

**COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW COMMISSION**  
**of the City of Richmond, California**  
**(CPRC)**  
**Wednesday, February 5, 2025**  
**7:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Chair Carol Hegstrom in the Richmond Room at 450 Civic Center Plaza, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, at Richmond, California.

**Present:** Marisol Cantú, Carol Hegstrom (Chair), Oscar Flores, Oscar Garcia, Andre Jackson, Daniel Lawson, Carmen Martinez and Rachel Lorber (Vice Chair)

**Absent:** None

**Staff:** Nickie Mastay

**Council Liaison:** Claudia Jimenez – Not Present

**City Attorney's  
Office Representative** Floy Andrews, City Attorney's Office - Present

**II. PUBLIC FORUM**

Oscar Garcia took this opportunity to recognize Shané Johnson, who had left the employ of the City and noted that she had been involved with the CPRC for a number of years. He commented that since the September 2024 meeting, the CPRC had lost all of its administrative and legal support and a lot of institutional history, which was a concern he wanted to address, particularly since there were new Commissioners who would have benefitted from that institutional history. He emphasized the importance of training for the CPRC with a focus on its institutional history to ensure it remained on track with its mission.

Chair Hegstrom adjourned into closed session at this time.

**III. EXECUTIVE SESSION – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC – Government Code §54954.5(e)**

- a. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION  
Government Code § 54956.9(d)(2) and § 54954.5(c)
- b. PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE/DISMISSAL/RELEASE  
Government Code § 54954.5(e)

**IV. REPORT ANY FINAL ACTION(S) TAKEN IN THE EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Floy Andrews, Legal Counsel, Aleshire & Wynder, LLP, reported that the CPRC had taken two actions in Executive Session.

Legal Counsel Andrews identified the first action as confirming the decision that had been made earlier that the only agenda item on CPRC agendas would be from the Chief of Police. The CPRC also approved the Public Case Summary 2023-6 (Simpson) with the findings of fact where complainant Mark Simpson filed a complaint alleging that officers discriminated against him based on his race when they stopped him, detained him, arrested him, damaged his phone and lost his wallet. The CPRC first found that there was excusable neglect in Simpson's failure to file his complaint within the statutory deadline set out in the CPRC ordinance. The CPRC further found that at each stage of the incident officers did not take enforcement actions on the basis of race but rather on the basis of evidence that properly supported their actions. The CPRC also recommended that the Richmond Police Department (RPD) amend its policy on body worn cameras to require that officers maintain BWC activation until contact with the suspect, detainee or member of the public has ended. The police officers were exonerated.

#### V. STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Legal Counsel Andrews verified that there was no conflict of interest with any member of the CPRC for any item on the meeting agenda.

#### VI. AGENDA REVIEW

Legal Counsel Andrews stated based upon the CPRC's determination in the closed session, Item X. Report by Police Officers' Association (RPOA) would be eliminated from the meeting agenda.

Commissioner Cantú requested that New Business, Item XII be moved up on the agenda after the approval of the minutes and public forum.

Commissioner Martinez requested under the same Item XII that subitem e.ii. be split into two items; one to take steps necessary to allow for anonymous complaints, and two to take steps necessary to allow the redaction of information identifying complainants on public documents. She also requested that those items be considered prior to the other items under XII.

There were no objections to the proposed changes.

#### VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (December 4, 2024)

<b>ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Cantú) to approve the minutes of the December 4, 2024 meeting, as submitted; approved by a voice vote: 8-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber, Martinez and Chair Hegstrom; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None).</b>
--

#### VIII. PUBLIC FORUM

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that he would be talking to the Youth Council to encourage the solicitation of a member of that Council to consider applying to the CPRC given the need for youth on the CPRC. He also invited everyone to the Contra Costa Mayors Conference meeting on February 13, 2025, at the Moraga Country Club requiring an RSVP by February 6, and reported that tickets would be \$70/person.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of the RPOA, reaffirmed the RPOA's policy and position with the RPD regarding immigration enforcement and stated the RPOA was committed to upholding the laws of the State of California, including Senate Bill (SB) 54, also known as the California Values Act, that limited local law enforcement agencies' involvement in federal immigration enforcement. Under SB 54, the RPD did not engage in the enforcement of federal immigration laws and officers were focused on maintaining public safety, protecting the community and enforcing state and local laws. Immigration enforcement was the responsibility of federal agencies and not the scope of local law enforcement officers. He added the RPOA was dedicated to fostering trust, collaboration within the community and encouraged all residents regardless of immigration status to report crimes, seek assistance and work together with the RPD to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the City. The RPD's priorities were to serve and protect all individuals within the jurisdiction regardless of immigration status.

