

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

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 P.M. by Chair Carmen Martinez in the Richmond Room at 450 Civic Center Plaza, 1st Floor, at Richmond, California.

Present: Marisol Cantú*, Carol Hegstrom, Oscar Flores (Vice Chair), Oscar Garcia, Daniel Lawson, and Carmen Martinez (Chair)
*Arrived after Roll Call

Absent: Andre Jackson and Rachel Lorber

Staff: Adam Cunha

Council Liaison: Claudia Jimenez – Present

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

II. STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Legal Counsel Floy Andrews verified that there was no reported conflict of interest.

III. AGENDA REVIEW

Commissioner Cantú requested that New Business Item b be considered first under New Business.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Hegstrom) to approve the agenda, as amended to consider Item VIII b. prior to Item VIII a; approved by a voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Jackson and Lorber).</p>

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (February 5, 2025)

Commissioner Hegstrom advised that she had a list of changes to make to the minutes of the February 5, 2025 meeting.

Legal Counsel Andrews recommended that the minutes be continued to the next meeting so that she and Commissioner Hegstrom could go over the changes to the minutes, to be resubmitted at the next meeting.

Commissioner Lawson stated that he also had changes to make to the minutes.

Chair Martinez recommended that any other requested changes be submitted to her to allow the minutes to be revised and resubmitted at the next meeting for consideration.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hegstrom/Lawson) to continue the minutes of February 5, 2025 to the next meeting for consideration; approved by a voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Jackson and Lorber).

V. PUBLIC FORUM

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, invited the CPRC to the Contra Costa Mayors Conference on April 3, 2025 in the City of Clayton, \$70 per person. He recommended that the CPRC schedule a retreat where residents could participate. He stated that he would be talking to the Youth Council about filling vacancies on the CPRC.

HOPE DIXON, Richmond, thanked the CPRC for all its work and for making the community safe for all Richmond residents. She described some of the problems and challenges faced by the homeless and noted that the homeless were more exposed to policing, and while many police tried to help sometimes it just made things worse. She supported the several items on the meeting agenda seeking City Council approval to help with transparency and ways to seek justice for all.

MARK WASSBERG reported that he had filed a complaint against Assistant Chief of Police Tim Simmons in September 2024 because of an incident at a City Council meeting, and he asked the CPRC whether or not it had the power to investigate that complaint.

Legal Counsel Andrews clarified that there was to be no interaction between the public and the Commission during the public comment portion of the agenda.

Mr. Wassberg continued to ask whether the CPRC had the power to file a lawsuit against the City of Richmond as a result of the referenced incident and became more and more agitated when he could get no response.

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

Chief of Police Bisa French reported that the Richmond Police Department (RPD) had 126 filled positions, two trainees starting on Monday, a number of police officers in training and several in the academy. There were 21 professional staff vacancies and staff was working to fill them, especially the sworn and dispatcher vacancies. There were seven officers on injury leave and two on light duty.

With respect to crime, Chief French reported that the stats being reported were for January. There were no changes in the number of homicides in January compared to December but aggravated assault had increased by 14 percent from 70 to 80 incidents, and there was a 44 percent decrease in robberies from 45 to 25, and sexual assaults increased from two to five in the month of January. Overall, the total number of violent crimes decreased by six percent from 117 to 110 incidents. There was a 33 percent increase in burglaries with incidents rising from 21 to 28, and a six percent decrease in thefts including auto burglaries from 142 to 133 incidents.

Vehicle thefts also declined by 14 percent from 84 to 72 incidents while arsons increased from one to four incidents. Overall total property crimes decreased by four percent from 248 to 237. For reports and calls for service, there was a 43 percent increase in impounds rising from 237 to 340, collision-related calls for service decreased by 22 percent from 189 to 148, DUI-related traffic collisions increased by 25 percent from four to five incidents and DUI reports increased 16 percent from 19 to 22 incidents.

Chief French reported In terms of use of force for January, there were 15 incidents when force was used with two canine contacts, 10 bodily force, five taser deployments, two taser surrenders and two bean bag deployments. With respect to community engagement in February, the RPD worked with community partners to host several immigration forums when it was reaffirmed that RPD did not engage in immigration enforcement. She had also done a radio interview with 98.1 where over a million listeners had been tuned into the interview regarding immigration enforcement.

