



**Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Outreach (IOLERO)
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL (CAC)
Public Meeting Agenda
June 11, 2025 6:00 p.m.
Finley Community Center
2060 W. College Avenue
Manzanita Room
Santa Rosa, CA. 95401**

ADVISORY NOTICE

The meetings will be held as an in-person/online hybrid format.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY ATTEND THIS MEETING IN PERSON AT THE ADDRESS ABOVE, OR MAY JOIN THE MEETING VIRTUALLY THROUGH ZOOM.

Members of the Community Advisors Council will attend the meeting in person, except that they may attend virtually via ZOOM, to the extent allowable by the Brown Act for good cause pursuant to AB-2449.

Join the meeting via the Zoom application on your computer, tablet or smartphone:

Go to:

<https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/j/87437324998?pwd=Z5arINb3d5lcr32nyHbBeocjWJ7dr3.1>

Please be advised that those participating in the meeting remotely via Zoom do so at their own risk. The CAC's public meetings will not be canceled if any technical problems occur during the meeting.

Call-in and listen to the meeting:

By telephone: Dial 1-669-900-9128

Webinar ID: 874 3732 4998

Passcode: (IOLERO) 465376

1. Spanish interpretation will be provided via zoom and in-person. Any additional language services could be available at all regular and special CAC meetings if made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to help ensure availability. For more information or to request services: contact (707) 565-1477. If you need an accommodation, an alternative format, or required another person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact the CAC Community Engagement Manager at (707) 565-1477 or by email cac@sonoma-county.org within 72 hours of the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation. Spanish interpretation will be provided within the Zoom application, you must use version 5.9.0 or later. We will make every effort to accommodate you.
2. **Interpretación al español se proveerá vía la aplicación de zoom y en persona.** Cualquier otro idioma/lenguaje podría ser disponible en todas las reuniones regulares y especiales del CAC si el pedido es 48 horas antes de la reunión para garantizar disponibilidad. Para más

información o para pedir servicios: llame al (707) 565-1477. Si necesita una adaptación, un formato alternativo o requiere que otra persona le ayude mientras asiste a esta reunión, por favor contacte ala Gerente de Compromiso Comunitario del CAC al 707-565-1477 o notifícanos por correo electrónico cac@sonoma-county.org en un plazo de 72 horas de la reunión para garantizar los arreglos para la adaptación. Para traducción en español, se tiene que usar la versión de Zoom 5.9.0 o una versión más adelantada. Haremos el esfuerzo posible por proporcionar la adaptación.

Public Comment at Community Advisory Council Meetings

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

- Should fall under the subject matter jurisdiction of the CAC (as noted in the founding documents).
- Are time limited. Time limits are at the discretion of the Chair and may be adjusted to accommodate all speakers.

In addition to oral public comment at the meetings, the community is 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@sonoma-county.org

CAC members may not deliberate or take action on items not on the agenda and may only listen and respond briefly in limited circumstances. Should CAC members wish to deliberate on an issue raised during public comment, that issue may be placed on a future agenda of the CAC for discussion and possible action. Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the CAC after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the IOLERO office at the above address during normal business hours or via email.

Purpose. An IOLERO community advisory council is hereby established to increase visibility for the public into the delivery by the sheriff-coroner of policing and corrections services, to provide community participation in the review and establishment of sheriff coroner policies, procedures, practices, training, and initiatives, and to engage the public to better understand the role of IOLERO and of the sheriff-coroner.

Agenda

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MAY 14, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

3. OPENINGS AND APPOINTMENTS

Chair will report on current openings and appointments. If you are interested in applying for the current vacancies, please visit: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/boardsandcommissions>

A. Current Vacancies:

- District 2
- District 4

4. ORAL REPORTS AND COMMENTS

Oral reports and/or comments to be provided. No action will be taken on these items.

- a. Sheriff's Liaison Report
- b. IOLERO Director's Report
- c. CAC Public Correspondence Report

5. PRESENTATIONS: NONE

6. BUSINESS ITEMS:

- a. Discussion and Possible Action on Approving and Adopting the Community Engagement Ad Hoc Committee Playbook/Manual
- b. Discussion and Possible Action on Approving the Final Canine Policy Recommendations Ad Hoc Committee Report

7. ADJOURNMENT FOR AD HOC COMMITTEE WORKING MEETINGS

The CAC will adjourn for a 30-minute recess for each ad hoc committee to conduct business. The public is free to stay and listen. As these are ad hoc working sessions, no official public comment period will be held. Access to these working sessions is not available on Zoom.

8. RECONVENE TO REGULAR MEETING

9. CAC COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ad Hoc Committee Chairs to provide oral reports and/or updates on the work being conducted. No action will be taken on these items.

- A. Community Engagement
- B. Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA)
- C. Policy Recommendations Review (Canine)
- D. Community Engagement about ICE

10. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

This section is intended for non-action items from this agenda and for items not appearing on the agenda that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the CAC. Please state your name and who you represent, if applicable. Comments will be limited at the discretion of the chairs based on number of comments and other factors.

11. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

12. CAC ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilmembers may provide oral announcements on things related to CAC business.

13. DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE TOPICS TO PUBLICIZE

The CAC will discuss possible topics of interest to publicize in order to better communicate with the public about the activities of the CAC. The CAC may take action to create such material or provide direction to staff to do so.

14. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Community Advisory Council will be **Wednesday, August 13, 2025.**

The in-person/hybrid meeting will be at the following location:

**Location:
Finley Community Center
2060 W. College Avenue
Manzanita Room
Santa Rosa, CA. 95401**

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”



Community Advisory Council Meeting Minutes
Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Outreach
May 14, 2025

Members of the public and CAC members attended this meeting in person/online hybrid format. May 14, 2025, Community Advisory Council meeting was held hybrid in person and via zoom.

PRESENT

Council Members: John Azevedo, Nancy Pemberton, Imelda Martinez De Montano, Trevor Ward, Casey Jones, Robin Jurs (zoom)

IOLERO Staff: John Alden, IOLERO Director, Lizett Camacho, Community Engagement Manager

Members of the Public: 6 members of the public attended via Zoom. 1 member attended in person.

Sheriff's Office: Sheriff's Liaison, Lt. Brent Kidder, Correctional Deputy, Heidi Eisenhauer

Absent: Lorena Barrera, Alberto Botello, Nathan Solomon

CAC Member Robin Jurs participated in the meeting virtually via Zoom per Government Code 54953 (j)(2) with the consent of the CAC members present.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00p.m.

1. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was facilitated by CAC Vice Chair Pemberton. Council members introduced themselves to the public.

2. APPROVAL OF APRIL 2, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

A. Motion to approve the meeting minutes: Councilmember Jones

2nd: Councilmember Azevedo

Vote:

Ayes: Jurs, Azevedo, Pemberton, Martinez De Montano, Jones, Ward

Abstain:

Absent: Solomon, Barrera, Botello

Motion passes.

3. OPENINGS AND APPOINTMENTS

Vice Chairperson Pemberton reported on current openings and appointments. If you are interested in applying for the current vacancies, please visit:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/boardsandcommissions>

A. We continue to have the following vacancies:

- District 2
- District 4

4. ORAL REPORTS AND COMMENTS

a. Sheriff's Liaison Report

Lt. Kidder reported that the SCSO staff attended 27 community events. Lt. Kidder shared some comments from Sheriff Engram regarding the "Meet & Greet" event. Lt. Kidder also shared comments/emails from community members. For more information on the oral report please click on the meeting recording: https://youtu.be/4NBCfqs_biM
A CAC member asked Lt. Kidder at the last CAC meeting whether the ICE arrest was at the Probation Department involved a reportable conviction pursuant to the Sheriff's Office policy? The answer was yes. The Sheriff's office will not comment any further on that incident. Any other inquiries should be directed to the Probation Department, Sonoma County Communications, and/or ICE. A CAC member asked at the last CAC meeting whether the 418 people Lt. Kidder reported were registered in programs in the MADF (jail) were 418 separate people... Lt. Kidder confirmed there were 418 individual incarcerated persons registered.

b. IOLERO Director's Report

Director Alden reported on the following topics:

Sonoma County BOS budget workshop took place in April.

IOLERO funding is stable thanks to the voters for giving us the funding floor of the equivalent of 1% of the Sheriff's Office budget. Due to inflation and the increase of other services, there might be less money for training opportunities for the CAC. IOLERO requested the BOS for an extra \$40,000 so that we could complete an audit of IOLERO, which is required by Measure P. Measure P requires an audit be done every 3 years to make sure it operates efficiently and up to the best practices in the field. IOLERO has a new Chief Deputy Mike Soto starting the last week of May. He will be introduced to the CAC at a future meeting.

c. CAC Public Correspondence Report

No report was shared.

Public Comment: 3 members of the public addressed the CAC.

5. PRESENTATIONS:

Received and Discussed Presentation Related to the Use of Tasers in the Jail, Conducted by SCSO Correctional Deputy Heidi Eisenhauer

Discussion included CAC members asking questions regarding the presentation.

Public Comment: 2 members of the public addressed the SCSO.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS:

- a. Discussion and Possible Action on the 2025 Work Plan of the Community Engagement on ICE Ad Hoc Committee

Discussion included CAC Vice Chair Pemberton sharing a brief summary of the committee's work plan.

Public Comment: 1 member of the public addressed the CAC

Motion to approve the 2025 Work Plan of the Community Engagement on ICE Ad Hoc Committee: Councilmember Jones
2nd: Councilmember Ward

Vote:

Ayes: Pemberton, Azevedo, Jurs, Martinez De Montano, Jones, Ward

Abstain:

Absent: Barrera, Botello, Solomon

Motion carries.

- b. Discussion and Possible Action to Amend the CAC Bylaws for the Purpose of Changing the CAC Regular Meetings from the 1st Wednesday of each month to the 2nd Wednesday of each Month.

Vice Chairperson Pemberton noted that staff was exploring the possibility of changing the CAC meetings from 1st Wednesday of the month to 2nd Wednesday of the month.

Public comment: no public comment

Motion to approve the amendment to the CAC Bylaws for the purpose of changing the CAC regular meetings from the 1st Wednesday of each month to the 2nd Wednesday of each month: Councilmember Azevedo

2nd: Councilmember Jones

Vote:

Ayes: Azevedo, Jurs, Ward, Pemberton, Martinez De Montano, Jones

Abstain: None
Absent: Barrera, Solomon, Botello

Motion carries.

- c. Discussion and Possible Action on the Possible Cancellation of the July and August CAC Regular Meetings.

Discussion included the CAC members discussing factors which included CAC members taking time around the 4th of July holiday.

Motion to approve the cancellation of the July CAC Regular Meeting:

Councilmember Azevedo

2nd: Councilmember Ward

Vote:

Ayes: Azevedo, Jurs, Ward, Pemberton, Martinez De Montano, Jones

Abstain: None

Absent: Barrera, Solomon, Botello

Motion carries.

7. Vice Chair Pemberton tabled without opposition Agenda items and skipped Item #7 (Adjournment for Ad Hoc Committee Working Meetings) and Item #8 (Reconvene to Regular Meeting) due to some CAC members being absent.

9. **CAC COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Chairs of each ad hoc reported on the work of their committees.

- A. Community Engagement: The ad hoc committee received one email response back regarding working with other organizations in the community. Los Cien, Executive Director Herman G. Hernandez is open to meeting with the ad hoc committee. The ad hoc committee has finalized the CAC handbook, which will be presented in the next June meeting.
- B. Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA): The ad hoc is going to meet next Thursday, the ad hoc will meet the SCSO on June 4th to discuss the committee's policy recommendations.
- C. Policy Recommendations Review (Canine): The ad hoc is on track to present a report and a set of recommendations for the CAC to adopt. The ad hoc will present their report at the next CAC meeting in June.
- D. Community Engagement about ICE: Ad hoc has completed and presented their work plan for 2025. The work plan was presented as a business item in today's meeting.

Public Comment: 1 member of the public addressed the CAC.

10. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment: 2 members of the public addressed the CAC.

11. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE ITEMS

12. CAC ANNOUNCEMENTS

NO announcements

13. DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE TOPICS TO PUBLICIZE

CAC members suggested the following items to publicize:

Public Comment: no member of the public addressed the CAC.

14. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:58pm.

Motion to adjourn the meeting: Councilmember Jones

2nd: Councilmember Azevedo

Votes:

Ayes: Azevedo, Jurs, Pemberton, Martinez De Montano, Jones, Ward

Abstain: None

Absent: Barrera, Botello, Solomon

Motion passes.

