



**Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Outreach (IOLERO)
Special Meeting of the Community Advisory Council (CAC)
CAC 2026 Strategic Planning Workshop
Public Meeting Agenda
Saturday, January 10, 2026, 10:00 a.m.**

THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD IN-PERSON ONLY.

Location: Rohnert Park Community Center, 5401 Snyder Lane, Rohnert Park CA. 94928

Time: 10:00am – 2:00pm

RSVP welcomed via email to CAC@sonomacounty.gov or by calling 707-565-1534.

Coffee, water, and a light lunch will be provided.

Public Comment at this Community Advisory Council Special Meeting

Members of the public are free to address the CAC. Public comments for this meeting:

- Should fall under the subject matter being discussed at this meeting
- Are time limited. Time limitations are at the discretion of the Chair and may be adjusted to accommodate all speakers.

In addition to oral public comments at the meetings, the community is also invited to communicate with IOLERO staff and CAC members through email. Members of the public who would like to make statements that may exceed the time limits for public comment, suggest topics to be placed on future agendas, or suggest questions to be raised and discussed by CAC members or staff, may send an email addressing these matters to CAC@sonomacounty.gov.

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Introduction and Purpose of the Strategic Planning Workshop

3. Overview of Ad Hoc Process and Resources

(Playbook and SMART goal template)

4. Community Engagement Conversation

A. Discuss opportunities for changes in how community engagement is conducted by the CAC in 2026.

B. Overview of retreat questionnaire/community input

5. Discussion: 2026 Ad Hoc Committees

6. Ad Hoc Breakouts to Determine SMART Goals for 2026

7. Breakout Reports

8. Adjournment

The next regular meeting of the Community Advisory Council will be held on Wednesday February 11, 2026, at 6:00pm.

Location:

Manzanita Room

Finley Community Center

2060 W. College Ave

Santa Rosa, CA. 95403

Commitment to Civil Engagement

All are encouraged to engage in respectful, non-disruptive communication that supports freedom of speech and values diversity of opinion. We, the members of the CAC, have adopted a list of norms referred to as our “Designed Team Alliance”, which describes the way we want to show-up and be in community while modeling collaborative behavior. We request that CAC members, staff, and the public follow the CAC’s agreed upon norms, which are:

- Be tough on the topic not on people
- Respect all participants in the meeting
- Respect others’ perspective, even when you disagree
- Respect each other’s time
- Stay within the meeting’s time and content parameters
- Practice active listening
- Listen with an open mind to all information, including dissenting points of view
- Speak to others as you would like to be spoken to
- Allow others to speak without comment or intrusive sounds
- Honor freedom of speech
- Call each other “in”



DATE: January 10, 2026

TO: Members of the Community Advisory Council (CAC)

FROM: John Alden, IOLERO Director

RE: Possible Policy Priorities for CAC in 2026

The Community Advisory Council (CAC) is set to hold a strategic planning meeting on Saturday, January 10, 2026, to discuss, among other issues, what policy issues the CAC might address in the upcoming year. This memo is designed to provide the CAC with a list of possible policy issues for Ad Hocs to address in 2026, and some background material on some of those policy issues. That said, the background material here is by no means exhaustive on any of these points. This is intended to give merely enough background such that CAC members and the public might be able to make informed choices about which policy items to prioritize over the next year.

Consider this memo akin to a restaurant menu, giving brief descriptions of each possible item one might order. Fully digging into any of items requires ordering the dish, or in this case, picking some of these policy items as priorities for the year. And of course, digging into some of these thoroughly will preclude us from fully digging into others, just as one can only eat so many dishes in a sitting.

These items are not intended to be in order of priority. Rather, prioritization is entirely up to the CAC. Nor are these issues the only ones the CAC might prioritize this year. At the retreat, the community may suggest, and the CAC may identify, more or different policy issues to prioritize. The CAC has a questionnaire out to the public on this point, feedback from which was not yet available when this memo was finalized.

1. Immigration Policies

Like any law enforcement agency, SCSO interacts with many people whose immigration status could be affected by contact with law enforcement. Some are victims of crime,

others are suspected of committing crimes, some are held in jail, and others may be witnesses or bystanders.

The CAC previously weighed in on these issues in 2017 via a series of public meetings, and also set of recommended policy changes found here:

https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Main%20County%20Site/General/Sonoma/BCCs/Department%20Information/_Documents/3-30-2017%20IOLERO%20Director%20Immigration%20Policies%20Recommendation.pdf

That report addresses, among other things, how and when the SCSO might notify federal immigration authorities about the status of persons held at (or soon to be released from) the jail, allowing detained person access to consular officials if they are nationals of other countries, and how and whether to honor federal requests or demands to hold such persons.

Current SCSO policy on this issue is found here:

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/542ec317e4b0d41ade8801fb/t/63d8695c2a56173c5820956e/1675127133080/Immigration_Policy.pdf

SCSO has made many changes to this set of policies in the last two years, restricting further the ways in which SCSO personnel might be in contact with ICE personnel. The CAC has had an Ad Hoc on community outreach to explain to the public these changes since mid-2025, and that Ad Hoc is still working on the issue. The CAC may wish to continue this Ad Hoc in 2026.