Commissioner Garcia stated he had attended two of the community events referenced by the Chief. He described the fear in the community and the fear to report incidents of domestic violence and was pleased that RPD was doing its best with community groups to make them feel comfortable in reporting, especially incidents of domestic violence.

Chief French stated the RPD had been specifically working with the Latina Center on immigration enforcement when it was reiterated that people needed to report crime to be able to make sure officers were aware of those incidents to be able to provide extra patrol as time permitted in those areas.

Commissioner Cantú referred to a postponed agenda item on RPD's request for exemption to the Sanctuary Ordinance with respect to LexisNexis software that sold its data directly to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). She asked about the status of that situation.

Chief French stated a Request for Proposal (RFP) had been put out to different vendors to get services to software that LexisNexis provided to see what other vendors were out there to provide those services. In the meantime, that portion of LexisNexis that provides information about the community had been shut off. Even though the portal had been shut off, LexisNexis could still write in to get the report. She stated the City was in compliance with the Sanctuary City Policy. The on-line reporting system had also been shut off and officers were now taking those reports from the community. She stated the RFP for that would close in the very near future and other solutions were being sought to avoid inconveniencing the community.

Chief French responded to questions. As to whether any of the use of force incidents were being investigated by the Office of Professional Accountability (OPA), she did not have those numbers at this time.

Commissioner Cantú requested that future reports include the OPA investigations and whether any of those investigations had come into the CPRC to avoid redundancies. She wanted to be able to understand how OPA was working with the CPRC.

Chief French explained there would always be redundancies because the RPD always investigated anything submitted to the CPRC.

Commissioner Cantú reiterated her request for the investigations being considered by the OPA, and Chief French advised she would get an opinion on whether or not that could be done.

VII. OLD BUSINESS, DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Status of the Commission's Proposed Revisions to Chapter 3.54

Legal Counsel Andrews reported that with the loss of the attorney earlier reported, the CPRC's proposed revisions to Chapter 3.54 were currently in a holding pattern. In response to Commissioner Hegstrom's request for a status report on each of the CPRC's recommended changes to the ordinance from the last meeting, she reported that all of the CPRC's requested changes, including those on the current agenda, would all be considered by the City Council together.

b. Update on the Electronic Submission of Complaint Forms

Staff Liaison Adam Cunha noted that former staff liaison Shané Johnson had started the on-line complaint form and he had completed it and had posted an English language version while a Spanish language version would be translated in the near future.

c. Interim Investigator

Legal Counsel Andrews stated the ad hoc committee had identified a number of candidates and the City's Human Resources (HR) Director had offered a position to one of the candidates as Interim Confidential Investigative and Appeals Officer (CIAO) Investigator. She understood the Interim Investigator had been engaged, would be available next month, and the Interim Investigator would be able to move forward to investigate the complaints in the queue. There was a separate search for a permanent investigator.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

b. Discuss and Vote on a Recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to Authorize the Community Police Review Commission to Automatically Review, Hear, and Investigate All Incidents Where a WRAP Device, TASER, Canine, or Firearm is Used in the Field by an Officer of the Richmond Police Department, Even When No Complaint Was Filed

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, an attorney, noted his understanding that the CPRC currently received complaints and automatically investigated certain types of incidents such as officer-involved shootings, deaths and serious-bodily injuries, and that the items on the agenda would strengthen the CPRC's ability to also investigate incidents where a WRAP device or TASERS were used for transparency and better accountability. He supported the strengthened oversight.

ROZIE, Richmond, opposed the use of WRAP devices and supported the items on the agenda to help provide clarity and transparency to keep officers accountable and to protect the community.