The next meeting of the CAC is scheduled for Wednesday June 11, 2025, at 6:00pm and will be hybrid (via zoom and in person).

Location:

Finley Community Center

2060 W. College Avenue

Manzanita Room

Santa Rosa, CA. 95401

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....2
 Collaboration in Practice4
RULES THE CAC ABIDES BY6
COMMUNITY OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT9
 Community Outreach In Action 10
 Means + Ways 10
 CAC website..... 10
 IOLERO Newsletter 12
 Social Media..... 13
 Events..... 15
 Tabling 16
 Speaking Engagements 18
 Media Invitations..... 20
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: HOW WE DO IT 21
 Means + Ways 22
 Monthly Meetings..... 22
 Ad Hoc Committees (Ad Hocs)..... 23
 Listening Sessions..... 25
 Town Halls and Special Meetings 28

INTRODUCTION

Civilian oversight of law enforcement has been a crucial tool for enhancing accountability, transparency, and community trust in law enforcement, especially at the county level, where sheriffs often have jurisdiction over policing and custodial (or correctional) functions.

Since its inception in 2016, and with the more recent enhancement of duties and responsibilities via Measure P (passed November 2020), the Community Advisory Council (CAC) has been steadfast in its mission to increase the public's visibility into the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office's policies, practices, and protocols.

The CAC provides an imperative service that includes:

- **Increasing transparency** by increasing public visibility into how the Sheriff and Coroner's office functions and how the agency delivers policing and corrections services.
- Augmenting **awareness of the legal framework governing law enforcement** to ensure that people know their rights, especially regarding the Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Outreach (IOLERO) and its operations.
- **Encouraging community participation** in shaping the county's public safety landscape; and
- Improving communication and **the relationship between the Sheriff's office and Sonoma County communities** and residents.

As civilian volunteers, CAC members represent the residents of Sonoma County and its communities. That makes us uniquely positioned to bridge the gap between community expectations and current law enforcement practices and directives.

As a civilian volunteer oversight agency, the CAC faces and works through inherent challenges (primarily limited resources) to accomplish the agency's objectives. Resource limitation (whether member time, agency budget, or access to experts and information) is a common hindrance for oversight agencies. Despite this, the CAC is committed to creatively and innovatively advancing its mission. By adapting and maximizing its resources and how members work together, it ensures that its oversight remains impactful and aligned with the community's needs.

This document serves as a playbook for tools and techniques commonly used by the CAC (and oversight agencies in general) to guide members as they do the work. It is best considered a living document that requires regular review and revision to reflect and inspire new operations.

< **BOX OUT** >

IOLERO & THE CAC

This is a partnership. IOLERO provides the administrative and investigative backbone for civilian oversight, while the CAC—a volunteer body of Sonoma County residents—serves as a direct channel for community voice and feedback. Together, they work to strengthen transparency, accountability, and public trust in the Sonoma County Sheriff’s Office.

IOLERO’s role is to provide awareness and support for those in the community who feel their rights have been violated by a member of the sheriff’s office. In addition, IOLERO aims to strengthen transparency and trust between law enforcement and the community by conducting independent audits, offering policy recommendations, and fostering engagement.

Recognizing the voluntary nature of the CAC, IOLERO also provides vital support to ensure the council can effectively fulfill its mission, including:

- Offering logistical and administrative resources to help CAC members execute their responsibilities and comply with public meeting laws;
- Developing reports, research, and educational materials to support CAC discussions and recommendations; and
- Aligning broader outreach efforts with the CAC’s priorities and initiatives.

The CAC’s role is to enhance IOLERO’s mission by representing diverse perspectives and fostering public participation. It exists to:

- **Increase public visibility** into how the Sheriff’s Office delivers policing and correctional services.
- **Create real avenues for community participation** in shaping law enforcement policy, practices, and priorities.
- **Engage and educate the public** about IOLERO, the Sheriff’s Office, and the systems that shape public safety.
- **Model ethical, transparent, and accountable oversight**, grounded in trust, fairness, and community voice.

It accomplishes these objectives by:

- Reviewing and recommending changes to law enforcement policies, practices, and training.

- Developing and implementing activities for the public that demystify oversight processes (e.g., hosting town halls, disseminating surveys, and facilitating workshops).
- Acting as a bridge across IOLERO, the Sheriff's Office, and the community to address concerns and provide feedback.

Collaboration in Practice

The partnership between IOLERO and the CAC focuses on:

- Increasing public visibility in law enforcement operations.
- Creating opportunities for community input to shape the County's public safety landscape in general and its accountability and oversight efforts specifically.
- Making complex policies, laws, and public safety practices accessible and transparent.
- Ensuring community voices are heard and, whenever possible, reflected in policy decisions.

By blending investigative oversight with community engagement, IOLERO and the CAC ensure that civilian oversight remains transparent, equitable, and responsive to the needs of Sonoma County residents.

< **BOX OUT** >

COMMUNITY AT THE CORE OF THE CAC

*Sec. 2-397. – Establishment and appointment of IOLERO community advisory council (CAC). (a) Purpose. An IOLERO community advisory council is hereby established to **increase visibility for the public into the delivery by the sheriff-coroner of policing and corrections services**, to provide community participation in the review and establishment of sheriff-coroner policies, procedures, practices, training, and initiatives, and to engage the public to better understand the role of IOLERO and of the sheriff-coroner. The members of the IOLERO CAC shall adhere to the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) Code of Ethics.*

Community engagement is a cornerstone of the CAC's mission and effectiveness. When functioning at its best, the CAC serves a dual role: it creates meaningful pathways for residents to provide input and share concerns and equips the community with clear, accessible information about the laws, practices, and systems that shape public safety in Sonoma County.

The CAC bridges the gap between technical policy and lived experience through listening sessions, town halls, and public resources, fostering transparency and trust.

As noted in the 2023–2024 IOLERO Annual Report, the CAC has taken meaningful steps toward deepening its engagement efforts. It has expanded from outreach that *informs* the public to practices that *invite the public to guide its priorities*. This shift reflects a broader commitment to participatory oversight and a belief that communities closest to the issues must be part of the solutions.

< NEW SECTION >

RULES THE CAC ABIDES BY

Like other local government agencies, the CAC, as a civilian volunteer oversight agency, is obligated by its own rules that members and staff are expected to know and follow:

1. Measure P (IOLERO/CAC) (Sonoma County Ordinance No. 6333)

Passed by voters in 2020, this measure significantly expanded IOLERO's powers. It formalized the Community Advisory Council's (CAC) role as a key vehicle for community input, transparency, and oversight of the Sheriff's Office.

2. The CAC Bylaws

Adopted in June 2023, the bylaws outline how the CAC operates, from how members are appointed and organized to how meetings are run and decisions made. They affirm the CAC's role as a bridge between the public and IOLERO, focusing on transparency, equity, and ethical conduct.

3. NACOLE Code of Ethics

Like other oversight agencies, the CAC adheres to the NACOLE Code of Ethics (the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement). This nationally recognized framework promotes integrity, transparency, independence, and respect for community voice in civilian oversight. By aligning with these standards, the CAC grounds its work in nationwide best practices from oversight bodies.

4. Public meeting laws: California's public meeting rules, governed by the Brown Act and Robert's Rules of Order, promote public access, transparency, and efficient meeting management.

Brown Act: Governing public meetings for local legislative bodies like the CAC, the law includes several key requirements:

Quorum requirements: More than half the appointed members must be present to take action or deliberate as a body. When a quorum is present, the meeting must be open to the public, and an agenda must be posted at least 72 hours in advance. Discussion is limited to the items listed on the agenda, and public participation must be allowed on those items and general matters within the CAC's jurisdiction.

Prohibition on serial meetings: CAC members may not engage in a series of communications that involve a quorum, whether directly or through intermediaries, to discuss, deliberate, or develop a shared position on an issue. These so-called *serial meetings* violate the Brown Act's intent, even if communication is spread across emails, texts, or individual conversations.

Members should also avoid discussing CAC and/or IOLERO-related matters with the public outside of official CAC meetings to maintain transparency and prevent the appearance of impropriety. The public is, however, encouraged to suggest items for future agendas through appropriate channels.

Robert's Rules of Order: This set of rules provides a framework for conducting meetings in an orderly manner. It outlines motions, voting, and debate procedures to ensure fair, efficient, and democratic decision-making.

5. Commitment to civil engagement: Norms for dialogue and collaboration

Effective oversight depends on respectful, constructive dialogue that upholds freedom of speech while valuing diverse perspectives. CAC members are committed to fostering a collaborative environment where all voices can be heard, considered, and engaged respectfully and without disruption.

To support this, the CAC developed a shared set of norms that shape how members show up for one another, the community, and IOLERO staff. These practices reflect its commitment to professional, inclusive, and purpose-driven collaboration. The commitment is posted in the monthly agenda packet.

< NEW SECTION >

COMMUNITY OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT

Community outreach and engagement are core to the CAC's mission and objectives. As a CAC member, we are encouraged to bring our perspective as a community member to our work while also centering the broader community. That means actively involving residents in oversight processes, ensuring their concerns and ideas are surfaced, and integrating their feedback to help shape policies and practices. It also means working towards increasing community awareness in multiple areas, including the role of the CAC, IOLERO, the laws and legalities that direct law enforcement, and an individual's rights regarding law enforcement.

The CAC's operations and ways of working emphasize diversity and align with best practices outlined by NACOLE and similar organizations, including other oversight bodies and – where relevant and appropriate – government agencies. These organizations highlight that oversight bodies are most effective when deeply rooted in their communities, fostering a collaborative environment where trust can grow.

Community Outreach in Action

Community outreach is the foundation of the CAC's work to build relationships, raise awareness, and invite participation in oversight processes. Unlike engagement, which emphasizes collaboration and dialogue, outreach focuses on connecting with residents and community members where they are and ensuring they are informed about the CAC's work, the role of IOLERO, and their rights when interacting with law enforcement.

Through various methods, including public events, media campaigns, and digital communications, the CAC ensures that information is accessible, straightforward, and widely distributed to diverse audiences across Sonoma County.

Means + Ways

CAC website

A comprehensive and well-maintained website can serve as a vital avenue for transparency, accessibility, and consistent communication with the community. As people access and absorb information in expanding ways, a website can serve as a central hub among many channels. The CAC website should house essential resources such as meeting agendas, annual reports, research and resources, as well as up-to-date information about the CAC's activities and oversight initiatives.

Currently, the CAC's central website is associated with and accessible through IOLERO's website, with separate web pages for its recommendations and reports. The CAC recently began sharing web pages on its Ad Hoc initiatives and maintains these even after an Ad Hoc committee successfully achieves its goals. In this way, the CAC's activities are catalogued for review and possible replication later, in a repository for residents and visitors to reference.

By maintaining an up-to-date and easy-to-navigate site, the CAC ensures that community members are kept informed, can access key information at any time, and can participate meaningfully in oversight processes.

Best practices for a comprehensive web presence

- **Collaborate with care** - Web content should be a shared effort among CAC members, with each contributor responsible for drafting accurate, relevant materials. All content must be reviewed and approved by CAC leadership before publication.

- **Be timely and informative** - Prioritize content that supports public understanding of oversight, law enforcement practices, and community safety. Use IOLERO's support to ensure materials are published in a timely, accessible, and accurate manner.
- **Distribute widely** - To maximize reach, share all website materials across CAC and IOLERO social media channels, highlight them within CAC networks, and reference them in relevant discussions to expand community awareness and engagement.
- **Ensure accessibility** - Ensure all website content is accessible by providing translations, adhering to accessibility standards, and optimizing for different devices. Use multimedia formats like audio, video, and infographics to accommodate diverse learning styles and make complex information easier to understand.

NICE TO HAVE

- As much as possible, develop a content calendar to regularly refresh website materials, ensuring timely updates for meetings, reports, or new initiatives. This proactive approach will keep the community engaged and encourages them to recognize the website as a reliable, up-to-date resource.
- Review website analytics regularly to determine what content resonates most with the community. Incorporate user feedback to improve navigation, identify information gaps, and refine content to better serve community needs.

IOLERO Newsletter

Another avenue for communication with community members and coalition groups is IOLERO's monthly newsletter. Community members are encouraged to subscribe and stay connected through this newsletter, which informs the public about the office's activities and developments in law enforcement oversight. The CAC coordinates with IOLERO to also use this platform to share updates on oversight initiatives and promote opportunities for community engagement.