Sergeant Therriault addressed activists, politicians, those who attempted to sow division between police and the communities served by promoting fear and misunderstanding regarding the RPD's role in immigration enforcement, and stated it was disheartening when individuals or groups sought to create distrust and assume that local law enforcement agencies like RPD would somehow be used to target or harm vulnerable populations based on their immigration status.

Sergeant Therriault emphasized that the RPOA and the RPD were present to serve, protect and build strong trusting relationships with all members of the community. The officers were dedicated to upholding the law, and SB 54 explicitly prohibited local agencies from participating in federal immigration enforcement. He wanted to ensure that everyone understood the collective goal and objective to address real issues like crime and public safety.

The following section of the agenda was moved up as requested.

## **XII. NEW BUSINESS**

- e. DISCUSS and VOTE on Each of the Following Recommendations to the City Council:
  - i. Take steps necessary to increase the time window during which individuals can file complaints

Commissioner Martinez noted the prior complaint and request to extend the current 120 days to file a complaint to up to a year given that the 120 days created a significant barrier for several reasons to those filing a complaint. If extended to a year, she suggested there would be more community redress that would lead to a more transparent and accountable system for the community and there were other civilian oversight models to consider that offered more time or less restrictive methods to filing a complaint. She suggested that would serve as a more equitable access to justice.

Commissioner Martinez made a motion to extend the 120-day window to file a complaint. Chair Hegstrom seconded the motion.

On the discussion, Commissioner Garcia asked why 120 days had initially been chosen as the filing period. He noted that there were provisions in the ordinance that allowed the CPRC to investigate anything received after that deadline.

Vice Chair Lorber understood there was an actual legal statute of limitations after 120 days where a complaint could be evaluated but action could not be taken unless the CPRC had made a finding of excusable negligence before doing so. She emphasized the need that if extending the time for filing, the website should be very clear of the time required to take action.

Legal Counsel Andrews clarified that cases could be investigated after the deadline but no disciplinary action could be taken after that time. It was her understanding that the deadline was a year from the date of filing with the CPRC but she would look into the provisions included in the ordinance.

Commissioner Cantú pointed out that the complaint form itself was also an item on the current meeting agenda. She commented that the ordinance allowed an investigation after one year even though there could be no disciplinary action and that an investigation, even after that time, would track a pattern of abuse and ensure that justice was served.

Prior to a vote, Legal Counsel Andrews asked for a clarification of the motion to verify the period to extend the deadline.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

EMILY ROTH, Richmond, supported the request to extend the filing deadline from 120 days to one year, and agreed that the public needed to be made aware of the filing deadlines and to file the sooner the better.

ANDREW MELENDEZ, Richmond, also supported the extension of the filing deadline from 120 days to one year given the time required to heal and get beyond whatever incident required the filing. He stated that other cities such as Oakland and San Francisco currently had no time limits and he suggested Richmond might want to consider that policy as well.

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, supported the proposal to extend the filing deadline and stated it would help the CPRC be more accessible and responsive to the community. Referring to language in Government Code §3304 D1, *except as provided .... no punitive action can be taken unless the investigation is completed within one year of the public agency's discovery by a person authorized to initiate an investigation of the allegation ....*, which suggested that the filing deadline would start from when the complaint had been filed. The CPRC was asked to do more research into that issue and find a way to notify potential complainants that the ability to discipline an officer may be lost if there was a late filing.

AMANDA JENKINS, Richmond, with Operation Ground Zero, noted that many people were unaware that complaints could be filed and many people did not know how to file a complaint for police misconduct. She supported the extension of the deadline to at least one year and agreed that it would be better if there was no deadline at all.

KAREN REID of Reimagine Richmond, a mental health worker, and a victim and survivor of police violence, described that situation and emphasized the importance of being able to file a complaint beyond the current 120-day period. She urged that Richmond consider a policy for at least a year's deadline to file a complaint and over time support a policy that there be no time limit. She added that the public was otherwise not aware of the time limit.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of the RPOA, stated he was following and "tracked" the previous speakers and stated their names which included Ray Wendell, Karen, Amanda Jenkins, members from Reimagine Richmond.

COMMISSIONER LAWSON interrupted the public speaker and called a point of order. He asked if it was appropriate for public speakers to be speaking out against other public speakers.