BARB ATWELL, representing the Racial Justice Action Team of the Berkeley Friends Meeting aka Quackers, spoke about WRAP devices, TASERS and canines and noted that many Bay Area cities, including Berkeley, had found a way to make their police oversight systems more transparent while complying with the Peace Officers' Bill of Rights. She supported the automatic review of all uses of a WRAP device, TASER, or canine and stated the WRAP device was a full body restraining system known to cause injuries. She objected to the use of those devices, and if they must be used stated they should be scrutinized by a non-police oversight body. She also stated that CPRC oversight was necessary to ensure that officers only used TASERS when it was strictly necessary to do so. She noted that the RPD had a long history of problematic use of police dogs and a high rate of injuries and the CPRC should be empowered to monitor protocols and policies. She urged the approval of the proposed changes to the RMC to strengthen the CPRC's oversight and keep Richmond safe.

LORRAINE BRASNA, Richmond, a teacher, objected to the fact that the RPD was still using dogs and she urged automatic review of all officers who used a WRAP device, TASER or canine. She stated that different strategies were required to help de-escalate and she urged the CPRC to adopt the automatic review. She also commented that residents did not know how to navigate the system to get a complaint filed and there should be an automatic review for all those kinds of incidents.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of the Richmond Police Officers' Association (RPOA), stated with respect to Item b that he did not believe people understood the reasons why the WRAP devices were being used and he urged more research to understand those devices that were less intrusive and far more humane for situations where police sometimes had to use force. As to the automatic review, he suggested it was a ploy to spread Berkeley type stuff in Richmond, and looking for problems that did not exist.

Commissioner Hegstrom wanted to understand why and when WRAP devices, TASERS and canines were being used and because of that she supported the proposed recommendation to the City Council.

Vice Chair Flores asked if there was a list of non-lethal or less-lethal devices used by the RPD, such as bean bags.

Commissioner Cantú commented that considering AB 481, the bill related to military equipment used by police departments, bean bags and other less lethal projectiles were part of RPD's compliance with that Assembly Bill while the WRAP, the TASER, batons and other devices listed were not part of RPD's compliance related to SB 481. Everything else was part of RPD's monthly reports and in compliance with an annual report for AB 481.

Commissioner Lawson agreed that batons should be included in the list of devices referenced.

Commissioner Garcia suggested that certain Commissioners were fixed in a position regardless of the data presented.

Commissioner Garcia referred to an unfortunate situation that was common in Richmond where a family member of his had a severe mental health crisis, and while RPD had nothing to do with it, his family member had been shot in the leg to back off from attacking other family members. He did not want to put RPD officers in situations where they might hesitate to use something less lethal when he saw first-hand the result of something more lethal. He did not support putting aside less lethal options.

Commissioner Cantú suggested that understanding when such things as WRAP devices and TASERS were being used and when they were not being used would provide more trust with the RPD, which she hoped would be the outcome of the proposed automatic review and investigation of all incidents when they were used.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Lawson) to recommend to the City Council the amendment of Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to authorize the Community Police Review Commission to automatically review, hear, and investigate all incidents where a WRAP device, TASER, canine, or firearm is used in the field by an officer of the Richmond Police Department, even when no complaint was filed; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Garcia; Abstain: None; Absent: Jackson and Lorber).

- a. Discuss and Vote on a Recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to Require the Investigative Officer to Publish an Annual Report

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, supported the amendment to require the Investigative Officer to publish an annual report and compared Richmond's Public Case Summaries with the City of Berkeley's system.

ROZIE, supported the agenda item that she stated would offer transparency to the community and expand the information available from the investigations and hold officers accountable for misconduct.

HOPE DIXON, Richmond, also supported the item that would provide more detail than the Public Case Summaries had provided and improve safety to Richmond residents.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of the RPOA, supported the recommended report and suggested that a 10-year review be provided. He suggested there was bias involved in the issues under discussion by those who did not support police.

LORRAINE BRASNA, Richmond, supported the increased transparency about the cases involved and supported the accountability of those in power.

EMELIE ROSS, Richmond, also supported publishing all records in accordance with state law and not redacting police officers' names from the Public Case Summaries. She noted that San Francisco was another city that had records publicly available and she supported that transparency to publicize all the information that was relevant for the public to hear.

Commissioner Lawson pointed out that every speaker was in favor of the recommendation. He moved to recommend to the City Council the amendment to Chapter 3.54 to require the Investigative Officer to publish an annual report.