Best practices for leveraging a newsletter/agency publication

- **Collaborate on content development** - CAC members, especially ad hoc committees, should consider their promotional needs early and coordinate with IOLERO/shared resources to broadly disseminate updates, perspectives, and insights. As much as possible, planning out the year or, at minimum, flagging important dates, initiatives, and meetings will enable us to prepare content and consider additional communications issues that might bolster messaging and programs (e.g., multimedia, accessibility, translation, etc.)

- **Ensure audience-centric content** - Because the Sonoma County community is broad and diverse, aim for clear, concise, and conversational yet professional language. Break down complex concepts, such as legal obligations or policies, into plain language and include summaries or visuals (e.g., infographics) to make information more accessible and easily understood.
- **Be mindful of timing** - CAC members are responsible for ensuring content is accessible and understood by all members of Sonoma's diverse communities. To promote inclusivity and engagement, CAC translates all materials into Spanish. Therefore, plan accordingly to allow sufficient time to prepare and deliver content effectively.
- **Call-to-action focus** - Clearly articulate the 'so what' by including calls to action or actionable items in articles and materials, highlighting upcoming meetings, surveys, or engagement opportunities. These elements help keep readers engaged.

NICE TO HAVE

- **Cross-promotion and engagement** - Maximize the newsletter's reach and impact by liking and sharing it across social media platforms, including personal accounts, if appropriate. Discuss the focus areas in the latest issue and share them among local community networks. Use analytics to track subscriber growth, open rates, and community feedback to refine content, improve visibility, and focus on what resonates most with readers.

Social Media

Social media is a powerful tool for outreach and awareness, allowing us to share information on platforms that community members and residents are likely already using.

The CAC's social media protocol is primarily dictated by Sonoma County's 9-1 Policy for Official Use of Social Media Sites, which was approved by the County of Sonoma Board of Supervisors in April 2011. The policy sets clear guidelines for officially administered accounts. It does not regulate personal social media use by employees or volunteers like CAC members unless they post in an official capacity. However, the line between personal and professional roles can easily blur, especially when social media activity might be perceived as conflicting with or compromising the integrity of CAC's oversight work. With that in mind, exercise discretion and refer to the County's social media policy for best practices and expectations.

While social media is great for real-time engagement, official agency websites remain the primary public information source.

What the county policy says: An overview

- According to the policy, every county-run social media account is considered an extension of the county's network. That means it must follow the same rules that apply to other government communications, including public records retention and accessibility standards.
- Social media posts are considered public records; therefore, all content must be archived and managed according to records retention policies.
- If an agency allows public comments, it must clearly state the purpose of the discussion and set ground rules.
- Comments that are off-topic, profane, discriminatory, promote illegal activity, or compromise public safety can be removed. While these platforms allow public participation, CAC accounts are not open forums for unrestricted speech; they exist to support the agency's mission and facilitate constructive dialogue.
- When posting on behalf of the county, employees and contractors must ensure that content is accurate, professional, and aligned with the agency's public service role.
- No confidential information should be shared, and political endorsements or commercial promotions are strictly off limits unless specifically approved.
- Each agency must identify its official presence and be transparent about who maintains the account.
- To keep things running smoothly, agencies must designate responsible staff, maintain account access records, and enforce compliance with this policy.
- The county's Information Services Provider (ISP) oversees social media approvals, technical standards, and public comment policies to ensure consistency across all county departments.

This policy ensures that social media is used ethically, legally, and effectively to serve the public. Setting clear expectations allows Sonoma County agencies to engage with the community transparently and professionally aligned with public service values.

Access and familiarize yourself with the full policy [here](#).

Events

Hosting, attending, and participating in community events is essential for CAC members to stay connected with residents, build trust, and remain informed about community developments.

It's essential to be mindful of quorum constraints when attending events, even social gatherings. A majority of currently appointed CAC members constitutes a quorum, triggering Brown Act requirements and turning the event into a public meeting.

When organizing or attending events, CAC members should coordinate to determine availability and who is best suited to attend and represent the group. The team should also consider key talking points and be mindful of what might be inappropriate to discuss in a public setting (e.g., speculation about ongoing investigations or personal opinions on the Sheriff/ SCSO).

Being invited to participate in or attend an event is an even more powerful opportunity than hosting one. Partnering with other community organizations or agencies can amplify our message, expand our network, and provide access to new resources and outreach practices. It's a chance to get out into the community, represent the CAC, build stronger relationships, and elevate the agency's mission by aligning it with others who share similar goals. These partnerships create more avenues for exposure and increase the likelihood that people will connect with the services and message.

Tabling

Tabling is a widely used community engagement strategy in which oversight agencies set up informational booths or tables at gatherings, public events, or spaces. By establishing a consistent presence in the community, the CAC meets people where they are and fosters authentic, human-centered connections. Over time, this visibility helps community members become familiar with the agency, its branding, and its mission.

Direct, face-to-face interactions enable community members to provide genuine and immediate feedback, ask questions, share information, and build greater trust in the CAC and its role in the community. Beyond building rapport, tabling is a powerful platform for educational outreach, sharing important information, clarifying misconceptions, and raising awareness about the agency's services and individuals' rights. Regular participation increases

the agency's visibility, fosters recognition, reinforces its commitment to transparency, and helps to build long-term community trust.

For oversight agencies, tabling is vital for connecting with residents in person. It creates an accessible space for residents to engage directly with the agency's work.

Best practices for effective tabling

- **Be prepared** - Do your homework to confidently speak about your role and related topics, such as the CAC, IOLERO, the Sheriff's office, and public safety. Remember, it's not a test; all you need to do is be authentic, genuinely curious, and empathetic. For example, if you're asked something you don't know, simply acknowledge it and offer to follow up with more information.
- **Practice facilitation and active listening** - Tabling is an excellent opportunity to increase awareness. Still, it's also a prime time to listen to community members' firsthand experiences and gauge their sentiments on specific issues. Be prepared to listen actively and take note of what you hear. You're not expected to solve problems on the spot. Instead, focus on understanding concerns and then bring them back to the full CAC/IOLERO. From there, determine if the issue is isolated, a broader trend that demands action, or something to monitor further.
- **Don't be shy** - The table should be visually inviting, but even if it's not always packed with people, don't hesitate to engage passersby. Ask if they're familiar with the CAC or IOLERO, and share materials available on hand. Offering snacks, swag, or freebies can draw people in. Once they approach the table, connect and listen to their concerns, ideas, and perspectives.
- **Encourage visitors to attend a monthly CAC meeting** – Many people who stop at the table will not know IOLERO or the regular CAC meetings. If you speak to someone who seems engaged in the conversation, encourage them to attend a CAC meeting to learn more and share their perspective.

NICE TO HAVE

Have a call to action - Include a call to action at your table to turn passive engagement into active participation.

Be sure to keep it simple. People will only spend a few minutes at your table, so ensure the ask is quick by focusing on one or two meaningful actions. A simple request, like signing up for updates or completing a short survey, is effective.

Effective calls to action should be relevant, straightforward, and easy to complete. For example, ask residents to submit feedback on law enforcement policies at a neighborhood safety event rather than offering a general flyer about oversight.

Every action should have a clear follow-up plan. A successful call to action isn't just about immediate action - it's about building lasting engagement and trust.

Speaking Engagements

Occasionally, members of the CAC are invited to speak on panels or participate in other speaking engagements. These opportunities are highly encouraged as they provide valuable engagement with the community and the opportunity to share insights about the role of accountability and oversight in public safety.

Like events and tabling, any opportunity to connect with the public and highlight the impact of the CAC's work is crucial. Speaking engagements also allow members to emphasize the interconnected nature of public safety and how it influences and is influenced by broader social issues such as economic development, housing, and quality of life.

These engagements also offer an excellent opportunity to collaborate with other groups serving Sonoma County communities. Participation demonstrates the CAC's commitment to working alongside others to foster positive change.

Best practices when accepting speaking engagements

- **Ensure alignment** - When accepting speaking engagements, it's essential to ensure alignment between the event and the CAC's values, mission, and purpose. Consider who is inviting you, where the event is being held, and the topic you've been asked to speak on. Research past events, speakers, and themes. The groups you associate with and the spaces you engage in directly reflect the CAC's credibility and reputation. Partnering with or attending events that conflict with the CAC's mission or the communities it serves can risk eroding trust and legitimacy. Additionally, participating in events without a clear connection to public safety may dilute your message and impact.

- **Know your audience and tailor your message** - Customize your message to fit the event's theme and topic. Consider your audience's makeup and areas of interest, and speak to those to ensure what you say resonates. For the most part, expect to focus on fundamentals, such as your role, the work and mandate of CAC and IOLERO, and their relationship, and the SCSO. Use clear, concise, easy-to-follow, and impactful statements and avoid jargon.
 - **Be ready for tough questions** - You may be asked challenging questions or confronted by members of the public who are upset and frustrated. Do your best to anticipate questions that might arise and prepare for them. Exercise emotional intelligence and empathy as you respond calmly and factually, and if you don't have an answer, offer to follow up afterward.
 - **Connect and follow up:** While it may not always be possible, consider how to engage the audience. Creating opportunities for interaction, as simple as a show-of-hands question, enhances the impact of your message. Even if live engagement isn't feasible, always bring materials that clearly explain your agency's efforts and have a means of capturing attendee information. Only do so with the agreement or collaboration of the host partner.
 - **Follow up after the event** - Thanking attendees, sharing additional resources, answering any remaining questions, or summarizing key points reinforces the CAC's commitment to transparency and continued engagement, leaving a lasting, positive impression.
-

Media Invitations

IOLERO staff participated in the **2024 Sonoma County Media Relations Training**, which covered key strategies for navigating media interactions and communicating effectively with the public. The training included:

- Tools for working with the media
- Best practices for digital communication
- Tips for interviews and public messaging
- An overview of the County's Communications Team and protocols

The complete **Sonoma County Media Relations Guide** and the county's media policy are available in the CAC Resource Binder on Google Drive.

< NEW SECTION >

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: HOW TO DO IT

Community engagement is about collaboration, building mutual trust through conversation, listening, and shared problem-solving. For the CAC, it means creating space for residents to inform, influence, and shape the oversight process. Engagement goes beyond telling the public; it invites them to take part.

Because the CAC is a public body, engagement efforts must follow formal requirements to ensure transparency and fairness. Per the bylaws and rules regarding official meetings, the CAC is subject to quorum requirements. A specific number of members (quorum) must be present to conduct business and make decisions, ensuring that any actions or recommendations reflect a representative portion of the CAC.

That also means that if enough members are present to constitute a quorum, the session must be noticed and abide by the rest of the public meeting rules. This allows for public presence and demonstrates a commitment to transparency and inclusion. The requirement aligns with standard good governance practices for public bodies, providing legitimacy and accountability in the council's oversight activities.

While compliance with open meeting laws like the Brown Act is strongly encouraged, sometimes oversight agencies need the flexibility to move quickly or meet and work at a frequency that makes adhering to open-meeting rules untenable. CAC members should be discerning when making such decisions. The following sections include ways of maintaining community connection and input beyond monthly and ad hoc meetings.

Means + Ways

Monthly Meetings

The Community Advisory Council convenes monthly. At the time of writing, these meetings are held on the second Wednesday of each month at 6:00 PM, as stipulated in the CAC bylaws. Permanent changes to meeting schedules require an amendment to the bylaws. These in-

person meetings (also available virtually) are open to the public, ensuring transparency and community involvement.

Regular monthly meetings are pivotal for:

- **Ensuring timely oversight:** Consistent meetings allow the CAC to promptly address developments within the Sheriff's Office and respond to community concerns.
- **Facilitating community engagement:** Monthly gatherings provide a structured platform for residents to voice their perspectives, fostering trust and collaboration.
- **Maintaining accountability:** Regular sessions enable the CAC to monitor progress on policy recommendations and ensure that the SCSO adheres to agreed-upon reforms.

These meetings are conducted per the Brown Act, guaranteeing that agendas are publicly posted at least 72 hours in advance and that the public can participate.

For the most current meeting schedules, agendas, and locations, please refer to the IOLERO Calendar.

Ad Hoc Committees (Ad Hocs)

Oversight agencies, including CAC, are responsible for being informed and studying, reviewing, and providing insights on policing protocols, policies, and procedures.

An Ad Hoc committee (sometimes called a task force or simply ad hoc) is a subset of members that convene regularly to work on a particular issue or focus area over a specified time. This approach is often used in police oversight to address specific issues, respond to high-profile incidents, and review and discuss policing trends impacting communities.

