



AB 1185 Community Outreach Working Group Meeting #2

October 25, 2022 ~ 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Zoom Link: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83862829565>

A G E N D A

- 6:00 pm* **I. Welcome and Introductions**
- Agenda Review
- 6:15 pm* **II. Survey Discussion**
- Review of Draft Survey Questions
 - Connecting with Community to Increase Survey and Community Conversation Participation
- 7:00 pm* **III. Legal Considerations**
- Discussion of AB1185 with Marin County Counsel
- 7:15 pm* **IV. Building Oversight in Marin County**
- Oversight Board/Committee Composition
 - Oversight Board/Committee Powers & Duties
 - Inspector General Role
 - Inspector General Powers & Duties
- 7:55 pm* **V. Summary and Next Steps**
- Draft Options/Recommendation to be Completed and to the Working Group by November 4
 - Community Conversations Begin the Week of November 1
 - Working Group Meeting #3: 11/15, 6-8pm
- 8:00 pm* **Close**

AB 1185 Sheriff's Oversight

Community Outreach Working Group

Meeting #2 ~ October 25, 2022



Today's Agenda

- I. Welcome & Introductions
- II. Survey Discussion
- III. Community Conversations
- IV. Legal Considerations
- V. Building Oversight in Marin
- VI. Summary & Next Steps



SURVEY DISCUSSION



Community Survey

- **Finalize Survey Questions**
- **Translation: Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese**
- **Distribution**



Connecting with the Community

- Increasing Survey Participation
- Increasing Community Conversation Participation

WHAT WILL THIS LOOK LIKE?

COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS



Community Conversations

- Content
- Outreach & Support



Group Discussion

What strategies will the Working Group use to reach and engage communities?

- Communities of color
- System-impacted communities
- Youth
- Seniors
- Limited-English proficient communities
- Low-income communities



LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS



BUILDING OVERSIGHT IN MARIN COUNTY



Oversight Committee Composition



CONSIDERATIONS

Number

Who

How long

Oversight Committee Powers & Duties



EXAMPLES

Reviewing Investigations

Annual Reports

Recommendations

Community Outreach

Role of the Inspector General



CONSIDERATIONS

Reporting Process

Relationship to the Board

Engagement Responsibilities

Inspector General Power & Duties



EXAMPLES

Complaint Process

Annual Reports

Auditing

Staffing Oversight Committee

NEXT STEPS

- **Community Engagement and Involvement**
- **Upcoming Community Conversations:**
 - November 1st 6:00 p.m.
 - November 3rd 6:00 p.m.
 - November 5th 10:00 a.m.
- **Working Group Meeting #3:**
 - November 15th, 6:00 p.m.
 - Possible agenda items...

AB 1185 Sheriff's Oversight

Community Outreach Working Group

Meeting #2 ~ October 25, 2022



AB 1185: Community Outreach Working Group Meeting #2 - Marin County, CA

Tuesday, October 25, 2022 – 6:00 p.m. PDT

Present: Gary Besser (Marin County); Jamillah Jordan (Marin County); Cameron McElhiney (NACOLE); Karen Williams (NACOLE); Curtis Aikens; Stephen Bingham; DeVera Boyd; Jacqueline Dagg; Charlie Dresow; Tara Evans Boyce; Steve Knudsen; Cesar Lagleva; Rondall Leggett; Heidi Merchen; Jeremy Portje; Stephen Raab (County Counsel's office); Ashley Reveche; Phoebe Smith; Cristine Soto DeBerry; Rachel Swaner (Center for Court Innovation); Nancy Weber.

McElhiney welcomed the group and those members who were not present at the first meeting provided quick introductions.

Question was asked regarding why this is such a seemingly rushed project. Jordan noted that there was a lot of community urgency and there is a want to have this project done before the year is out. Additionally, a comment was made that receiving information so close to the meeting felt like materials were being pushed at them for approval rather than being the work of the committee.

A comment was made regarding the digital divide and the method of having the survey and community conversation online. It was felt that this discourages certain segments of the population and that there must be nontraditional means to engage in outreach.

Suggestion was made to get the Human Rights Committee page up and running so that the onus isn't solely on this working group to spread the word about this program.

Community Survey Discussion:

Survey questions need to be finalized, with translations to Spanish, Vietnamese, and Chinese. A discussion needs to be held regarding distribution of surveys and how paper copies will be distributed, retained, and tabulated.

Rachel Swaner (Center for Court Innovation): Role is to take the questions that are most important to understand where the community is right now in discussions of accountability and transparency. The shorter the survey, the most likely people are to take it; however, with brevity may come a loss of information that can be gathered.

Steven B. indicated he sent a red-lined version that simplifies the language outlined in the original version submitted earlier.

Ashley suggested a weighted question be added to ask whether people have had any engagement with the Sheriff's Department. The first questions of the survey need to be the most important to answer. She would like to see the survey results parsed out by whether persons have had contact with law enforcement.

Nancy indicated that additional wording regarding confidentiality of responses should be added.

A discussion was held regarding the various questions and appropriate wording to ensure the survey is equitable to all parties, especially impoverished and people of color. Need to focus on reading level and simplicity. Additionally, questions should focus on one item, such as policies OR procedures, not both in one question. Demographic information was also discussed and what the most important demographics are to capture. The need for open ended questions was had.

The timeline was again discussed and the need for input from the community. McElhiney indicated that NACOLE is working within the timeline that was given. Jordan stated that community input is absolutely needed and the timeline would be reassessed if it was determined that more time is needed to complete the process. Curtis reiterated that this feels very rushed and it shouldn't be rushed just to make sure the process is complete. There will be community input through the survey, community conversation, and the Human Rights Commission meetings. Jeremy asked how to provide input if he didn't want to speak in public but couldn't provide feedback on the survey. McElhiney noted there has been great success with general e-mail mailboxes ("click here to provide your feedback"), working group members as representatives of the community that can relay stories, use of comment cards, etc.

(Unknown speaker) – What about starting the survey with "Have you had an interaction with MCSO" – if yes, continue on with survey; if not, stop the survey.

Cesar – do we even need a survey since there has been so much data gathered by the county before?

Ashley – since we have discussed the need for oversight in previous data sets, perhaps this survey should be more focused on what type of framework there should be. The survey should not only be a listening session but a political item that shows the will of the people.

Community Conversations:

McElhiney shared the draft schedule for the community conversations which will be held on November 1 and November 3 in the evening, and November 5 in the morning. Brian Corr (NACOLE) and McElhiney will be doing the presentation. Note takers are needed for the breakout sessions. These will be done virtually.

Conclusion:

McElhiney noted the next meeting is scheduled for November 15. She stated she would be speaking with Besser and Jordan on next steps. Stephen Raab with the County Counsel's office added that there can be either an oversight board, an inspector general, or both in the framework of the county, clarifying one of the main questions left from the previous meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m. PDT.