Chair Martinez recommended that other things be added such as demographics of the complainants. She wanted to see how the complaints were being submitted and how the City was in compliance with SB 1421 and SB 16 (expanded public access to law enforcement public records) or not in compliance.

Commissioner Hegstrom noted for the record that the item on the agenda simply required the Investigative Officer to publish an annual report while the staff report had identified a long list of minimum requirements that should be included in the report.

Commissioner Lawson withdrew his motion and made another for purposes of clarity.

Commissioner Hegstrom sought clarification from Commissioner Cantú of the first of nine items to be included in the report, which was provided. She also noted for the record that the job description for the Investigative Officer also required an annual report.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Cantú) to recommend to the City Council the amendment of Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to require the Investigative Officer to publish an annual report that would include the nine items listed in the recommended action in the agenda report, Exhibit VIII.a, to also include the demographics of complainants and compliance with SB 1421 and SB 16; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: Garcia; Absent: Jackson and Lorber).

- c. Discuss and Vote on a Recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to Require All Records and Reports that are Characterized as “Not Confidential” Under California Penal Code Section 832.7(b)(1) be Published on the City’s Website

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, stated that the Police Officers’ Bill of Rights Act had been amended a few years ago to designate records related to certain disciplinary proceedings as not confidential, which under state law would allow the public access to those records through a Public Records Act request. He noted that request was not always as easy as it should be, and for fairness and transparency he recommended the City should proactively publicize the records that were, by law, not confidential, so that the public could see them. It would also show that the CPRC was transparent.

BEN THERRIault, President of the RPOA, stated those issues would be a meet and confer issue. He noted that people in the past, including the CPRC, had dealt poorly with the issue of confidential records when people, including investigators and members of the CPRC, had been rightly sued. The same had also happened in the City of Berkeley. The issue around records was a big deal and the RPOA would be mindful of people’s lawful rights as employees and as dues-paying members of the RPOA.

LORRAINE BRASNA, Richmond, emphasized that citizens had a right to know who was doing what when, especially when they were in the service of protection. She urged the CPRC to approve the agenda item and to publish all records without redacting the names of police officers.

Commissioner Hegstrom referred to the references to the Penal Code, and specifically to Penal Code Section 832.7(b)(6), which did not allow for the redaction of officers' names or work-related information. She asked for clarification.

Commissioner Cantú explained that according to the Peace Officers' Bill of Rights, only a sustained complaint would allow the police officer's name to be listed on the Public Case Summary. All others would be redacted.

Legal Counsel Andrews stated it was her understanding that the more aggravated level of complaint would allow the names to be disclosed, subject to review by the City Attorney's Office.

Commissioner Hegstrom explained that was a change made a few years ago, a limited scope where names could be disclosed. She commented that the CPRC had paid a heavy price, as earlier reported, for releasing information it was not supposed to release, which was why it was very difficult to get any information released now. She wanted to make sure that anything done was legally sound.

Commissioner Cantú explained it would be that limited scope in accordance with the Peace Officers' Bill of Rights under state law that this item would change.

Commissioner Garcia emphasized that Commissioners would have to be super aware of the legal implications of how to comply with the complex data requirements and his concern was with the past when someone, who had not been properly trained, had placed the City and the CPRC at huge legal risk. The same risk applied here. He stated that Commissioners were still not trained in basic policing and police policies and he was reluctant to handle or have access to records that might jeopardize the ability of the CPRC to act.

Commissioner Garcia also expressed concern with how the information could be weaponized against police officers given a number of political incidents where information related to police officers used CPRC data to make the RPD look worse than it actually was.

Commissioner Cantú made a motion to adopt the recommended action as shown in Exhibit VIII.c of the agenda packet dated March 5, 2025. Commissioner Flores seconded the motion.

Prior to a vote, Legal Counsel Andrews requested an amended motion to include the language *subject to review by the City Attorney's office*, so that before the report was published it would be reviewed by the City Attorney's office to ensure that the material would be appropriate to provide in the public sphere, which might ultimately involve some redaction. When asked if the Investigator could make that determination, she stated the motion should identify that the records would be coming from the Investigator. She added that since this would be a recommendation to the City Council, the City Council may work out the detail at that level.