Ad Hocs differ from other committee configurations in that they are temporary (unlike, for example, a steering committee), typically formed to address a particular issue, and dissolve once they've completed their mandate.

Ad Hoc topics should be:

- Impactful or potentially impact the community
- Public safety-specific and/or SCSO-focused
- Required or related to charter requirements

Ad Hocs are primarily established at the yearly CAC strategic planning session when important and relevant issues are identified.

Best practices for an effective Ad Hoc

Clear mandate + objectives - Discuss and agree on a well-defined mission with specific goals and a clear scope of investigation. **All Ad Hocs are expected to use SMART goals** (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) to ensure clarity, accountability, and forward momentum. This keeps the work focused, actionable, and easier to track over time.

Inclusive community representation - Whenever possible, Ad Hoc committees should include or engage community members from outside the CAC. Involving community stakeholders and integrating their voices ensures that the committee's efforts and recommendations reflect the concerns and needs of those most impacted by the SCSO.

Follow-up mechanisms - An Ad Hoc Committee should anticipate providing progress reports to the CAC at regular intervals or when requested by the CAC Chair, Vice Chairs, or other members. Upon completing its stated goals and objectives, the committee should prepare a full report for the CAC, relevant partners, and stakeholders. These reports shall be posted on the IOLERA website.

Additionally, when an Ad Hoc committee's work involves recommendations to the Sheriff for review and potential implementation, it is good etiquette and fosters a collaborative partnership to engage the Sheriff or their designate to discuss findings, gather feedback, and refine recommendations before publicly sharing the committee's process and outcomes.

Ensure lasting impact - Particularly when addressing complex or long-term issues, some Ad Hocs propose follow-up structures or transition their recommendations to a more permanent body, such as a steering committee or a standing CAC agenda item. This continuity helps sustain momentum and support meaningful implementation.

Transparency and communication - Regular public updates and a final publicly available report help to maintain transparency, build trust, enhance community awareness, and keep pressure on authorities to enact the committee's recommendations. For the duration of the Ad Hoc, the committee should consider other means to strengthen community awareness about the issue in question, creating an easily accessible and regularly updated repository of research, recordings, and outputs.

Ad Hocs: How to Execute

It helps to approach and organize an Ad Hoc as if it were a unique project with a framework to organize activities and integrate milestones. Make time to discuss and develop a plan with clear phases, acknowledged logistical requirements, and milestones that lead to action. Here's a simple framework to help organize the work:

1. Discovery & Learning

Get grounded in the topic. Gather relevant research, best practices, model policies, and input from subject matter experts or key stakeholders. This phase helps members build shared understanding and identify where the Ad Hoc can have the most impact.

2. Planning & Design

Map out the work. Decide what activities must happen, such as reviewing policies, drafting recommendations, hosting forums, inviting experts, or consolidating perspectives. Assign roles, set timelines, and ensure deliverables align with your goals. There may be many moving parts to executing this stage, including:

- *Planning and logistics:* Scheduling, preparation for meetings, running the meeting, following up, keeping notes, responding to queries, creating and updating web pages
- *Outreach:* Surveys, public forums, promotional material, language access (if required)

Consider and incorporate these elements as necessary for the overall objective.

3. Reporting and Decision-Making

Ad Hocs report progress during regular CAC meetings. When work is ready for action or endorsement, prepare a clear summary or presentation, including key findings, options, and a recommended path forward. Help the full CAC and the public understand the “why” and “how” of your work.

Checklist:

- Have a clear vision of the desired outcome.
 - Establish **SMART goals** to define objectives.
 - Create a roadmap with clear deliverables, timeline, accountability structure, and approach to tracking progress.
 - Ensure alignment of outputs and division of labor.
-

Listening Sessions

A listening session is a structured gathering where community members share their experiences, concerns, and perspectives with an agency or organization. Unlike town halls or special meetings, which often involve presentations or discussion, listening sessions are designed for active listening. They provide a space for participants to speak freely while CAC members and supporting staff focus on hearing and recording anecdotes, suggestions, concerns, and responses to prompts.

For law enforcement oversight agencies like the CAC, listening sessions are crucial tools for building trust, identifying systemic issues, and shaping oversight priorities based on direct community input. They create a safe forum for community members, especially those who may feel unheard or avoid traditional public meetings, to voice concerns about the SCSO, public safety, and accountability in a setting centered on their experiences.

Best practices for effective listening sessions

- **Set clear objectives** - Define the session's purpose (e.g., gathering feedback on a specific policy, understanding community concerns, or informing future oversight efforts.) Be transparent about how input will be used and commit to meaningful follow-up so participants see the impact of their contributions.
- **Create a safe and inclusive space** - Choose welcoming, neutral, and accessible locations. Address potential barriers, such as language access and physical accessibility. To encourage open sharing, set ground rules to maintain a respectful and open dialogue and consider offering anonymity or non-attribution, especially for sensitive topics. Thoughtful facilitation ensures broad participation, particularly from historically marginalized groups.
- **Facilitate, don't dominate** - The CAC's role is to listen, not to defend or explain. Use neutral facilitators when possible.
- **Document key takeaways** - Capture key themes, recurring concerns, and insights while maintaining anonymity where needed. This helps identify patterns and inform oversight priorities.
- **Follow up with action** - Show that community voices matter by summarizing key themes, outlining next steps, and providing updates on addressing concerns. Transparent follow-up strengthens trust and accountability.

Town Halls and Special Meetings

A key tool in oversight and outreach, town halls provide a structured forum for public dialogue and an opportunity to expand community awareness. Unlike listening sessions, which prioritize community voices without direct response, town halls typically feature the oversight agency alongside key stakeholders, such as subject matter experts, impacted community representatives, and, at times, law enforcement, engaging in discussion directly with or in front of the public.

These events often include a panel discussion or brief presentation before opening up to a public Q&A or informal conversations afterward. This way, town halls foster understanding and clarify public safety and oversight issues.

Sometimes, the CAC or IOLERO may also convene a *special meeting* to address time-sensitive matters outside the regular meeting schedule. While these meetings require only 24 hours' public notice and must stay tightly focused on the posted agenda, they are still subject to the Brown Act's transparency rules. Oversight bodies should use this tool judiciously, ensuring that urgent timelines never come at the cost of public trust or participation.

Why host a town hall or special meeting?

Town halls and special meetings are helpful for complicated issues requiring time and space to understand, absorb, and debate.

- **Policy changes (significant or contentious implications)** – When a policy requires substantial changes or the proposed changes impact public safety, oversight, or accountability in ways that may spark controversy or widespread debate, a town hall offers a space for community dialogue and input. Town Halls are useful for gathering public input on policies, priorities, or recommendations before they are finalized.
- **A new law or legal decision with broad impact** – Legislative changes, court rulings, or ballot measures that influence law enforcement practices, civilian oversight, or public rights may require public education and discussion in the form of a town hall to ensure the community understands the implications and has a voice in shaping responses.

- **Community crisis or significant incident** – If a critical incident involving law enforcement occurs (e.g., use of force, misconduct allegations, or a high-profile case), a town hall can provide a forum for the community to voice concerns and receive updates.
- **Public safety trends or emerging issues** – When there is a growing concern about crime trends, law enforcement practices, or oversight matters, a town hall allows for broader discussion and information sharing.
- **Oversight agency updates** – If the CAC is making significant changes to its operations, launching new initiatives, or releasing a critical report, a town hall can help educate the public and gather feedback.
- **Community-driven concerns** – If residents or advocacy groups have raised ongoing issues related to policing and oversight, hosting a special meeting can demonstrate responsiveness and commitment to transparency.
- **Collaboration with other stakeholders** – Special meetings can bring together various public safety, legal, and community partners to discuss shared issues, ensuring a well-rounded conversation.

These events foster transparency, offer residents the opportunity to raise concerns, and allow oversight bodies like the CAC to invite speakers, experts, and impacted residents to share their perspectives, findings, and recommendations. When done right, they can also be another space for respectful debate and discussion with the SCSO to help bridge the gap between the community and law enforcement.

Best practices for a successful town hall

- **Clearly define the purpose** – Clarity on objectives ensures that panelists and attendees understand the event’s intent and stay on track.
- **Ensure accessibility and representation** – The event should be held in a neutral, welcoming space with considerations for language access, disability accommodations, timing, and transportation. Additionally, panelists should reflect on the diverse communities impacted by policing and oversight.
- **Set ground rules for constructive dialogue** – Public safety discussions can be highly charged. Establishing clear guidelines, such as time limits for speakers, respectful engagement expectations, rules of conduct, and moderated Q&A sessions, helps maintain a productive atmosphere.

- **Facilitate, don't dominate** – The CAC should guide discussions but allow space for community input. Where possible, consider engaging skilled, neutral moderators to help ensure the conversation remains balanced and community-driven.
 - **Provide multiple ways to participate** – Not everyone is comfortable speaking publicly. Offering alternative methods such as written comment cards, online submissions, or breakout discussions ensures broader engagement.
 - **Follow up with transparency** – Town halls should not be one-off events. Share materials ahead of time, leverage your web presence and social media platforms to socialize the topic, and familiarize community members with the issue. Document key takeaways, share them with attendees, and outline how the agency will act on community feedback. This reinforces accountability and builds trust.
-

CONCLUSION

This playbook is designed to support the CAC in its work, offering guidance, tools, and expectations for work individually and collectively. It reflects the values embedded in Measure P, the CAC bylaws, and the nationwide best practices from oversight bodies.

As the CAC's work evolves, this document should, too. Members are encouraged to revisit it regularly, reflect on what's working, and suggest necessary improvements. Oversight is not static; it requires iteration with integrity and shared purpose.

Whether you're leading an Ad Hoc, hosting a town hall, reviewing a policy, or just starting your first term, this playbook is here to help you stay focused on what matters most: building trust, advancing transparency, and ensuring the community's voice is at the heart of public safety in Sonoma County.

IOLERO Community Advisory Council Report: Sonoma County Sheriff Department Canine Policy

Prepared by Canine Ad Hoc Committee

Introduction

In 2022-23, Sheriff Department handler/canine teams were involved in 3 serious dog bite incidents which led not only to serious injuries to suspects, but also to litigation settlement payments of \$2.2 million, as well as unpublished litigation costs. IOLERO found that in each incident, Sheriff deputies “likely violated” SCSO canine policy. No discipline occurred. While SCSO has made recent improvements in canine policy, the CAC Canine Policy Ad Hoc Committee has identified additional areas where the Sheriff can and should update canine policy to provide more “comprehensive and specific” guidance in the application and regulation of canine force, as required by state law. The Committee offers this report and these recommendations -- intended to increase accountability and public trust in Sheriff operations -- for adoption by the full Community Advisory Commission.

Summary of Report

- 1. IOLERO audits revealed “likely violations” of SCSO canine policy leading to serious dog bite injuries.**
- 2. In two instances, SCSO canines failed to release bite on command.**
- 3. County paid \$2.2 million to settle canine force lawsuits.**
- 4. SCSO has made useful, but limited changes to canine policy.**
- 5. CAC Canine Policy Committee conducted research, interviews and observations of canine program.**
- 6. SCSO leadership declined invitation to participate in public meeting or private meeting to discuss policy questions and concerns.**
- 7. Committee remains concerned SCSO policy lacks “comprehensive and specific” guidance for canine force.**
- 8. Committee recommends canine policy changes to increase clarity, effectiveness, accountability, public safety.**

Summary of Activities and Research By Committee

The Canine Policy Ad Hoc Committee formed after IOLERO audits identified shortcomings in canine field deployments and canine policy in 3 separate SCSO canine apprehensions during 2022 and 2023, each having led to serious injuries to suspects. In at least one case, SCSO expressly rejected IOLERO conclusions and recommendations. As a result of these canine deployments, two suspects injured by SCSO canines filed federal excessive force lawsuits. The County agreed to pay the claimants settlements of \$1.35 million and \$850,000, while also incurring substantial costs of defense.

The Committee's guiding principle in reviewing canine policy has been the California Legislature's legal requirement, as stated in Penal Code Section 7286, that law enforcement agencies adopt and maintain policies which provide **"comprehensive and specific guidelines regarding approved methods and devices available for the application of force."** This requirement for increased force policy specificity has been adopted by both the California Department of Justice and POST (California Commission on Police Officer Standards and Training).

In June, 2024, members of the Committee and a member of IOLERO staff met with two SCSO Sergeants who oversee the canine program for general orientation and discussion. During a roughly 90-minute meeting with the Sergeants, the Committee heard general information about the program, about canine use in law enforcement, and about canine/handler training and tactics in the field. Among the things the Committee was told was that determinations regarding canine use to apprehend are necessarily subjective and difficult to direct with specific policy controls, and that canines are typically not released to apprehend suspects who are known to be armed.

