AB 1185 Sheriff’s Oversight
Community Outreach Working Group
Meeting #12

March 28, 2023 ~ 5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

Zoom Link:
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/7744304192?pwd=bXR6NWJmNzhMVmpDeHudsonhUVIFvQT09

AGENDA

5:30 p.m.  I. Welcome
• Agenda Review

5:40 p.m.  II. Final Review and Discussion of the Draft Recommendations

6:15 p.m.  III. Review and Discussion of Options

7:00 p.m.  IV. Providing Information to the Community

7:15 p.m.  V. Next Steps
• Posting of Final Recommendations
• Presentation to Board of Supervisors (April 25th or May 2nd)

7:30 p.m.  VI. Close
Final Review and Discussion of the Draft Recommendations:

McEllhiney ran through the most recent edits to the drafting recommendations that have been made since the meetings with the various stakeholders. A significant discussion surrounding the involvement of former law enforcement on the commission was held and edits made to clarify the language in the document. Additionally, edits were made surrounding the stipend program, the accessibility in filing a complaint and processing through to the MCSO, the merit-based employment vs. at-will vs. contract employment and termination.

Review and Discussion of Options:

The Drafting Subcommittee feels that there is only one option - Option One – but two other configurations are included based on the request from the Board of Supervisors for options. Options Two and Three rely on less personnel and/or contractual employees. Besser noted what the equivalent Community Engagement Coordinator and Administrative Assistant position titles would be under current county personnel titles. Edits were made to add the applicable county personnel title with the job title (such as Community Engagement Coordinator) in parentheses. Besser also suggested that the fully loaded economic impact (salary plus benefits) be listed in this section as well. Weber asked if there should be a different option that involves a contracted IG with the two support staff (the Community Engagement Coordinator and the Administrative Assistant). Raveche suggested that Option Two be reworked to have a three-person office with the IG being a contractual position. After additional discussion, it was determined to leave the recommendations as-is. Raveche moved, seconded by Bingham, to accept the document as written with the edits made this evening.

Providing Information to the Community/Next Steps:

Jordan shared she will be meeting with the BoS subcommittee on April 4th. The BoS subcommittee will then present the recommendations at the end of April or the very first part of May. Bingham asked if a group from this committee could be present and Jordan noted that it is not the procedure of the BoS to have others present, though McEllhiney is planning to be present. Aikens suggested that each person on the committee can reach out to their Supervisor. Jordan stated the final document will be put up on the website for the public’s review and a release would be sent advising the public of the recommendations and the BoS meeting where the recommendations would be presented to the full board.
Jordan also noted there had been questions from the community about how this process was working and encouraged anyone in the working group to speak to those in the community. It was noted that this working group is not subject to the Brown Act (which only applies to legislative bodies) and these working group meetings are not required to be open to the public.

McEllhiney noted she would be putting together a presentation for the full BoS meeting and will share that presentation ahead of time to ensure it represents the feelings of the working group.