CITY ATTORNEY LIAISON responded by saying as a public speaker, this pertains to the issue we are speaking about.

COMMISSIONER LAWSON stated that it seemed it would have a chilling effect on public participation.

BEN THERRIAULT continued his public comment by stating that it's more of a chilling effect by getting in the way of people's First Amendment right and freedom of speech. He thanked City Attorney Andrews. He then clarified that the policy for a filing deadline used to be 90 days and it had been increased to 120 days to accommodate a previous request. He suggested that the speakers represented a coordinated effort and comments had been farmed out by Reimagine Richmond and did not appear to be anything specific to Richmond. He said the Commission is doing what other people are doing and he knew it would pass because he had zero expectation of anything else. He stated the RPOA's position was that the requested change in deadline would be subject to another meet and confer with the City of Richmond.

Legal Counsel Andrews clarified, when asked, that the issue was a recommendation to the City Council, which would make the determination as to whether or not to move forward with a meet and confer. She stated the City Council could eventually pass an ordinance to implement the recommendation, which could trigger a meet and confer.

The motion on the floor by Commissioner Martinez and Chair Hegstrom was replaced with the following motion.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Hegstrom) to recommend that the Richmond City Council amend the ordinance to extend the 120-day window for filing a complaint to one year for filing a complaint; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber, Martinez and Chair Hegstrom; Noes: Garcia; Abstain: None; Absent: None).**

- ii. Take steps necessary to allow for anonymous complaints.

Commissioner Martinez requested that the CPRC make a recommendation to the City Council to address fears of retaliation, avoid privacy concerns, and offer anonymity to

complainants during the investigation portion of a complaint, by redacting the identity of complainants on public documents.

Vice Chair Lorber noted that the most common kind of complaint was a visual interaction with police and she agreed with the need to ensure anonymity of complainants in that process.

Commissioner Lawson pointed out that the presence and comments of the RPOA President was a good reason to provide anonymity to complainants to allow them to voice their concerns without fear of retribution.

In response to Commissioner Garcia as to how an anonymous investigation would work in following up on a complaint, Commissioner Martinez referred to civilian oversight models in other jurisdictions that allowed all information to be anonymous except for an email with no name included that would allow a follow-up. She stated it would be up to the CPRC to educate the community on how to file a complaint with so much detail as to avoid the need for follow up.

Commissioner Cantú reported that the City of Berkeley allowed anonymous complaints and the City's investigator was able to decipher through body cameras the name of officers, date, time and location and all they needed to go through was the police officer's report, other witnesses, badge numbers, and photos that allowed the investigator to get the required information. She recommended empowering the City of Richmond's Confidential Investigative and Appeals Office (CIAO) to see how other jurisdictions processed anonymous complaints and create a protocol in the City of Richmond. With respect to the City of Richmond's complaint forms, she recommended encouraging the complainant to be as detailed as possible so that the investigation could be expedited with the notation that the investigation could be prolonged if the necessary information was not included. She emphasized the need to ensure privacy, security and confidentiality for community members, especially under the current federal administration where there was fear and panic in the community.

Commissioner Garcia stated in his experience there had been challenges with many investigations, even with names and witnesses, and if everything was anonymous he suggested that would create a more difficult situation for the City's interim or new CIAO. He noted the insinuation that the RPD cooperated with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and he did not want that situation to be made worse for those involved.

Chair Hegstrom reiterated the proposal had to go through the City Council along with the legalities of changing the provisions of the ordinance, that the CIAO yet to be hired would have to investigate the backlog of cases and there would be considerable time to get used to the process before the implementation of any anonymous complaints, if approved by the City Council. Even with anonymous investigations, there may be enough information to work with and if not people could be advised to use their name.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

ROSIE RENDON thanked the CPRC for considering the items and noted that Mr. Therriault's calling out speakers was inappropriate and why anonymous complaints were supported to avoid retaliations. She stated the option to disclose or not disclose names was important and she was extremely uncomfortable with the comments.

DANE JANEEN, Richmond, also supported the proposal and wanted to hold RPD accountable and ensure there were more opportunities to create a safe space for anyone to report abuse or misconduct by an RPD officer anonymously, which the current process did not allow. If filing was allowed to be done anonymously, she stated the community could be empowered to speak up against any abuse or misconduct and patterns of abuse could be tracked. She suggested the current protocols and attitude was why there was no trust between RPD and the community.