After meeting with the Sergeants, the Committee attended canine program training at (The North County Detention Facility). During the training session several sheriff dog/handler teams demonstrated on and off-leash command maneuvers, canine team search and locate tactics, and canine apprehend/bite, call off and release maneuvers. The Committee found SCSO personnel engaged and helpful, and upon departing from the training session, the Sergeants invited Committee members to reach out with any future questions, requests for information or for future meetings for further exposure to the canine program.

The Committee also reviewed the SCSO-funded canine policy assessment by Sheepdog International, as well as various reports on canine force policy and tactics prepared by several law enforcement leadership groups and civil rights

advocates. The Committee also reviewed numerous canine policies of other Northern California county and city law enforcement agencies.

In September, 2024, the Committee invited SCSO canine program personnel to participate in a public town hall to introduce and explore SCSO canine policy and practice, but SCSO leadership declined the invitation, and later expressed concern with the planned forum and desire to be included in planning.

At CAC's annual workshop in February, 2025, Sheriff Eddie Engram told the CAC and members of the public that SCSO was satisfied with the state of its canine policy, in part because there had been no canine bite/apprehensions since changes were made to canine policy in Fall of 2024. For example, Sheriff Engram publicly identified a change which directed handlers to make the determination to employ canine force based on threat level presented by the suspect's conduct at the time of the arrest, rather than consideration of past violent conduct by the suspect.

In March, 2025, the Committee sent policy comments and questions to SCSO, and asked to meet with SCSO canine personnel to discuss those matters. SCSO leadership declined to meet with the Committee, citing both satisfaction with the current state of the policy and an unwillingness to incur overtime expenses.

(Current SCSO Canine Policy and Canine Committee Communications attached for reference.)

Canine Ad Hoc Committee Report

The Committee's report seeks to be brief, and is directed to its efforts to review SCSO canine policy to identify ways SCSO canine policy could become more "comprehensive and specific," could provide better, more detailed guidance for handlers in the field, could more clearly describe expectations and requirements for handling canine deployment, and could minimize dog bites and injuries to suspects in ways consistent with SCSO law enforcement mission. These improvements in policy and practice would likely enhance SCSO's ongoing efforts to improve trust with the community.

- 1. During 2022-24 Sonoma County Paid \$2.2 Million to Settle Excessive Force Claims in Canine Bite Cases, in Addition to Legal Defense Costs Incurred.**

- a. During 2022, County paid \$1.35 million to settle a lawsuit brought by Jason Anglero-Wyrick. IOLERO reviewed the evidence and found that after the suspect had been tased and incapacitated, and was on the ground with his hands behind his back, the deputy/handler released the dog and ordered it to bite the suspect. The handler then intentionally permitted the dog to bite and hold the suspect for 27 seconds while he was being handcuffed. The handler then tried and failed to remove the dog from its bite for an additional 63 seconds. Mr. Anglero-Wyrick was charged with no crime other than resisting/obstructing a law enforcement officer. Mr. Anglero-Wyrick suffered substantial muscle and nerve damage to his lower leg. IOLERO concluded that the deputy “failed to provide an adequate factual basis for deploying the canine” to bite after the suspect was “incapacitated” by the Taser.
- b. During 2023, IOLERO reviewed an SCSO investigation regarding arrest of Roberto Hildebrand-Perez, who had been bitten by an SCSO canine when arrested for an outstanding warrant for failure to appear in court. IOLERO reviewed the evidence and reported that SCSO had information that Perez had a history of conviction for non-firearm weapon possession and domestic violence. Deputies had no objective basis for suspicion that Perez was armed with firearms. Perez was located in a shed he lived in. Deputies announced their presence and intent to send a canine into the shed. 51 seconds after announcements began, Perez’s companion walked out of the shed. 7 seconds after Perez’s companion emerged from the shed, the canine was released, entered the shed and bit Perez. The deputy/handler then entered the shed, saw that Perez was apparently unarmed with his hands up, and ordered the dog to release Perez. The handler began tugging at the dog’s harness. It took 18 seconds for the deputy to get the dog to release its bite. Perez sustained injuries from multiple bites to his shoulder, wrist and hand. Despite IOLERO’s request, SCSO never provided any explanation or analysis of the 18 seconds it took for the deputy to force the dog to release Perez.
- c. In November, 2024, County paid \$850,000 to settle a lawsuit brought by Adam Gabriel. IOLERO reviewed the evidence and concluded that an SCSO deputy released a canine to bite Gabriel, then a car-jacking suspect, while he was kneeling with his hands in

the air. When the deputy then ordered Gabriel to crawl on hands and knees toward the deputy, Gabriel -- who was not in fact involved in the car-jacking being investigated -- became angry and argued with the deputy, although he remained on his knees with hands up. The deputy ordered the dog to bite Mr. Gabriel not based on any identified threatening movement, but because he was looking around and perhaps "formulating a plan" to resist or escape. The dog bit Mr. Gabriel multiple times in the biceps/shoulder area causing extensive injury and requiring a week of hospitalization. IOLERO concluded that deescalation efforts were inadequate, and that releasing the dog to bite was not reasonable given that Gabriel posed no immediate threat at the time.

2. SCSO Has Amended Parts of its Canine Policy Following Comments from IOLERO Audits, Recent Lawsuits Alleging Excessive Force, and Community Advisory Ad Hoc Committee Comments

The Committee has reviewed SCSO Canine Policy 309 as it existed in August, 2023, and its most recent iteration published January 27, 2025. The January, 2025 version makes the following material changes:

- Removes "threatening to resist arrest" as a basis for canine "deployment."
- Provides more specificity describing instances when canines may be "deployed" to support warrant service.
- Identifies five circumstances when canines "shall not" be "deployed for subjects."
- Provides several factors to consider in determining when a dog must be directed to release bite (verbal surrender, suspect following officer command, suspect hands seen not in possession of weapon, adequate resources to control suspect).
- Requires canine deployment to be "continuously evaluated" to determine "appropriateness" of continued canine deployment.
- Requires verbal/physical control and "visual sight" of canine when practical.

These amendments taken as a whole represent meaningful improvement in SCSO canine policy, although, as set forth below, additional modifications should be made to the policy to provide more comprehensive and specific guidance to handlers in the field.

3. SCSO Declined to Meet with CAC in a Public Town Hall, or Privately with Ad Hoc Committee to Discuss Policy Analysis and Comments

As discussed above, SCSO leadership declined CAC's invitation to have canine program leadership make a presentation and answer questions regarding SCSO canine policy and practice at a public town hall. Thereafter, the Committee requested a private meeting between SCSO canine leadership and the Committee to discuss its policy questions and comments. In its request, the Committee asked to discuss:

- A mission statement for the use of canine force including specific purposes and limitations on such force.
- The need for definitions of key terms used by the policy -- "imminent threat," "violent resistance," "passive resistance" -- critical to providing clear guidance regarding use of canines.
- The need for canine-specific deescalation tactics and requirements.
- The need for a clearly identified tactical purpose(s) for releasing the dog to bite and hold a suspect.
- The need for clear guidance on common tactical situations -- armed suspects, verbally threatening suspects not believed to be armed, concealed suspects, fleeing suspects.
- The need for clearly identified guidance on when handler must order a canine to release, and what handler must do when canine fails to release.

(the Committee's communication requesting a meeting is attached.)

Despite Measure P's clear direction to the Sheriff to make staff available to IOLERO to facilitate review of policy, practice and training, and despite SCSO canine program leaders' invitation, after the June, 2024 training session, to continue dialog, SCSO leadership refused to authorize a meeting with the Committee to discuss its policy concerns and questions.

4. Department Canine Policy Continues to Lack Adequate Specific Guidance or Requirements for Canine Find, Bite and Release of Suspects

SCSO has updated its canine policy in useful but limited ways. Nevertheless, the Committee believes important issues remain, and that further updates are required to more closely approach the "comprehensive and specific" guidance for use of canine force which is required by California law.

a. Current Policy 309 lacks any Strategic Mission Statement Recognizing and Balancing Injury Canines Can Inflict and Safety Benefits Canines Can Confer

The Committee believes a thorough policy mission statement is needed. The policy should expressly recognize the seriousness of canine force and attendant injuries, which are often permanent, and explain the public safety reasons why SCSO uses such force. The Department should articulate requirements that such serious force must be used in a responsible, limited way, for clearly identifiable tactical purposes, and that violations by deputies will be subject to discipline.

b. SCSO Canine Policy Fails to Define Many of its Own Key Terms, and Lacks any Reference to Other Law Enforcement Requirements

The following terms which are used in Canine Policy 309 are not defined in that policy, or in Use of Force Policy 300:

- “Deployed for suspects”
- “Apprehended”
- “Imminent threat of violence or serious harm”
- “Violently resisting arrest”
- “In possession of a weapon likely to cause serious bodily injury”
- “Serious felony”
- “Verbally surrenders”
- “Adequate resources available to control the suspect”

These are key terms which guide and restrict when a canine may be released to bite a suspect, and when the canine must be called off its bite. They are currently undefined. Without such definitions, the policy cannot provide comprehensive and specific guidelines for deployment of a canine to bite and hold a suspect. This necessarily, and unacceptably, leaves these decisions to the discretion of the deputy/handler. Significantly, the lack of specificity effectively precludes SCSO from identifying policy violations and improper uses of canine force, and from disciplining handlers responsible for policy violation.

c. Canine Policy Fails to Identify Specific Tactical Goals or Principles for Canine Bites and Define Conditions for Termination of Canine Bites

The policy identifies suspect conduct which warrants canine “deployment.” (It does not say what “deployment” means -- in fact it means biting and holding a suspect.) But it does not state the acceptable purposes for canine deployment. The policy does not currently identify any tactical objective of the dog biting the suspect. The policy fails to answer basic questions:

- How does an attacking, biting canine help deputies to take a suspect into custody?
- Is the canine attack used to defend deputies and public from imminent harm? To disarm an armed suspect? To ensure that the suspect is not armed so that deputies can then approach and handcuff him?
- Is the canine used to compel the suspect to verbally and physically surrender due to pain or fear? To offer his hands for cuffing?
- Are deputies to go “hands on” while the dog is attacking? Or only after the dog has been called off?
- What parts of the body are to be bitten? What parts must not be bitten, and if bitten, require that the dog be called off?
- When is the tactical mission accomplished such that the dog must be called off?

None of these questions is answered by the current policy. Whatever the permissible, and impermissible, tactical purposes for using a biting dog to help get a suspect into custody, they should be stated with specificity, and must clearly require that the canine be removed when the specific tactical objective is achieved.

d. Canine Policy Fails to Adequately Anticipate Common Search and Arrest Scenarios and Explain When and How Canines May “Apprehend” Suspects

Law enforcement faces multiple predictable scenarios in which canines might be released to bite, such as:

- Unarmed suspects violently, actively or passively resisting arrest
- Fleeing suspects potentially armed
- Concealed or barricaded suspects potentially armed
- Non-compliant suspects potentially armed
- Persons in crisis potentially armed
- Suspects believed/known to be armed (firearms, other weapons and potential weapons)

The policy does not, but should anticipate and provide comprehensive, specific guidance for predictable scenarios. Such specificity would provide more clarity and better preparation for canine handlers. It would systematize responses, making canine encounters more predictable and trainable. It would also make policy violations clearer, and better subject to correction and discipline.

e. Canine Policy Does Not Expressly Require or Describe Specific Deescalation, Proportionality and Crisis Intervention Tactics, Requirements and Approaches

Deescalation and proportionality are legal requirements. Crisis intervention with people struggling to understand others and control behavior is a weekly or even daily event for law enforcement. These legal requirements and best practices need to be specifically incorporated into SCSO canine policy, with “comprehensive and specific” tactical guidance provided. Canines should not be used to bite suspects who do not pose an immediate, articulable threat to others. Canine bites should only be used when the injury they inevitably cause is clearly preferable to additional attempts at deescalation.

f. Canine Policy Fails to Describe When a Canine Must be Ordered to Release a Suspect, or what Handler Must do if Canine Fails to Release

Because current policy fails to specifically identify tactical objectives for deploying a canine to bite a suspect (ie, to distract, to prevent suspect from arming self, to ensure suspect is not armed, to compel compliance with orders, to permit handcuffing, etc.) the policy cannot and does not provide specific guidance as to when the dog must be called off the bite. Nor does current policy provide any guidance for the known risk that a canine may bite a suspect's head, throat, breast, genitalia, or fail to release the bite when commanded to. The policy says nothing about which body parts a dog must not be permitted to bite. Nor does it provide guidance about techniques or tools a handler must use when a canine does not release the suspect immediately when ordered to.