On the discussion, Commissioner Hegstrom suggested that the complainants' names should also be redacted in spite of the action to do so taken by the CPRC at the last meeting because that action had not yet been formalized by the City Council.

Commissioner Hegstrom commented that if everything was to be made public (with exceptions), she questioned the need for closed sessions to consider complaints.

Legal Counsel Andrews explained that the complaints were considered in closed session because the legal analysis was confidential.

On the continued discussion, a review by the City Attorney's office was supported given the fines involved when illegally releasing officers' names, and there had been times when CPRC Commissioners had made small changes/edits to reports and there was a need to ensure compliance with the law.

Commissioner Cantú made a friendly amendment to her original motion to add language to *redact the names of complainants*, to include the language *subject to review by the City Attorney's Office*, and *with the Investigator to comply with cited laws*. Commissioner Lawson seconded the friendly amendment.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Flores) including a friendly amendment, to recommend to the City Council the amendment of Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to require all records and reports that are characterized as "not confidential" under California Penal Code Section 832.7(b)(1) be published on the City's website; to redact the names of complainants, the records to be published would include all materials listed in Penal Code section 832.7(b)(3), subject to redaction only for the reasons specified in Penal Code section 832.7(b)(6), which does not allow for the redaction of officers' names or work-related information, subject to review by the City Attorney's office and with the Investigator to comply with cited laws; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Garcia; Abstain: None; Absent: Jackson and Lorber).

- d. Discuss and Vote on a Recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to Change the Standard of Proof for a Finding of Misconduct to "Preponderance of the Evidence" and Add that the Investigation and Decision on Findings Shall be Fair, Unbiased, and Evidence-based

JULIE SOLOMON, Richmond, stated she was offended by the comments from the President of the RPOA in that no one who was present intended to waste time, because they hated cops or wanted to create unnecessary work, but were present given that transparency was a critical component to creating a good relationship between the police and the citizenry. She supported the proposal to bring the standard of evidence in line with every other civilian oversight agency in California, which was the appropriate standard when dealing with civilians who did not know the law. As a former criminal defense attorney, she explained that members of the public were afraid they would not be believed and changing the standard to a preponderance of the evidence standard from the clear and convincing evidence standard would help in that regard.

Commissioner Garcia left the room at 8:32 P.M. and returned at 8:34 P.M.

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, supported the item and did not see the need for a heightened burden of proof to apply to the review of a civilian oversight commission of complaints in the field.

LORRAINE BRASNA, Richmond, agreed with the comment that community members were afraid to come forward. She supported a situation where abuse of power was not allowed and to do that the City needed to be in line with statewide and nationwide best practices. She urged the Commission to support the item to change the burden of proof to avoid tipping the scales in favor of police officers.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of RPOA, was offended and stated other police officers were as well in that nothing about making a complaint had to do with the evidence standard in that if the evidence was there, the evidence was there. He stated this was about watering down and lowering the threshold to make more sustained complaints and it affected officers' careers. The same effort to lower the standard had been attempted a year ago and this was just another way to lower the standard so that more complaints could be sustained. He stated if there was no case, there was no case.

Commissioner Lawson agreed that a sustained complaint could affect an officer's career in that a sustained complaint against an officer meant that an officer had done some wrongdoing as determined by the CPRC, which should have some effect to affect improvement to the RPD and affect its goal of having a better relationship between the RPD and the community. He stated it was not about lowering the bar but making the bar the same as elsewhere in the state and with the same standard nationwide. The RPD in its investigations of wrongdoing was to use as the standard of evidence a preponderance of evidence. He strongly supported the recommendation.

Commissioner Garcia referred to a case last September when the Investigator had made a recommendation and despite the evidence the CPRC had disagreed and the Investigator had quit because of ethical and legal ramifications. He supported the item.

Legal Counsel Andrews noted that much of what had been said related to a confidential closed session item that should not be discussed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Flores) to recommend to the City Council the amendment of Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to change the standard of proof for a finding of Misconduct to "preponderance of the evidence" and add that the investigation and decision on findings shall be fair, unbiased, and evidence-based; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Garcia; Abstain: None; Absent: Jackson and Lorber).