AMBER HATFIELD, Richmond, stated the RPD was well funded, armed with military grade weapons and aided by expanded surveillance throughout the City and wielded a significant amount of power over the general public. As such, she stated Richmond residents deserved access to a powerful oversight body and equal protection of community members harmed by police. She supported anonymous complaints with the redaction of personal identifiable information in public case studies to ensure those who might otherwise feel intimidated equal protection under the law given that the names of officers were often removed.

ANDREW MELENDEZ, Richmond, supported the request that would allow anonymous complaints to be filed without the need for personal information and allow those to seek justice who feared retaliation from the public for filing such a complaint. He noted that Oakland and San Francisco allowed anonymous complaints and allowed those complaints to provide information on other witnesses to the incident, which would allow other follow up. He urged the adoption of the item to make the CPRC more accessible.

KAREN REID, Richmond, supported the agenda item because anonymity was important to people who wanted to report police violence and abuse without the fear of retaliation. She added that she felt targeted to be called out by a prior speaker and anonymity would allow her to be able to speak up for herself without fear of retaliation.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of the RPOA, commented that the CPRC was a public body and this was a public forum and it was important to be informed if there were bad police officers, and it was better to tell the RPD to be able to root that out. He stated the fear mongering that continued to occur was on purpose. He described it as activist stuff with an agenda, and equal protection under the law was important in that police officers had rights too and were entitled to know when people were leveling complaints, true or not. The bottom line was that transparency was important and officers were entitled to know when serious accusations were being leveled against them. He stated the RPOA would have a meet and confer on that issue.

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, an attorney, spoke in support of the proposal to allow anonymous complaints to avoid deterring people from filing a complaint. With respect to due process, he stated the vast majority of American workers had no job security, could be fired at will for any reason, and no one had due process rights for their jobs. The CPRC was an advisory board and had no authority to discipline or dismiss officers in that the Police Chief and City Manager made all disciplinary decisions and could take into account whether a complaint was filed anonymously. He clarified the anonymity was only in the investigative phase of the CPRC's oversight.

Commissioner Jackson asked if there was any documentation of any retaliation against any complainant in the City of Richmond, and Legal Counsel Andrews stated she had no information on that issue one way or the other.

Commissioner Jackson stated that when the CPRC had been formed there had been serious concerns and incidents within the community and with RPD, although that was no longer the case. He believed that citizens had rights and police had rights as well.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Hegstrom) to recommend that the Richmond City Council take the steps necessary to redact information identifying complainants; approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-2 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Lawson, Lorber, Martinez and Chair Hegstrom; Noes: Garcia; Jackson; Abstain: None; Absent: None).**

Commissioner Martinez referred to another aspect of the item to make a recommendation to the City Council to amend the ordinance to require the redaction of complainant and witness names from all publicly available materials including the Case Summary Webpage.

Chair Hegstrom noted that some information had already been published and that information should not be redacted.

Chair Hegstrom did not believe an ordinance change was required in this case, simply from this point forward there would be redactions in the Case Summary webpage.

Commissioner Cantú suggested it was critical to institutionalize the proposed changes, that the City Council would review a slate of the changes proposed by the CPRC, and that the ordinances of other jurisdictions specifically identified the information to be redacted in accordance with officers' rights and state law. She supported an amendment to the ordinance to that effect.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

EMILY ROTH, Richmond, referred to the concerns related to public commenters and the rights of the police and the community, and suggested that police had more rights than did members of the community. She agreed that the names of community members needed to be appropriately protected. As such, she supported the proposed action.

Given that it was 9:00 P.M., Chair Hegstrom advised that a motion would be required to continue the meeting.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hegstrom/Lawson) to continue the meeting to 10:00 P.M.; approved by a voice vote: 7-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber, Martinez and Chair Hegstrom; Noes: Garcia; Abstain: None; Absent: None).**

ANDREW MELENDEZ, Richmond, supported the redaction of civilian names from Public Summaries, commented that currently the names of police officers were not published in Public Case Summaries while the names of civilians were disclosed. He supported the equal protection for all and stated that approving the item would create more accessibility for the community to file complaints without the fear of retaliation.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Hegstrom) that the Community Police Review Commission determined to require the redaction of complainant and witness names from all publicly available materials including the Case Summary Webpage, and recommended that the City Council amend the ordinance with that**

**requirement; approved by a voice vote: 8-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber, Martinez and Chair Hegstrom; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None).**

- ii. Take steps necessary to authorize the CPRC to review any complaints against the Richmond Police Department

Chair Hegstrom clarified the intent of the item with Commissioner Martinez that instead of limiting the complaints that could be filed under the CPRC's purview, as identified in the ordinance, there would be no limit on the type of complaint to be filed with the CPRC.