CAC's interest in contributing to policy drafting is in ensuring clarity, adherence to law, public safety, officer safety and avoiding unnecessary injury. CAC is in favor of more comprehensive and specific policy guidance which promotes these goals, while also enhancing community trust and accountability. CAC has identified several areas where the Sheriff can and should provide increased guidance to deputies in the field. If the Sheriff develops policy which addresses the following issues thoughtfully and thoroughly, SCSO canine policy will become more coherent, less likely to permit errors in judgment during critical events, and more likely to minimize unnecessary bites and excessive injury. For these reasons, CAC recommends that the Sheriff make the following changes in Canine Policy 309:

1. Adopt a mission statement for SCSO canine program and deployment which recognizes that canines released to bite suspects do cause injury, and sometimes, serious injury. State public safety reasons why SCSO nevertheless uses canines to bite and apprehend suspects, and how SCSO ensures that canine force is appropriately limited and controlled to ensure public safety and to minimize injury.
2. Define key terms currently undefined, including those set forth in this report.
3. Require canine-specific deescalation, proportionality and crisis intervention protocols, tactics and techniques.
4. Describe permissible tactical purposes for deploying a dog to bite and apprehend a suspect.
5. State requirements for when a canine is to be called off the bite following execution of tactical purpose of deployment, or determination that canine cannot aid in promptly executing the tactical purpose of the deployment.
6. State actions handler must take when canine does not release bite on command.
7. Describe tactics for predictable specific factual scenarios law enforcement commonly encounters in field, including those summarized in this report.
8. Provide appropriate admonition that violations of policy will subject handler to discipline as would any other violation of force policy.

**COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL RECOMMENDS CHANGES IN SHERIFF CANINE
POLICY FOLLOWING CANINE-CAUSED INJURIES**

The Community Advisory Council (CAC) for IOLERO is recommending changes to the Sonoma County Sheriff's canine policy after its review of SCSO dog-bites which led to serious injuries and lawsuit settlements totaling \$2.2 million during 2022-2023. CAC recommendations follow policy changes the Sheriff made in 2024.

IOLERO investigators found that three separate '22-'23 canine bite incidents "likely violated" policy. IOLERO found that deputies released dogs to bite suspects who did not pose immediate threat to deputies, that Sheriff's canines failed to release bitten suspects upon command, and that deputies failed to adequately "deescalate" confrontations in attempt to avoid canine bite injuries. The Sheriff found no wrongdoing and imposed no discipline.

Following nearly two years of analysis, the CAC recommendations seek to more fully comply with California Law which requires that Sheriff Office policy provide "comprehensive and specific" guidelines for any use of force, including use of canines to bite or "apprehend" suspects. Included in CAC recommendations to the Sheriff:

- Provide a mission statement of purpose and limitations for releasing canines to bite suspects;
- Identify the tactical purpose for releasing a canine to bite a suspect;
- Better identify when canine must be called off, and what deputy must do when the dog fails to release;
- Provide thorough guidance for common law enforcement scenarios: fleeing, barricaded, armed or non-compliant suspects, or subjects in mental crisis;
- Provide guidance for legally required deescalation specific to canine use;
- Provide higher levels of accountability in handler conduct to improve trust within the community.

A CAC sub-committee developed policy recommendations following two years of study including review of Sheriff canine incidents, review of reports and commentary by canine industry experts, meeting with Sheriff canine program leaders and attending Sheriff canine training. CAC's full report, Sheriff Canine Policy 309, and related materials can be accessed here:

From: **Casey Jones** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, Feb 17, 2025 at 8:37 PM
Subject: SCSO Canine Policy Review
To: <[Brent](#)> [REDACTED]
Cc: Robin Jurs <[rjurs](#)> [REDACTED]

Lt. Kidder:

Robin Jurs and I serve on the CAC Canine Policy Ad Hoc Committee. As you probably know, we are reviewing SCSO canine policy in the context of community concerns and expectations about law enforcement canine practices.

The Sheriff and SCSO leadership have recently made changes to canine policy. We have some familiarity with those changes, and have prepared the attached notes regarding SCSO canine policy as amended last fall. We previously met with Sgts. Parks and O'Neill, and attended a canine training session, which provided valuable insights. As a next step, we'd like to meet with them again to better understand policy updates and their implications.

We hope you can help coordinate this meeting and attend, along with the supervising lieutenant who oversees the canine program. Topics we'd like to discuss include:

- De-escalation tactics in canine deployment
- Under what circumstances handlers may deploy a canine to apprehend a suspect
- When and how handlers call off a canine, and the required response if the canine does not release on command.

We welcome the opportunity to hear directly from SCSO canine experts, and also to discuss community concerns about canine policy. Please let us know if you can help arrange this meeting. Happy to discuss further by phone if needed.

Casey Jones
[REDACTED]

"We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies." Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address

February, 2025

Canine Policy Study

The CAC ad hoc canine policy committee has reviewed Sheriff Engram's recent statements regarding SCSO's updated canine policy. Specifically, the Sheriff wrote in response to a Press Democrat editorial criticizing SCSO canine program, that Policy 309 regarding canines has been modified based in part on CAC's "recent recommendations." The Committee assumes that the Sheriff is referring to the Committee working notes which were published in its November, 2023 public meeting agenda. **CAC has made no formal recommendations to SCSO regarding canine policy since July, 2021, under a previous Sheriff. Those 2021 recommendations have never been responded to.**

Given the Sheriff's comments about policy changes, the Committee has reviewed SCSO Policy 309 dated October 16, 2024 against 2023 policy. We are pleased to note that SCSO has made its canine policy more "comprehensive and specific" in some areas, as required by Penal Code Section 7286. **Specifically, guidance for when canines "shall not" be deployed, and requirements for ordering canines to release their bite have been expanded, and meaningfully improved.** CAC congratulates SCSO on these improvements.

Following its recent policy review, the Committee continues to note areas for improvement, and has the observations, recommendations and requests set forth below, which it would like to discuss with SCSO canine program leadership:

Specific Comments re 309.6 "Apprehension Guidelines" dated 10/16/2024:

(these comments track Policy 309 by referring to its paragraph structure)

1. Instances where canines may be "deployed for suspects" **The word "apprehension" is nowhere defined and has been removed in favor of the even more vague language that a canine "can be deployed for suspects."** Why this change, and what does it mean? **Deescalation is not mentioned.** Is this intentional?
 - (a) Misdemeanor suspects are now specifically included as legitimate subjects for canine bites; However:
 - (a) "imminent threat" is not defined.
 - (b) "violently resisting arrest" is not defined.
 - (c) "possession of a weapon" without threat is often lawful conduct, and not a basis for a canine bite.
 - (b) **"Serious or violent felony" is not defined.** Many "serious" felonies are not violent.

“Actively resisting” is not defined, and not distinguished from “violently resisting arrest” as used above. As written, this paragraph authorizes canine search and bite for non-violent offenders hiding (concealed) from officers.

(c) **Warrant Service:** As written, this section permits use of a canine to bite during warrant service when the person to be served has a criminal history including firearms or previous “evasion,” and has possession of a weapon (which may be lawful), or is concealed. Is this intentional? Where is deescalation?

2. Instances Where Canines Shall Not Be Deployed:

3. **“Passive resistance” is not defined.** “Reasonably necessary given the totality of the circumstances” is no guidance at all in the context of undefined “passive resistance.” More specific guidance is required here. Policy should forbid canine apprehension against minors, visibly disabled persons, aged persons, etc. except when a specifically described imminent threat is present.

3. Guidance Re Ordering Canine to Release:

“Totality of circumstances” is not meaningful guidance.

Specific guidance is needed that a suspect “fighting the dog,” ie, defending against a biting canine, is not a basis for failing to order canine to release the suspect.

General Comments and Observations re Policy 309 dated 10/16/2024::

In addition to addressing the items identified above, the Committee requests that these additional areas be improved with more comprehensive and specific guidance, or that SCSO explain why it will not address them:

1. Updated Policy 309 does not make a **thorough humane statement of departmental purpose and intention to deputies and the community** regarding public safety reasons for use of trained canines to find and bite suspects, and recognition that use of canines to bite can severely injure people, and must be strictly controlled and limited.
2. Policy 309 does not provide comprehensive specific guidelines for when a canine may or shall not be deployed in predictable, **specific tactical scenarios including** (1) an on view confrontation with a suspect; (2) a concealed suspect; (3) a suspect believed to be armed; (4) a suspect threatening violent resistance with or without visible means of executing the threat, and the like. **Each common scenario should have comprehensive, specific policy guidelines.**

3. Policy 309's phrase "totality of circumstances" is not defined, and is highly subjective, inviting different handlers to interpret situations differently. **This general statement is reasonable guidance only after policy has provided "comprehensive and specific guidelines" for use of force, as described above.**
4. **Deescalation is not mentioned in Policy 309.** Deescalation is required by California Law. Specific guidance should be provided in this canine policy.
5. **Policy 309 does not cover specific training regarding release on command,** and what handlers must do if **release command is ineffective as has been documented in multiple SCSO arrests in recent years.** How is failure to release on command treated under this policy.
6. Can on-leash use of canines be enhanced such that uses of canines to bite and hold can be diminished?
7. Policy 309 does not state that use of canines in violation of policy is grounds for discipline as is any other improper use of force.
8. Where does SCSO provide policy guidance for use of canines in jail, if canines are used in jail?

The CAC canine ad hoc committee (Robin Jurs and David Jones) respectfully requests a meeting with leadership of the SCSO canine program, specifically, with Sergeants Parks and McNeill, and with any other personnel SCSO thinks appropriate, to discuss these and related issues.

SCSO Response to K9 Policy Ad Hoc Committee Summary Report

1. No comment.
2. No comment.
3. No comment.
4. Contradiction. SCSO amended portions of the Canine Policy (Policy 309) to align with Penal Code Section 835a and to ensure the most appropriate utilization of a canine to align with the Sheriff's Office overall mission and/or core values. Additionally, preceding lawsuits alleging excessive force, which were each thoroughly reviewed and decided upon, the Sheriff's Office considered associated resulting recommendations; some of which were implemented into current Canine Policy.
5. No comment.
6. No comment.
7. Policy 309.6 outlines in detail when a Canine "can be deployed" which would include the utilization of a canine to search and/or locate a person.
 - Policy 309.6 (1) (a-c) outlines specific criteria in which a Canine can be deployed.
 - Policy 309.6 (2) outlines specific criteria in which a Canine "shall not" be deployed.
 - Policy 309.6 (3) outlines specific criteria in which a Canine handler "shall promptly" direct the Canine to release. Additionally, Policy 309.6 (3) (1-2) includes additional factors to consider when assessing the suspect's intent or action(s) of surrendering.
 - Our current policy establishes specific and comprehensive guidelines and/or requirements in relation to a "Canine Search" and/or "Bite and Release of Crime Suspects".
8. Our agency is constantly reviewing policies to ensure they not only meet our agency needs but are also in compliance with the law and/or are consistent with accepted best practices and the industry standard. With that, we disagree with some of the recommendations.
 - Our mission statement aligns with the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office Overall Mission and Core Values: In partnership with our communities, we commit to provide professional, firm, fair, and compassionate public safety services with integrity and respect.
 - Our mission and purpose are as follows: Sonoma County Sheriff's Office canine teams assist the patrol division and investigations bureau through a variety of functions. Canine teams are utilized to protect law enforcement officers and citizens from violence, locate / apprehend violent criminals or criminals fleeing from crime scenes, conduct searches to detect contraband

SCSO Response to K9 Policy Ad Hoc Committee Summary Report

or narcotics, and provide public education through exhibitions and demonstrations.