- e. Discuss and Decide on Goals for 2025 and Create Subcommittees to Meet Those Goals

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, supported the item and noted the City of Berkeley Police Accountability Board used various subcommittees. He supported the same for the CPRC.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of the RPOA, suggested that subcommittees should be public meetings. For goals, he recommended the reinstatement of ridealongs so that members had a basis of understanding what was actually going on and passing judgment on whether police officers were doing right or wrong, such as preponderance of evidence versus clear and convincing, and being trained to understand what a WRAP did, what canines did, getting involved in the RPD and getting training.

Mr. Therriault suggested that would be a complete counter for many of those on the Commission over the last six months to a year, to actually operate from a point of understanding instead of a point of pontification.

Commissioner Hegstrom stated in the past there had been some subcommittees and she agreed there should be a meeting of the group to figure out what needed to be done and identify who wanted to do it. She recommended a new flyer and other outreach materials through an outreach subcommittee.

Chair Martinez described what she had done to train herself in the workings and processes of the CPRC and other oversight bodies and she supported more training opportunities for CPRC members through a training subcommittee.

Commissioner Flores wanted to review the RPD policies and procedures to see if there could be some recommended changes through a policy review subcommittee.

Commissioner Cantú recommended reviewing state assembly and senate bills for compliance and enforcement, such as AB481 and the Racial Justice Act and SB 1416, a legislative subcommittee to ensure compliance through a legislative compliance subcommittee.

Commissioner Hegstrom suggested that of the many things to push through the City Council there should be a committee to make sure that there be a presence of the CPRC at Council meetings to represent the CPRC or to promote actions supported by the CPRC through an ordinance amendment subcommittee.

Commissioner Cantú suggested that the Chair, Vice Chair and City Council Liaison should be doing that.

Legal Counsel Andrews explained that if the committees were permanent committees they would be Brown Act committees that required a staff report and process that could be burdensome while if the committee was limited in scope and the members were less than a quorum of the CPRC it could be more of an ad hoc committee. She clarified that if the Chair and Vice Chair were charged to work things through the City Council, there would be no need for a committee to do that.

On the discussion, it was noted that most committees could be ad hoc committees while a Policy Review Subcommittee with an ongoing review of the RPD Police Manual would be more of a Brown Act committee, and the Training Subcommittee would also likely be a Brown Act committee.

Commissioner Hegstrom commented that when the new Investigator was on board that person would have a role to play in training, as shown in the job description, but in the interim there could be an ad hoc committee to help with training.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Hegstrom) to continue the meeting to 10:14 P.M. prior to the closed session; approved by a voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Jackson and Lorber).

Chair Martinez and Commissioner Hegstrom expressed a desire to work on an outreach.ad hoc committee.

Chair Martinez, Commissioner Cantú and Commissioner Garcia expressed a desire to work on a training ad hoc committee.

Commissioner Cantú and Commissioner Lawson agreed to work on an ad hoc committee to deal with legislative compliance.

Legal Counsel Andrews clarified that committee members could communicate with each other but could not loop in other members of the CPRC given potential Brown Act violations. Updates from each committee would be brought to the full CPRC.

IX. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS, STAFF, RIDEALONGS

There were no reports.

The CPRC moved into Executive Session at 9:03 P.M.

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

X. EXECUTIVE SESSION – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

- a. PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE/DISMISSAL/RELEASE
Government Code §§ 54957(b) and 54954.5(e)
- b. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Government Code §§ 54956.9(d)(2) and 54954.5(c) (One Case)

Return to Open Session

Legal Counsel Andrews reported that in closed session the CPRC voted to leave the Public Summary in the McDonald matter up on the website and voted to have the City Attorney add to the Public Summary the outcome of the Chief of Police’s review of the investigation and the City Manager’s review of the investigation to the Public Summary; approved by a vote of 5-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Garcia; Abstain: None; Absent: Jackson and Lorber). In addition, the CPRC had indicated that in the future on a go-forward basis when the Chief of Police issued the results of their investigation that would be added to any Public Summary that was on the website, the same with the City Manager; approved by a vote of 6-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Jackson and Lorber).

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately P.M.

Carmen Martinez, Chair