chapter 516, Statutes of 2004, extended the same provisions of SB 1762 to deputy sheriffs in Butte County.

AB 272 (Matthews), Chapter 127, Statutes of 2005, extended the same provisions of SB 1762 to deputy sheriffs in Inyo, Merced, San Joaquin, and Tulare Counties.

AB 151 (Berryhill), Chapter 84, Statutes of 2007, extended the same provisions of SB 1762 to deputy sheriffs in Glenn, Lassen, and Stanislaus Counties.

AB 2215 (Berryhill), Chapter 15, Statutes of 2008, extended the same provisions of SB 1762 to deputy sheriffs in Lake, Calaveras, Mariposa, and San Benito Counties.

AB 1695 (Beall), Chapter 575, Statutes of 2010, allowed the duties of custodial officers employed by the Santa Clara County Department of Corrections to be performed at other health care facilities in Santa Clara County, in addition to duties performed at Santa Clara Valley Medical Center.

SB 1254 (La Malfa), Chapter 66, Statutes of 2012, provided peace officer status to deputy sheriffs in Trinity and Yuba Counties employed to provide custodial care and supervision of inmates in the county jail and related facilities.

**4. Argument in Support**

According to PORAC:

Under current law, in certain counties, a deputy sheriff, who is employed to perform duties exclusively or initially relating to custodial assignments with responsibilities for maintaining the operations of county custodial facilities, is a peace officer whose authority extends to any place in the state only while engaged in the performance of the duties of the officer's employment and for the purpose of carrying out the primary function of employment relating to the officer's custodial assignments, or when performing other law enforcement duties directed by the officer's employing agency during a local state of emergency. This bill would include a deputy sheriff employed by the County of Del Norte, the County of Mono, or the County of San Mateo within that definition of peace officers.

**-- END --**