- The utilization of a Canine is a force option. Prior to any utilization of a Canine to apprehend or locate a crime suspect, Canine Handlers are required, per policy and law, to consider possible or known, factors (Policy 309.6.1)
 - i. The nature and seriousness of the suspected offense.
 - ii. Whether violence or weapons were used or are anticipated.
 - iii. The degree of resistance or threatened resistance, if any, the suspect has shown.
 - iv. The suspect's known or perceived age.
 - v. The potential for injury to deputies or the public caused by the suspect if the canine is not utilized.
 - vi. Any potential danger to the public and/or other deputies at the scene if the canine is released.
 - vii. The potential for the suspect to escape or flee if the canine is not utilized.
 - viii. The ability of the suspect to understand and comprehend canine warnings to include mental health, language, and other disabilities.
 - ix. The availability and practical use of other less-lethal force intervention options.
- Case law is ever-changing, and in any force incident, our Canine Handlers are expected and required to adhere to current case law, policies and procedures, and criminal law which prohibits unnecessary and unreasonable force (Penal Code Section 835a).
- Canine Handlers are required to adhere to all Sheriff's Office policies and procedures, to include De-Escalation (Policy 104) and Use of Force (Policy 300). These policies clearly outline, specifically identify, when force may be used by a member of the Sheriff's Office and when de-escalation tactics shall be considered and implemented. Additional policies include Communications with Persons with Disabilities (Policy 332) and Crisis Intervention Incidents (Policy 409), which clearly outlines and specifically identifies, and further restricts, potential force options in many cases, such as the utilization of a Canine.
- In reference to identifying specific tactics for "predictable suspect encounter scenarios", I disagree with this notion as no situation is predictable. Due to this fact, Canine Handlers, and Deputies alike, are trained to develop and communicate a plan, when feasible, in any response involving a potential crime suspect interaction. Additionally, due to the unpredictability of any situation involving a crime suspect, Canine Handlers, and Deputies alike,

SCSO Response to K9 Policy Ad Hoc Committee Summary Report

consistently prepare for, and communicate, contingency plans to ensure safety of law enforcement officers, the public, and crime suspect(s).

- Canine Handlers are equipped with “bite breaker bars” as a contingency plan if a canine will not release. Additionally, Canine Handlers ensure an electronic collar is affixed to their Canines neck area and ensure these are in working order prior to the beginning of their shift or duties.
 - ***Additionally, our Canine Handlers take into consideration additional contingencies in the event one of our attempts to release a canine ever fails. With that said, we prepare to have at least 3 options of releasing our canine from a crime suspect. These options are specific to each canine and Canine Handler to ensure proper utilization in the field, and desired response; to remove the canine in any situation. Canine Handlers train these “release” techniques in both scenario based and skills assessment training to ensure success during a real world deployment.***
- No comment.

Canines

309.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This policy establishes guidelines for the use of canines to augment police services to the community including, but not limited to locating individuals and contraband and apprehending criminal offenders.

309.2 POLICY

It is the policy of the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office that teams of handlers and canines meet and maintain the appropriate proficiency to effectively and reasonably carry out legitimate law enforcement objectives pursuant to Use of Force Policy 300.

309.3 ASSIGNMENT

Canine teams should be assigned to assist and supplement the Patrol Bureau to function primarily in assist or cover assignments. However, they may be assigned by the Watch Commander to other functions, such as routine calls for service, based on the current operational needs.

Canine teams should generally not be assigned to handle routine matters that will take them out of service for extended periods of time and then only with the approval of the Watch Commander.

309.4 CANINE SUPERVISOR

The canine supervisor shall be appointed by and directly responsible to the Patrol Bureau or the authorized designee.

The responsibilities of the canine supervisor include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Reviewing all canine use reports to ensure compliance with policy and to identify training issues and other needs of the program.
- (b) Maintaining a liaison with the vendor kennel.
- (c) Maintaining a liaison with command staff and functional supervisors.
- (d) Maintaining a liaison with other agency canine supervisors.
- (e) Maintaining accurate records to document canine activities.
- (f) Recommending and overseeing the procurement of equipment and services for the teams of handlers and canines.
- (g) Scheduling all canine-related activities.
- (h) Ensuring the canine teams are scheduled for regular training to maximize their capabilities.

309.5 REQUESTS FOR CANINE TEAMS

Patrol Bureau members are encouraged to request the use of a canine. Requests for a canine team from office units outside of the Patrol Bureau shall be reviewed by the shift supervisor or canine sergeant.

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

309.5.1 OUTSIDE AGENCY REQUEST

All requests for canine assistance from outside agencies must be approved by the shift supervisor or canine sergeant and are subject to the following:

- (a) Canine teams shall not be used for any assignment that is not consistent with this policy.
- (b) The canine handler shall have the authority to decline a request for any specific assignment that he/she deems unsuitable.
- (c) It shall be the responsibility of the canine handler to coordinate operations with agency personnel in order to minimize the risk of unintended injury.
- (d) It shall be the responsibility of the canine handler to complete all necessary reports or as directed.

309.5.2 PUBLIC DEMONSTRATIONS

All public requests for a canine team shall be reviewed and, if appropriate, approved by the canine supervisor prior to making any resource commitment. The canine supervisor is responsible for obtaining resources and coordinating involvement in the demonstration to include proper safety protocols. Canine handlers shall not demonstrate any apprehension work unless authorized to do so by the canine supervisor.

309.6 APPREHENSION GUIDELINES

1. Canines can be deployed for suspects in the following circumstances:
 - (a) The suspect has committed, or is about to commit, any crime (to include misdemeanors), and there is a reasonable belief to include any of the following:
 - (a) The suspect poses an imminent threat of violence or serious harm to the public, or any officer.
 - (b) The suspect is violently resisting arrest, and the use of the canine appears necessary to overcome such resistance.
 - (c) The suspect is in possession of a weapon likely to cause serious bodily injury.
 - (b) There is reasonable suspicion or probable cause that the suspect has committed a serious or violent felony, and the suspect is actively resisting or believed to be concealed in an area where entry, other than the canine, is believed to pose an imminent threat to the safety of officers or the public.
 - (c) Warrant service where any of the following are met:
 - (a) The suspect is wanted for a violent felony.
 - (b) The suspect has a violent criminal history.
 - (c) The suspect has a criminal history involving firearms.
 - (d) The suspect has a criminal history of being physically assaultive towards law enforcement or felony evasion.

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

- (a) And at least one of the following conditions are met
 - (a) The suspect poses an imminent threat of violence or serious harm to the public, or any officer.
 - (b) The suspect is violently resisting arrest, and the use of the canine appears necessary to overcome such resistance.
 - (c) The suspect is in possession of a weapon likely to cause serious bodily injury.
 - (d) The suspect is actively resisting or believed to be concealed in an area where entry, other than the canine, is believed to pose an imminent threat to the safety of officers or the public
2. Canines shall not be deployed for subjects in the following circumstances:
 1. Infractions
 2. Misdemeanor crimes (such as simple assault, petty theft, vandalism, city code violations) when factors in 309.6 (1) are not present.
 3. Passive resistance by a suspect should not be considered as grounds for a canine apprehension, unless the suspect is wanted for, and/or suspected of committing a serious or violent crime, and use of canine is reasonably necessary given the totality of circumstances.
 4. Mere flight from an officer
 5. Protest or crowd control situations
3. When a canine has apprehended a suspect and the handler believes the suspect no longer poses a threat, or the totality of circumstances indicates there are adequate resources available to take the suspect into custody, the handler shall promptly direct the canine to release its hold. Factors in assessing when a suspect is surrendering include, but are not limited to:
 1. Suspect verbally surrenders and/ or physically complies by following commands provided by officer(s)
 2. Suspect's hands can be seen and are not in possession of a weapon, and/ or there are adequate resources available to control the suspect.

NOTE: It is recognized that situations may arise that do not fall within the provisions set forth in this policy. Such events require consideration of the totality of the circumstances and the use of an objective reasonableness standard applied to the decision to use a canine.

The deployment of a canine shall be continuously evaluated during an incident to determine appropriateness of its use. During deployments, when practical and safe to do so, the handler shall maintain verbal control and/or have physical control of the canine; the handler should maintain visual sight of the canine if the environment and/or incident allows.

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

No handler or canine will be deployed unless the handler and canine meet current POST and/or CNCA guidelines in which the handler has demonstrated their ability to maintain control of the canine.

Use of a canine to locate and apprehend a suspect wanted for a lesser criminal offense than those identified above requires approval from the on-duty / on-call Lieutenant. Absent a change in circumstances that present an imminent threat to deputies, the canine or the public, such canine use should be conducted on leash or under control of an electronic collar, under conditions that minimize the likelihood the canine will bite or otherwise injure the individual.

309.6.1 PREPARATION FOR DEPLOYMENT

Prior to the use of a canine to search for or apprehend any suspect, the canine handler and/or the supervisor on-scene should carefully consider all pertinent information reasonably available at the time. The information should include, but is not limited to:

- (a) The nature and seriousness of the suspected offense.
- (b) Whether violence or weapons were used or are anticipated.
- (c) The degree of resistance or threatened resistance, if any, the suspect has shown.
- (d) The suspect's known or perceived age.
- (e) The potential for injury to deputies or the public caused by the suspect if the canine is not utilized.
- (f) Any potential danger to the public and/or other deputies at the scene if the canine is released.
- (g) The potential for the suspect to escape or flee if the canine is not utilized.
- (h) The ability of the suspect to understand and comprehend canine warnings to include mental health, language, and other disabilities.
- (i) The availability and practical use of other less-lethal force intervention options.

As circumstances permit, the canine handler should make every reasonable effort to communicate and coordinate with other involved members to minimize the risk of unintended injury.

It is the canine handler's responsibility to evaluate each situation and determine whether the use of a canine is appropriate and reasonable. The canine handler shall have the authority to decline the use of the canine whenever he/she deems deployment is unsuitable.

A supervisor who is sufficiently apprised of the situation may prohibit deploying the canine.

Unless otherwise directed by a supervisor, assisting members should take direction from the handler in order to minimize interference with the canine.

309.6.2 WARNINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A clear audible announcement that a canine will be used if the suspect does not surrender should be made prior to releasing a canine, and the handler should allow a reasonable time for a suspect

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

to surrender. The handler should, if feasible, quiet the canine momentarily to listen for any verbal response to the warning.

If officers are in a location opposite the warning, and the situation allows, the handler should attempt to verify that the announcement could be heard. If there is any indication or knowledge of a language barrier, verbal warnings should be given in other languages if the situation allows.

The exception to the canine warning announcement may include when the canine handler has knowledge, or reasonably believes the suspect is armed with a dangerous weapon, and providing an announcement would increase the risk of injury, or serious bodily injury, to officer(s) or others.⁸

⁸ See ***Estate of Rodgers v. Smith***, 188 F. App'x 175 (4th Cir. 2006), ***Escobar v. Montee***, 895 F.3d 387, 395-96 (5th Cir. 2018), ***Jarvela v. Washtenaw County***, 40 F.3d 761 (6th Cir. 2022), ***Johnson v. Scott***, 576 F.3d 658 (7th Cir. 2009), ***Thomson v. Salt Lake County***, 584 F. 3d 1304 (10th Cir. 2009), ***Crenshaw v. Lister***, 556 F. 3d 1283 (11th Cir. 2009)

Any apprehension by a canine from this Sheriff's Office shall be documented. It is the responsibility of the handler using force to ensure that the use of force is documented completely, promptly, and accurately in an appropriate report. The handler shall document whether a verbal canine warning was provided, and how the verbal canine warning was given. If no verbal canine warning was provided, the handler shall document the reasons for not giving a verbal canine warning.

309.6.3 REPORTING DEPLOYMENTS, BITES AND INJURIES

Whenever a canine deployment results in a bite or causes injury to an intended suspect, a supervisor should be promptly notified and the injuries documented in a canine use report. The injured person shall be promptly treated by emergency medical services personnel and, if appropriate, transported to an appropriate medical facility for further treatment. The deployment and injuries should also be included in any related incident or arrest report.

Any unintended bite or injury caused by a canine, whether on- or off-duty, shall be promptly reported to the canine supervisor. Unintended bites or injuries caused by a canine should be documented in an administrative report, not in a canine use report.

If an individual alleges an injury, either visible or not visible, a supervisor shall be notified and both the individual's injured and uninjured areas shall be photographed as soon as practicable after first tending to the immediate needs of the injured party. Photographs shall be retained as evidence in accordance with current office evidence procedures. The photographs shall be retained until the criminal proceeding is completed and the time for any related civil proceeding has expired.

Canines used by law enforcement agencies are generally exempt from impoundment and reporting requirements. However, the canine shall be made available for examination at any reasonable time if requested by the local health department. The canine handler shall also notify the local health department if the canine exhibits any abnormal behavior after a bite (Health and Safety Code § 121685).

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

309.7 NON-APPREHENSION GUIDELINES

Canines should not be used to track or search for non-criminals (e.g., lost children, individuals who may be disoriented or in need of medical attention).