Commissioner Cantu noted that the City of Berkeley allowed all complaints to be filed.

Commissioner Garcia agreed that folks should be allowed to file complaints if there was a genuine concern with the RPD but he stated all of the examples offered would have fallen within the CPRC's purview and he had not heard a case where the CPRC did not have the authority to investigate.

Commissioner Garcia suggested the vast majority of cases that did not get investigated were traffic-related and he proposed focusing on the more serious cases and wanted to be specific in terms of what applied.

Hypothetical scenarios of what could occur if there were incidents of that type of concern were noted and the number of things that the CPRC could be allowed to cover were highlighted such as house searches without a warrant, abusive language, failure to provide information and failure to respond, discrimination practices, harassment, detention, consistent deliberate annoyance through repeated contacts, among many other things the CPRC could not investigate under its purview. It was clarified that because many of the complaints received by the CPRC did not fit into the categories of complaints under the CPRC's purview, a complaint was often placed in inappropriate categories where the CPRC exonerated the officers because the specific complaint could not be found, such was the case of the item on the current agenda under closed session.

Commissioner Garcia read those items that the CPRC was charged to investigate and noted that the discrimination category was broad. He objected to the CPRC getting into the detail of investigating a lost wallet, for instance.

Chair Hegstrom suggested with those kinds of detail there may be more cases filed and the CPRC would have to decide how to address them, which might include the requirement for a second meeting every month. She stated a full-time CIAO was being sought and that investigator would likely have the time to address those issues. She stated the point of the CPRC was to root out police misconduct. She acknowledged it would be a big change and might take a while to get through.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

ENIS PEREZ, Richmond, a youth advocate, stated the issue was not about the careers of police officers but about creating a living model of community safety that worked, could be used in other places, and bettered the lives of residents.

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, noted that the CPRC could apparently also not investigate suppression of First Amendment Rights, which happened frequently and which should be included in the CPRC's purview. The most serious types of complaints could be investigated directly by the CPRC and the lesser form of complaints could go through the Office of Professional Accountability's (OPA's) investigation process and if the complainant was not happy with a case it could be appealed to the CPRC, which would mean that the lesser complaints would be investigated twice and the current proposal would eliminate that duplication.

DANE JANEEN supported the proposal and wanted to see the CPRC be able to investigate all complaints against the RPD with the goal to empower the community to speak up against any abuse or misconduct and to find patterns so that there was no more abuse or misconduct. She stated the CPRC needed to be empowered to reflect statewide best practices for police oversight bodies and needed to set a high standard.

ROSIE RENDON, Richmond, supported the item and told her story of a situation that was an example of the type of complaint that was not under the purview of the CPRC. Ms. Rendon noted at the time of her interaction with the RPD, she had no knowledge of the CPRC, and the RPD had done nothing to help since there were no resources to address her particular situation.

AMBER HATFIELD, Richmond, supported the proposal to expand the scope of complaints that could be heard by the CPRC, which would go a long way to empower the community. The current process of allowing only certain types of misconduct to be reported to the CPRC and allowing only appeals of complaints were dismissed after the police had investigated seemed unduly biased and was below the standards for review in other Bay Area cities.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of the RPOA recommended that the speakers contact the Police Chief to discuss their grievances and provide details. Seeing the same speakers month after month, he wondered if some folks on the CPRC and their connection to activist friends had used the absence of complaints to create a drive to find more ways to get more complaints instead of considering that the lack of complaints might indicate a well-functioning and accountable police force. He commented that many members of the CPRC did not reach out to engage with the RPD, with no ridealongs and no training, and if expanding the reach of the CPRC he suggested members should know why things were done the way they were. He stated the RPOA would reserve its right to meet and confer on the issue.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/[there was no second]) that the Community Police Review Commission recommended that the Richmond City Council take the steps necessary to authorize the CPRC to review any complaints against the Richmond Police Department; approved by a voice vote: 6-1-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Lawson, Lorber, Martinez and Chair Hegstrom; Noes: Jackson; Abstain: Garcia; Absent: None).**

Chair Hegstrom moved to Old Business at this time.

## XI. OLD BUSINESS, DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. Status of Meet and Confer with RPOA re Commission's Proposed Revisions to Richmond Municipal Code Chapter 3.54.

