



# OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

HALL OF JUSTICE

ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF



July 25, 2025

Fesia Davenport, Chief Executive Officer  
Chief Executive Office  
County of Los Angeles  
Kenneth Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street, Room 713  
Los Angeles, California 90012

Hans Johnson, Chair  
Sharmaine Moseley, Executive Director  
Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission  
World Trade Center  
350 South Figueroa, Suite 288  
Los Angeles, California 90071

Sent via Electronic Transmission

Dear Ms. Davenport, Ms. Moseley, and Commissioner Johnson:

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE REGARDING THE MEMORANDA OF  
UNDERSTANDING RELATED TO THE DEPARTMENT'S PARTICIPATION IN  
THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY MONEY LAUNDERING TASK FORCE**

I am in receipt of the Civilian Oversight Commission (COC) Chair, Hans Johnson's, letter addressed to County Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Fesia Davenport dated July 24, 2025. This letter provides the COC Chair's approval of the filing of the two memoranda of understanding (MOU) that are to be considered at the July 29, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting. This letter is an effort to address the issues noted in that correspondence.

The letter to CEO Davenport states that I did not address the COC's concerns regarding the phrasing in one section of the MOU and the lack of a sunset or expiration date. I was surprised to learn that the COC Chair does not believe

211 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

*A Tradition of Service*  
— Since 1850 —

Ms. Davenport  
Ms. Moseley  
Mr. Johnson

-2-

July 25, 2025

those issues were addressed, as that is counter to my belief and understanding.

As you are aware, I personally attended the July 17, 2025, meeting of the COC. Several members of the Department, including those with subject matter expertise related to the specific MOUs and the critical public safety work of the task forces involved were also in attendance. During my report to the COC and the public, I was not asked any questions regarding the MOUs or the Task Force. When the agenda item was later called and discussed during the COC meeting, I was no longer present but Assistant Sheriff Jason Skeen was assigned to attend the remainder of the meeting on my behalf, specifically because the MOUs were on the agenda and because of his particular expertise in this area. In addition, Commander Brandon Dean and Acting Captain Arturo Spencer were present at the front table and prepared to address the COC directly with respect to any question that was presented. No questions were asked of any of these individuals who were present and prepared to present.

The COC discussion of the agenda item focused on the commissioners' ability to provide input and consultation on items such as the MOUs. While it is unfortunate that they did not ask specific questions of my team, no commissioner called or wrote to request further clarification on any of the MOUs or to indicate any issue remained outstanding in the week since the meeting.

The COC meeting was not the only communication my Department engaged in with either the public or the COC on this matter. Prior to the meeting, when I first learned that the COC had questions, the Department responded to questions presented to the COC in writing in an effort to address concerns that we learned existed. Even before the COC meeting, Department representatives attended the Board of Supervisors Operations Cluster Meeting, with the public safety deputies, to address all questions. Representatives of the COC staff regularly attend these meetings, and I am told they were present for this discussion as well.

Therefore, based on all of the above efforts to engage the COC on issues they expressed concerns about, it was my impression that all outstanding issues had been addressed to the satisfaction of the COC.

Ms. Davenport  
Ms. Moseley  
Mr. Johnson

-3-

July 25, 2025

I also bring all of this to your attention to emphasize my commitment to addressing issues presented by the COC. This is the reason I attend every COC meeting that I am able. When I am not present, I send a high-ranking member of my executive team to attend on my behalf. Further, when I am informed of a particular topic on the agenda, I usually have one or more subject matter experts from the Department available at the meeting to respond to questions presented. My office spends a considerable amount of time and energy trying to address all issues presented by the COC, whether at a public meeting or when they present questions in writing. However, if they do not ask a question, I cannot respond to it.

If they had asked questions related to the MOUs at their monthly public meeting, I would have responded as I did in my July 16, 2025, COC correspondence in which I stated that the MOUs are a long-standing practice between local and federal law enforcement agencies. Most if not all, local law enforcement agencies use them.

Not only are these MOUs standard, but the federal government has a long-standing practice of presenting pre-established MOUs that local law enforcement agencies must sign to participate in these task forces. They are not negotiated instruments. Our engagement in any task force ends when I, or they, provide notice and withdraw our team. This process is standard practice throughout the nation. I cannot change this process nor, based on my experience, am I inclined to do so due to my positive overall experience with these task forces.

Most importantly, these MOUs are critical to public safety. They are unrelated to immigration enforcement or supporting civil immigration enforcement. Instead, they enhance public safety by providing resources and expertise to the Department for the investigation of significant criminal activity, particularly situations in which massive fraud is committed that crosses state boundaries – where the Department otherwise has no jurisdiction to investigate. These MOUs allow the Department to engage in more effective public safety efforts and identify individuals behind these massive schemes. Fundamentally, they support our efforts to bring those to justice who harm our residents. We would otherwise be unable to do this work.

Ms. Davenport  
Ms. Moseley  
Mr. Johnson

-4-

July 25, 2025

It is, therefore, imperative these MOUs proceed forward immediately. They have already been delayed a week to permit the COC to hold its hearing. That hearing took place. If there are unresolved questions that remain with any member of the COC, I always stand ready to engage them on questions of concern. However, given all of the above efforts, and that the Department cannot change the standard MOUs, it would not be appropriate to further delay Board action on these items. In my professional opinion, as your law enforcement leader, further delay will have an adverse impact on public safety in our County.

Out of respect for their oversight authority, I remain available to the COC to answer any question that they have on this or any other item. At the same time, I hope that they have respect for my operational authority of the Department to ensure the public safety of the residents we serve. I suspect that is why they have also indicated that these matters should not be delayed any further.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Assistant Sheriff Jason Skeen, Countywide Operations, at (213) 229-3067.

Sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

ROBERT G. LUNA  
SHERIFF