309.7.1 ARTICLE DETECTION

A canine trained to find objects or property related to a person or crime may be used to locate or identify articles. A canine search should be conducted in a manner that minimizes the likelihood of unintended bites or injuries.

309.7.2 NARCOTICS DETECTION

A canine trained in narcotics detection may be used in accordance with current law and under certain circumstances, including:

- (a) The search of vehicles, buildings, bags and other articles.
- (b) Assisting in the search for narcotics during a search warrant service.
- (c) Obtaining a search warrant by using the narcotics-detection trained canine in support of probable cause.

A narcotics-detection trained canine will not be used to search a person for narcotics unless the canine is trained to passively indicate the presence of narcotics.

309.7.3 BOMB/EXPLOSIVE DETECTION

Because of the high risk of danger to the public and deputies when a bomb or other explosive device is suspected, the use of a canine team trained in explosive detection may be considered. When available, an explosive-detection canine team may be used in accordance with current law and under certain circumstances, including:

- (a) Assisting in the search of a building, structure, area, vehicle or article where an actual or suspected explosive device has been reported or located.
- (b) Assisting with searches at transportation facilities and vehicles (e.g., buses, airplanes, trains).
- (c) Preventive searches at special events, VIP visits, official buildings and other restricted areas. Searches of individuals should remain minimally intrusive and shall be strictly limited to the purpose of detecting explosives.
- (d) Assisting in the search of scenes where an explosion has occurred and an explosive device or secondary explosive device is suspected.

At no time will an explosive-detection trained canine be used to render a suspected device safe or clear.

309.8 CANINE HANDLER MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS AND SELECTION PROCESS

The minimum qualifications for the assignment of canine handler include:

- (a) A deputy who is currently off probation.
- (b) The testing process will consist of an oral board and physical agility test.

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

- (c) Residing in an adequately fenced, single-family residence (minimum 5-foot high fence with locking gates).
- (d) Living within 60 minutes travel time from the Sonoma County limits.
- (e) Agreeing to be assigned to the position for a minimum of three years.

[See attachment: Canine Proficiency Standard.pdf](#)

309.9 HANDLER RESPONSIBILITIES

The canine handler shall ultimately be responsible for the health and welfare of the canine and shall ensure that the canine receives proper nutrition, grooming, training, medical care, affection and living conditions.

The canine handler will be responsible for the following:

- (a) Except as required during appropriate deployment, the handler shall not expose the canine to any foreseeable and unreasonable risk of harm.
- (b) The handler shall maintain all office equipment under his/her control in a clean and serviceable condition.
- (c) When a handler is off-duty for an extended number of days, the assigned canine vehicle should be stored at the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office facility.
- (d) Handlers shall permit the canine supervisor to conduct spontaneous on-site inspections of affected areas of their homes as well as their canine vehicles to verify that conditions and equipment conform to this policy.
- (e) Any changes in the living status of the handler that may affect the lodging or environment of the canine shall be reported to the canine supervisor as soon as possible.
- (f) When off-duty, the canine shall be in a kennel provided by the County at the home of the handler. When a canine is kenneled at the handler's home, the gate shall be secured with a lock. When off-duty, the canine may be let out of the kennel while under the direct control of the handler.
- (g) The canine should be permitted to socialize in the home with the handler's family for short periods of time and under the direct supervision of the handler.
- (h) Under no circumstances will the canine be lodged at another location unless approved by the canine supervisor.
- (i) When off-duty, the handler shall not involve the canine in any law enforcement activity or official conduct unless approved in advance by the canine supervisor.
- (j) Whenever a canine handler is off-duty for an extended number of days, it may be necessary to temporarily relocate the canine. In those situations, the handler shall give reasonable notice to the canine supervisor so that appropriate arrangements can be made.
- (k) Canine handlers are responsible for maintaining all county equipment to include their assigned patrol vehicle. Any equipment that is not properly functioning shall be brought

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

to the attention of the canine supervisor. The canine supervisor shall be notified as soon as practical.

309.9.1 CANINE IN PUBLIC AREAS

The canine should be kept on a leash when in areas that allow access to the public. Exceptions to this rule would include specific law enforcement operations for which the canine is trained.

- (a) A canine shall not be left unattended in any area to which the public may have access.
- (b) When the canine vehicle is left unattended, all windows and doors shall be secured in such a manner as to prevent unauthorized access to the dog. The handler shall also ensure that the unattended vehicle remains inhabitable for the canine.
- (c) Canines shall be under the direct control of the handler at all times when off leash.

309.10 HANDLER COMPENSATION

The canine handler shall be available for call-out under conditions specified by the canine supervisor.

The canine handler shall be compensated for time spent in the care, feeding, grooming and other needs of the canine in accordance with the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), and according to the terms of the collective bargaining agreement (29 USC § 207).

309.11 CANINE INJURY AND MEDICAL CARE

In the event that a canine is injured, or there is an indication that the canine is not in good physical condition, the injury or condition will be reported to the canine coordinator or Watch Commander as soon as practicable and appropriately documented.

All medical attention shall be rendered by the designated canine veterinarian, except during an emergency where treatment should be obtained from the nearest available veterinarian. All records of medical treatment shall be maintained in the handler's personnel file.

309.12 TRAINING

Before assignment in the field, each canine team shall be trained and certified to meet current POST guidelines or other recognized and approved certification standards. Cross-trained canine teams or those canine teams trained exclusively for the detection of narcotics and/or explosives also shall be trained and certified by the California Narcotic Canine Association (CNCA) or other recognized and approved certification standards established for their particular skills.

The canine supervisor shall be responsible for scheduling periodic training for all sworn office members in order to familiarize them with how to conduct themselves in the presence of office canines.

All canine training should be conducted while on-duty unless otherwise approved by the canine supervisor.

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

309.12.1 CONTINUED TRAINING

Each canine team shall thereafter be recertified to a current POST, CNCA or other recognized and approved certification standards on an annual basis. Additional training considerations are as follows:

- (a) Canine teams should receive training as defined in the current contract with the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office canine training provider.
- (b) Canine handlers are encouraged to engage in additional training with approval of the canine supervisor.
- (c) To ensure that all training is consistent, no handler, trainer or outside vendor is authorized to train to a standard that is not reviewed and approved by this office.
- (d) Following a deployment of a canine (post bite) the handler shall have the canine evaluated by the master trainer as soon as practical.
- (e) At any time, based on the needs of the office, the canine Lieutenant can direct the canine and handler be evaluated by the master trainer to identify any training concerns, deployment concerns, or order remedial training.
- (f) In the event a Sheriff's Office canine team misses three (3) or more maintenance training days with the master trainer (8 hour monthly trainings), that team is not to return to duty at any capacity until the following occurs:
 1. The canine team participates in a "Return to Duty" evaluation for both patrol and narcotics detection conducted by the master trainer.
 2. The canine team is cleared for duty by the canine sergeant and/or lieutenant.
- (g) Once the canine team is re-evaluated and cleared for duty, documentation will be placed in the canine training file, clearing the team for full duty. In the event a team does not successfully complete the re-evaluation, a training plan will be developed by the master trainer and canine supervisor(s) to bring the team up to an acceptable level.

309.12.2 FAILURE TO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE TRAINING

Any canine team failing to graduate or obtain certification shall not be deployed in the field for tasks the team is not certified to perform until graduation or certification is achieved. When reasonably practicable, pending successful certification, the canine handler shall be temporarily reassigned to regular patrol duties.

309.12.3 TRAINING RECORDS

All canine training records shall be maintained in the canine handler's and the canine's training file.

309.12.4 TRAINING AIDS

Training aids are required to effectively train and maintain the skills of canines. Deputies possessing, using or transporting controlled substances or explosives for canine training purposes must comply with federal and state requirements regarding the same. Alternatively, the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office may work with outside trainers with the applicable licenses or permits.

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

309.12.5 CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE TRAINING AIDS

Deputies acting in the performance of their official duties may possess or transfer controlled substances for the purpose of narcotics-detection canine training in compliance with state and federal laws (Health & Safety Code § 11367.5; 21 USC § 823(g)).

The Sheriff or the authorized designee may authorize a member to seek a court order to allow controlled substances seized by the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office to be possessed by the member or a narcotics-detection canine trainer who is working under the direction of this office for training purposes, provided the controlled substances are no longer needed as criminal evidence.

As an alternative, the Sheriff or the authorized designee may request narcotics training aids from the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA).

These procedures are not required if the canine handler uses commercially available synthetic substances that are not controlled narcotics.

309.12.6 CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE PROCEDURES

Due to the responsibilities and liabilities involved with possessing readily usable amounts of controlled substances and the ever-present danger of the canine's accidental ingestion of these controlled substances, the following procedures shall be strictly followed:

- (a) All controlled substance training samples shall be weighed and tested prior to dispensing to the individual canine handler or trainer.
- (b) The weight and test results shall be recorded and maintained by this office.
- (c) Any person possessing controlled substance training samples pursuant to court order or DEA registration shall maintain custody and control of the controlled substances and shall keep records regarding any loss of, or damage to, those controlled substances.
- (d) All controlled substance training samples will be inspected, weighed and tested annually. The results of the annual testing shall be recorded and maintained by the canine supervisor with a copy forwarded to the dispensing agency.
- (e) All controlled substance training samples will be stored in locked, airtight and watertight cases at all times, except during training. The locked cases shall be secured in the trunk of the canine handler's assigned patrol vehicle during transport and stored in an appropriate locked container. There are no exceptions to this procedure.
- (f) The canine supervisor shall periodically inspect every controlled substance training sample for damage or tampering and take any appropriate action.
- (g) Any unusable controlled substance training samples shall be returned to the Property and Evidence Unit or to the dispensing agency.
- (h) All controlled substance training samples shall be returned to the dispensing agency upon the conclusion of the training or upon demand by the dispensing agency.

309.12.7 EXPLOSIVE TRAINING AIDS

Deputies may possess, transport, store or use explosives or destructive devices in compliance with state and federal laws (Penal Code § 18800; 18 USC § 842; 27 CFR 555.41).

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

Explosive training aids designed specifically for canine teams should be used whenever feasible. Due to the safety concerns in the handling and transportation of explosives, inert or non-hazardous training aids should be employed whenever feasible. The use of explosives or destructive devices for training aids by canine teams is subject to the following:

- (a) All explosive training aids, when not in use, shall be properly stored in a secure facility appropriate for the type of materials.
- (b) An inventory ledger shall be maintained to document the type and quantity of explosive training aids that are stored.
- (c) The canine EOD supervisor shall be responsible to verify the explosive training aids on hand against the inventory ledger once each quarter.
- (d) Only members of the EOD team shall have access to the explosive training aids storage facility.
- (e) A primary and secondary custodian will be designated to minimize the possibility of loss of explosive training aids during and after the training. Generally, the handler will be designated as the primary custodian while the trainer or authorized second person on-scene will be designated as the secondary custodian.
- (f) Any lost or damaged explosive training aids shall be promptly reported to the canine supervisor, who will determine if any further action will be necessary. Any loss of explosives will be reported to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF).

309.12.8 NARCAN FOR CANINES

Narcan use by handlers is approved for use on canines, under the following conditions:

- (a) Handlers will not deploy their canine in any situation that Fentanyl is believed or is suspected of being present.
- (b) Since the canines are frequently deployed in situations with no prior intelligence about the substance they may be encountering, after every deployment, each handler will monitor their canine for signs and symptoms of an overdose/exposure.
- (c) Handlers will be noting any unusual behavior in the canine to indicate an exposure. If an exposure is suspected, the handler will immediately respond to the nearest animal hospital.
- (d) All handlers will carry updated medical kits to include the opiate antidote Naloxone.
- (e) Recurring yearly training from the local animal hospital will provide each handler with the proper protocol to administer the antidote in the field.
- (f) A yearly review of the medical kits will be conducted by the canine supervisor and the animal hospital.
- (g) Naloxone (as well as the other drugs) will be replaced at its expiration date.
- (h) If a handler deploys any of the treatment drugs on a canine, the canine supervisor and shift supervisor will be notified immediately and the drug will be replaced by the animal hospital.

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office

Policies

Canines

- (i) After any treatment drug is administered on a canine, the handler and the canine will immediately respond to a 24 hour emergency veterinarian.
- (j) If a canine is exposed or you suspect exposure has occurred, you shall immediately notify the on duty sergeant or Watch Commander. You will also, as soon as practical, notify the canine sergeant. If no canine sergeant is contacted they you will contact the canine lieutenant.