

**AB 1185 Sheriff's Oversight  
Community Outreach Working Group  
Meeting #8**

*February 15, 2023 ~ 5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.*

Zoom Link:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/7744304192?pwd=bXR6NWJmNzhMVmpDeHhudnhuVIFvQT09>

---

**A G E N D A**

---

- |                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| <i>5:30 p.m.</i> | <b>I. Welcome</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agenda Review</li></ul>  |
| <i>5:40 p.m.</i> | <b>II. Review of Preliminary Survey Assessment</b>   |
| <i>6:10 p.m.</i> | <b>III. Review of Focus Group and Canvassing Analysis</b>  |
| <i>6:40 p.m.</i> | <b>IV. Overview of Draft Recommendation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commission</li><li>• Inspector General</li><li>• Staffing and Budget</li></ul> |
| <i>7:20 p.m.</i> | <b>V. Updated Timeline</b>   |
| <i>7:30 p.m.</i> | <b>VI. Close</b>   |

# AGENDA

- Preliminary Survey Data
- Focus Group Memo
- Overview of Draft Recommendations
- Updated Timeline
- Future Agenda Items

*AB1185 Working Group Meeting No. 8*

*February 15, 2023*



# CURRENT TIMELINE

Working Group Mtg #8:  
Review of Draft Options  
February 15, 2023

Working Group Mtg #9:  
Review of Draft Options  
with MCSO Union  
February 21, 2023

Working Group Mtg #10:  
Review of Draft Options  
with Sheriff  
February 27, 2023

Working Group Mtg #10  
Review of Draft Options  
with CAO/County Counsel  
March 14, 2023

Working Group Mtg #11  
Final Review of Draft  
Options  
March 21, 2023

Options Submitted to BOS  
Subcommittee  
March 23, 2023

Options Presented to Board of Supervisors: Q1 2023 TBD



CAMERON MCELLHINEY  
mcellhiney@nacole.org

## **AB 1185: Community Outreach Working Group Meeting #8 - Marin County, CA**

**Wednesday, February 15, 2023 – 5:30 p.m. PST**

**Present:** Gary Besser (Marin County); Jamillah Jordan (Marin County); Cameron McElhiney (NACOLE); Elise White (Center for Justice Innovation); Curtis Aikens; Stephen Bingham; Devera Boyd; Jacqueline Dagg; Tara Evans; Steve Knudsen; Cesar Lagleva; Heidi Merchen; Jeremy Portje; Stephen Raab (County Counsel's Office); Ashley Raveche; Christine Soto DeBerry; Nancy Weber.

**Absent:** Charles Dresow, Rondall Leggett

Cameron ran through the agenda for the evening.

### **Survey Assessment Review:**

Elise White, the Deputy Research Director for the Center for Justice Innovation (formerly Center for Court Innovation) discussed the work that her agency does and what the original scope of work was for Marin County. Dr. White referred to this as “exploratory data” since there was no hypothesis to be proven and discussed the limitation of the survey. 526 online and paper surveys were collected in English, Spanish, and Chinese. Half of the respondents were from two neighborhoods. Most people encountered the MCSO at a community event, when asking for help, or in the course of a traffic stop. 53% reported their contact as positive (ADD IN REMAINDER). 53% did not know that the MCSO had a complaint process. 67 people responded to an open-ended question regarding their experience with the existing complaint process, with responses ranging from lack of trust in the MCSO and the process, a fear of retaliation, or feeling that the complaint process did not yield any results.

Per the survey, the top roles and responsibilities that civilian oversight of MCSO should have are independently investigating complaints made against MCSO employees; independently investigating complaints against the MCSO jail; issuing public reports on complaints, investigation outcomes, and other work of the body.

The top three public reports that should be issued are injuries and deaths in the MCSO jail; violence and use of force in the MCSO; and jail conditions.

Mandatory training should be conducted on constitutional principles of policing; state laws; use of force law/policy/tactics; MCSO training, policies, and procedures; jail tours and ride-alongs with law enforcement; ethics; the criminal justice process; and others.

Dr. White noted the final memorandum would contain all of the quantitative information, additional context derived from targeted open field questions, a synthesis of responses to the final open-ended question, and an addendum of all responses organized by question.

Stephen asked if it would be possible to add the RIPA data with the survey data in order to weight the responses of people of color in order to get a better sense of what people think about the MCSO. Dr. White explained that the data collected does not truly lend itself to this type of comparison, particularly since race was not a required question in the survey.

**Focus Group Committee Update:**

Cameron ran through the benefits of the focus groups and how they were conducted. There were nine focus groups in total. One of the limitations of the focus groups were that it was difficult to engage those on the virtual focus groups because they did not turn on their cameras. She shared the highlights of the memo regarding comments that were made based on the various questions that were asked during the focus groups (each group was asked the same series of questions).

**Drafting Committee Update:**

Cameron began the discussion of the completed draft of the drafting subcommittee's writeup. Several edits were made and discussions held on particular items of the draft recommendation. Please send any edits or comments to Cameron to be incorporated into the document.

**Timeline Updates:**

Upcoming meetings (all at 5:30 p.m.):

February 21 (Review of Draft Options with MCSO Union)

February 27 (Review of Draft Options with the MCSO Sheriff and Undersheriff)

March 14 (Review of Draft Options with CAO/County Counsel)

March 21 (Final Review of Draft Options)

Options submitted to the BoS Subcommittee – March 23, 2023

Presented to the full BoS, TBD at end of 1<sup>st</sup> quarter or very beginning of 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, February 21, 2023 at 5:30 p.m.