Legal Counsel Andrews reported that since the CPRC had last met there had been a meet and confer and there had been a discussion, and another meeting had been planned. She also noted that the City's HR Attorney involved had recently resigned and she was working with the Legal Department to identify a replacement.

- b. Update on the Electronic Submission of Complaint Forms

Chair Hegstrom's report on the status of the electronic submission of complaint forms was in process with the IT Department and she expected that additional language would be added both to the form and to the page that displayed the form.

- c. VOTE to Approve Final Design of CPRC Logo

Chair Hegstrom referred to the four logo examples in the staff report and noted that all four forms in English and Spanish were the property of the CPRC.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, was impressed with the design of the logo package and supported its approval.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/[second was not audible]) to approve the final design of the logo package included in the staff report dated January 15, 2025; approved by a voice vote: 8-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber, Martinez and Chair Hegstrom; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None).**

## XII. NEW BUSINESS

- a. RECEIVE an Annual Overview Report for 2024 and DISCUSS What the CPRC Would Like to Accomplish in 2025

Chair Hegstrom presented what would become an Annual End-of-Year Report for 2024 and reported that there had been many changes in Commissioners and staff during 2024. Stating that one of the major tasks of the CPRC was to receive and hear complaints against Richmond police officers, she reported that there had been 12 complaints filed in 2024 up from 9 in 2023, and she identified the disposition of those complaints. She also identified the correspondence to the Chief of Police to identify the CPRC's decisions and recommendations in closed session. She highlighted the actions taken by the CPRC in 2024, the recommendations to the City Council, the trainings made available to CPRC Commissioners, and outreach conducted. She pointed out the projects started but yet to be finished, the problems associated with the loss of the CIAO, and recommended goals for 2025.

Legal Counsel Andrews advised that an offer had just been made for an Interim CIAO and the recruitment for a permanent CIAO had been initiated.

Commissioner Cantú requested that the continued discussion of the goals for 2025 be tabled to another meeting given the lateness of the hour.

PUBLIC COMMENT

EMILY ROTH, Richmond, commended the CPRC for its accomplishments and suggested it was well poised for other accomplishments this year.

b. NOMINATE and VOTE on CPRC Chairperson

Commissioner Cantú nominated Carmen Martinez as Chair of the CPRC for 2025. Commissioner Martinez accepted the nomination, which was seconded by Commissioner Lawson.

Commissioner Jackson nominated Carol Hegstrom as Chair, and she accepted the nomination if there was a need for another nomination. Commissioner Garcia seconded the nomination.

Commissioner Martinez nominated Daniel Lawson but he declined the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, supported Carol Hegstrom as Chair given her display of leadership and professionalism, although he could also support Carmen Martinez.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Lawson) to elect *Carmen Martinez* as Chair of the CPRC for 2025; approved by a voice vote majority of the CPRC.**

Commissioner Lawson commended Chair Hegstrom for a job well done.

c. NOMINATE and VOTE on CPRC Vice-Chairperson

Commissioner Cantú nominated Oscar Flores as Vice Chair of the CPRC for 2025 given his leadership and decorum soon after his appointment to the CPRC. Commissioner Lorber seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hegstrom nominated Rachel Lorder as Vice Chair but she declined the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, supported Oscar Flores as Vice Chair of the CPRC.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/[second not audible]) to designate Oscar Flores as Vice Chair of the CPRC for 2025 by acclamation.**

Legal Counsel Andrews also commended Chair Hegstrom for her assistance since she had been designated Legal Counsel for the CPRC.

d. VOTE to Move the Month of Future CPRC Officer Elections to January

There was a discussion as to whether there would always be a CPRC meeting in January given that the meetings were always scheduled for the first Wednesday of the month when the New Year holiday was likely to result in the cancellation of a meeting.

Instead, it was recommended that the first meeting of the year be designated as the time for CPRC officer elections.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lorber/[second not audible]) to move future CPRC officer elections to the first meeting of the year; approved by a voice vote: 8-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber, Martinez and Chair Hegstrom; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None).**

**XIII. REPORT BY CHIEF OF POLICE (Chief French or Designee)**

Chief of Police Bisa French was not present but a written report had been submitted to the CPRC.

**XIV. REPORT BY POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION (Ben Therriault or Designee)**

This item was removed from the agenda, as previously reported after the closed session.

**XV. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS, STAFF, RIDEALONGS**

There were no reports.

**XVI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 P.M.

---

Carol Hegstrom, Chair