## AB 1185 Sheriff's Oversight Community Outreach Working Group Meeting 13

May 24, 2023 ~ 5:30 p.m. − 7:30 p.m.

### Zoom Link:

https://us06web.zoom.us/j/7744304192?pwd=bXR6NWJmNzhMVmpDeHhudnhuVlFvQT09

AGENDA		
5:30 p.m.	I.	Welcome / Agenda Review
5:40 p.m.	II.	Process Update
6:00 p.m.	III.	Review of Feedback from BOS Subcommittee and MCSO
6:45 p.m.	IV.	Engaging the Community
7:10 p.m.	V.	Presentation to the Board of Supervisors on June 13, 2023
7:30 p.m.	VI.	Close

# AB 1185: Community Outreach Working Group Meeting #13 - Marin County, CA Wednesday, May 24, 2023 – 5:30 p.m. PST

<u>Present:</u> Jamillah Jordan (Marin County); Cameron McEllhiney (NACOLE); Curtis Aikens; Stephen Bingham; Jacqueline Dagg; Tara Evans; Matthew Hymel (County Administrator); Steve Knudsen; Heidi Merchen; Stephen Raab (County Counsel's Office); Ashley Raveche; Nancy Weber.

<u>Absent:</u> Gary Besser (Marin County), Devera Boyd, Charles Dresow, Cesar Lagleva, Rondall Leggett, and Christine Soto Deberry.

#### **Process Update:**

Cameron McEllhiney updated the group on the timeline – the working group approved the recommendations on March 28, the BoS subcommittee met on April 4<sup>th</sup>, April 26<sup>th</sup>, and will meet on May 25<sup>th</sup>, and the final presentation to the full BoS will occur on June 13<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Review of Feedback from BOS Subcommittee and MCSO:**

McEllhiney ran through the feedback that had come about through various meetings in the previous 6 weeks. The BoS subcommittee agreed with the importance of having a commission and an IG, as well as a Community Engagement Coordinator. More work will need to be done on the job classification and salary of the positions so that final funding recommendations can be made. The subcommittee would like to look at additional community-facing organizations help provide candidates. Additionally, they would like to have half of the members serve two years and the other half three years to keep from disruption after year 1. Further clarification is needed regarding when independent counsel will be sought and the delineation of the roles of the Commission and the Inspector General. A final legal review will be needed to ensure there are no conflicts between the state statute and what is/is not allowed by law.

The MCSO expressed concern that some aspects of the authority may be in conflict with the POBR, such as reviewing complete investigations and issuance of public reports. Additionally, some clarification regarding audits, independent investigations, and recommendations is needed. The MCSO does not support having public meetings after a death in custody due to potential litigation. They are concerned with the Commission/IG having unfettered access to BWC footage, and does not support unannounced visits to the jail. Finally, they wish to have an additional Lieutenant position that will serve as a liaison between the MCSO and the Commission/IG.

Matthew Hymel noted a few things that were being evaluated for consistency across county departments – an employee (IG) in an at-will position, a support staff that would share responsibilities with the front desk, and a two-year contract for the community engagement person which would be reevaluated at the end of the two years. Over \$600K has been asked for in the next budget to fulfill these positions. He added that the BoS is not trying to change the recommendations brought forward by this working group. Jamillah Jordan noted she would send out the draft staff recommendation letter but noted it was very much in line with the recommendations of the working group.

Nancy Weber noted that some of the concerns expressed by the MCSO focus on some of the same transparency issues that the public has with the MCSO. Hymel noted that some of the concerns that are being raised by the various groups are things that may be worked out once this process is in place. Several other members noted their concerns with what the MCSO expressed concern about. Several working group members took issue with the fact that the concerns of the MCSO were not in writing. McEllhiney explained that the items shared were her takeaways from the various meetings that had been held and were her interpretations of their concerns.

#### **Engaging the Community:**

Jamillah Jordan asked how this information can best be communicated with the community. She noted there had been e-blasts and newsletter items, and the website would be updated to encourage people to come to the meeting on June 13<sup>th</sup>. She asked for input on how to reach the community. There is a listserv of approximately 3000 people. Heidi Merchen noted that the meeting will be during a workday at the same time of day as those who work a traditional schedule. Jordan noted she would put in the next communication that written comments would be welcomed. The meeting will also be on Zoom.

#### Presentation to the BOS on June 13, 2023:

McEllhiney noted she will be present in Marin County for the presentation to the BoS on June 13<sup>th</sup>. She would like to have some volunteers to help present at the meeting. Merchen asked what the presentation would look like. McEllhiney stated there would be a discussion of community engagement and the process that the working group went through, as well as an overview of the recommendations of the working group. This will be followed up by the staff recommendations. There will be a dry run through once those volunteers are determined.