2. De-Escalation

In 2021, the CAC suggested policies for de-escalation of force, based on new California laws from 2020 that mandated de-escalation policies and training in local law enforcement:

https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Main%20County%20Site/General/Sonoma/BCCs/Department%20Information/_Documents/7-12-2021-De-Escalation-Policy-Recommendations-Final.pdf

The SCSO subsequently enacted a de-escalation policy, as required by state law:

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/542ec317e4b0d41ade8801fb/t/61e07774d365911a737b8270/1642100596719/De-Escalation.pdf>

In the last five years, the CAC and SCSO do not appear to have followed-up on de-escalation beyond one SCSO presentation to the CAC in 2023, [CACMeeting_De-](#)

Escalation Presentation The CAC considered having, but did not create, an Ad Hoc on this topic in 2023.

Given the centrality of de-escalation to modern use of force, the CAC might wish to continue the conversation with the SCSO on this topic by inquiring as to the differences between the recommended and adopted policies, examining current training at the SCSO on de-escalation, and/or assessing whether any data show how well de-escalation policy and training have improved outcomes in the field for both the public and SCSO personnel.

3. Administrative Investigation Interview Policies

The recent IOLERO report on the shooting death of Dávid Peláez Chavez helped clarify that SCSO's own administrative investigations, called "Administrative Reviews" or "ARs", often do not include interviews with the involved deputies about policy or training issues. In many cases, ARs rely on relatively short statements made to other law enforcement agencies as part of a criminal, not administrative or personnel, investigation. Whether such deputies are interviewed administratively is a judgment call made by SCSO, not a specific written policy. In practice, such interviews are rare.

Some on the CAC have asked whether this practice conforms to best practices in law enforcement accountability. An Ad Hoc on this topic could discuss it further with SCSO personnel, learn more from experts in the field, and gather community input.

4. Evictions and Unlawful Detainers

Sheriff's Offices are the only law enforcement agencies specifically charged with handling evictions. The rate at which tenants across California are evicted has increased as COVID-era eviction protections have rolled back. Generally speaking, whether a person is evicted is a decision made by courts, not sheriffs. But local sheriffs do have some control over how they communicate with tenants, and how the evictions are carried out. See, for example, some examples from other communities:

<https://www.sfsheriff.com/services/civil-processes/evictions/get-help-if-youre-being-evicted>

<https://dcba.lacounty.gov/portfolio/eviction/>

SCSO provided an overview of their eviction processes to the CAC in 2024. One can watch that meeting here. [CACMeeting_on_Evictions](#)

If the CAC were interested in this issue in the next year, the CAC might consider recommending policies and practices at the SCSO that might make the eviction process

clearer or less stressful for tenants being evicted, and/or connect the evicted to relevant services.

5. Programming at the Jail

Over COVID, pandemic precautions and staffing challenges forced the county jail (MADF, or Main Adult Detention Facility) to pare back on programming for incarcerated persons. In last few years, those services have bounced back. But in that time, the CAC has not studied what services are provided at MADF, or how they could help.

Programming in jails generally includes substance abuse treatment, education about cycles of violence and anger management, language skills, and even music classes. An Ad Hoc on this topic could learn about the programming currently provided at MADF, programming provided in jails in other counties, and ways to connect volunteers or community resources to this programming to maximize their impact.

6. Language Access

How law enforcement provides language access when responding to calls for service can make a big difference in the outcome. Clear communication can be challenging in tense situations, even when everyone involved speaks the same language. Language differences exacerbate this challenge.

Different agencies have different approaches to this issue. Some differences include giving personnel different thresholds for when they are expected to provide translators, different translation services, and different training for officers who provide translation. For those interested in more detail, here are two such policies, one from the San Francisco Police Department and one from SCSO:

<https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/DGO5.20%20Language%20Access%20Services%20for%20Limited%20English%20Proficient%20%28LEP%29%20Persons.pdf>

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/542ec317e4b0d41ade8801fb/t/63a4a5ab2905c4171d04cc68/1671734706860/Policy+Manual+12-19-22.pdf> (See Policy 335, page 251.)

If the CAC were to examine this issue, the CAC might discuss when translation services are required, who provides them, which languages are prioritized for translation, and the training given to SCSO personnel about how to provide those services.

7. SCSO Budget

The SCSO has a large and complicated annual budget. Every year, as with all County Departments, this budget is set by the Board of Supervisors. As with any agency, such budgets are a strong statement as to policy priorities for the upcoming year.

The CAC might consider whether it would prioritize hearing from the SCSO about its budget proposal for the upcoming year, provide feedback on how that proposal might fit with community expectations, and examine whether the CAC might be able to assist the SCSO in advocacy for any particular aspects of that budget proposal.

Such an Ad Hoc may also wish to consider when to start work. Budgets for most county agencies are planned in the fall, submitted to the County Administrator in January, submitted to the Board of Supervisors in April, and approved by the Board in June. This Ad Hoc might therefore work best if it started by watching the budget process in 2026 and then working with SCSO about budget recommendations in late 2026 for the budget process in 2027.