AB 1185 Sheriff’s Oversight
Community Outreach Working Group
Meeting #4

November 15, 2022 ~ 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Zoom Link:
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/7744304192?pwd=bXR6NWJmNzhMVmpDeHhudnhuVIFvQT09

AGENDA

6:00 pm  I. Welcome
         ▪ Agenda Review

6:10 pm  II. Process
         ▪ Purpose
         ▪ Review of revised timeline
         ▪ Discussion of subcommittees and process

6:35 pm  III. Community Conversations, Focus Groups and Future Engagement Strategies

7:00 pm  IV. Survey
         ▪ Purpose
         ▪ Finalization of survey for translation and distribution

7:50 pm  V. Future Agenda Items
         ▪ Next Meeting of the Working Group: November 29th
         ▪ Additional Items

8:00 pm  Close
AGENDA

• Process
• Community Conversations, Focus Groups and Future Engagement Strategies
• Survey
• Future Agenda Items
PROCESS
TIMELINE

- **Community Conversations**
  - November 1-5, 2022

- **Working Group Meeting #3**
  - November 15, 2022

- **Survey Closes**
  - December 16, 2021

- **Working Group Meeting #4**
  - November 29, 2022

- **Subcommittee Work**
  - December 1-16, 2022

- **Distribution of Survey**
  - November 21, 2022

- **Working Group Meeting #5**
  - January 3, 2022

- **Community Focus Groups**
  - January 9-11, 2022

- **Working Group Meeting #6**
  - January 16, 2022

- **Recommendation Submitted to BOS Subcommittee**
  - January 23, 2022

- **Presented to Board of Supervisors**
  - February TBD
DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE

Working group brainstorming session

Draft recommendations created by subcommittee

Brought to full committee for finalization
FOCUS GROUP SUBCOMMITTEE

1. Identify key stakeholder groups
2. Identify locations
3. Work to fill focus groups
4. Review and present key information
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

- Develop strategy to get surveys in the hands of community members
- Develop education and information strategies
- Develop other engagement opportunities as needed
ENGAGING WITH COMMUNITY
Engagement Strategies

• Community Conversations
• Focus Groups
• Additional Engagement Strategies
SURVEY
ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA
Curtis spoke as part of the Human Rights Commission. He thanked NACOLE for their involvement and reiterated his and the HRC’s commitment to the process, and be willing to serve this committee and the subcommittees. He noted he would like everyone to reset and recommit to the process and the reason the group is gathered together.

Cesar talked about his disappointment with the turnout of the community conversations and discussed the goals for this particular work. He is hopeful that his questions can be answered and noted he feels the top-down approach from the County is not working in the county and is not working in this process.

To respond, Gary Besser noted there were 14 community members on the Tuesday forum, 23 at the Thursday forum, and about 5 at the Saturday forum.

McEllhiney ran through the agenda for the evening. The extended timeline for the committee was visualized. It is hoped that the survey will be available next week if it can be finalized and have four weeks of distribution. She discussed the subcommittee structure that is envisioned and the duties of each subcommittee.

Ashley asked about how to break into subgroups and whether there would be overlap so that information could be shared? McEllhiney noted there should be a chair of each subcommittee that could share information. She noted this would take meetings outside the regular meeting times.

Steve K. asked about the order of the groups and the relationship of timing of the subcommittees.

Cesar asked what metrics should be used to evaluate the success of a robust community engagement process looks like. He added that it will be a tough sell if the focus groups are being run by the county. McEllhiney noted that focus groups can be made to be viewed as a community process, not one that is run by the county or the working group.

Stephen B. stated he believed the drafting group would need to wait until after the survey and focus group results are in, otherwise it appears to be a dog and pony show. McEllhiney responded that you may want to show some drafts to the focus group to gain input from those focus groups. The surveys will take place (time-wise) prior to the focus groups.

McEllhiney addressed some of the questions in the chat: CCI will be tabulating the data that comes out of the surveys. It is hoped that there can be focus groups in specific languages with facilitators and notetakers in that language to avoid having to use translators if possible.
Cesar suggested that the group be called “The People’s Process (or the People’s Initiative) re: AB1185 Convened by the HRC” in order to take the focus away from the county, which may have a negative connotation for some parties in marketing the focus groups and survey.

McEllhiney began to talk about community engagement. The minutes from the three community conversations are available and will be sent out. She ran through a few of the comments that were made during the community conversations.

Various parties announced which subcommittee they wanted to be on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drafting Subcommittee</th>
<th>Focus Group Subcommittee</th>
<th>Community Engagement Subcommittee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Cesar</td>
<td>Steve K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen B.</td>
<td>Rondall</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tara asked what the role of the Sheriff’s office would be regarding their role in the process and what might be an impediment to the process. Charlie mentioned the various impediments contained in the police officer bill of rights (POBR) in California and said he would circulate some documents regarding these issues.

The most recent draft of the survey was viewed. Several edits were made and a discussion regarding the introduction and how detailed the summary of AB1185 needs to be. Additional topics for MCSO contact were added in question 1. Various other revisions were made to expand certain questions and simplify others.

A decision was made to make edits to the survey and send it around again before the end of the week.

Meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m. PDT.