

COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW COMMISSION
of the City of Richmond, California
(CPRC)
Wednesday, April 2, 2025
7:00 P.M.

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 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), Andre Jackson, Daniel Lawson, Rachel Lorber[^] and Carmen Martinez (Chair)
[^]On Zoom

Absent: Oscar Garcia

Staff: Adam Cunha - Present

Council Liaison: Claudia Jimenez – Not Present

City Attorney's Office Representative Christopher Dykzeul, City Attorney's Office - Present

II. STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND STATEMENTS OF ZOOM COMPLIANCE

Legal Counsel Christopher Dykzeul verified with Commissioners Hegstrom and Lorber that they were in compliance with the Brown Act requirements to attend the meeting remotely through Zoom, and the just cause was the threat of a shooting at 4:40 P.M. this date, which created an emergency occurrence that justified the remote appearance.

Commissioner Lorber verified that the current meeting agenda had been posted publicly, she was located at 34th and McBride in Richmond, California, there were no adults in the room, and she was appearing remotely because of the safety concern identified.

Commissioner Hegstrom verified that the current meeting agenda had been posted publicly, she was located at 100 Thorndale Drive, San Rafael, California, there were no adults in her presence, and she was appearing remotely because she was currently disabled and unable to walk.

III. AGENDA REVIEW

Commissioner Cantú requested a reorder of the six items under Item IX. New Business, with the following order: Items b, d, f, a, e and c. The CPRC accepted the recommended changes to the order of the agenda.

II. STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Legal Counsel Dykzeul stated in reviewing the materials in hand and in discussion with the permanent Legal Counsel for the CPRC, he was unaware of any statements to give for the Conflict-of-Interest section.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (February 5, 2025)

Chair Martinez reported that she had reviewed the edits requested by Commissioner Hegstrom at the last meeting on March 5, 2025, and those edits had been included in the minutes provided to the CPRC for the February 5, 2025 meeting.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Lawson) to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2025 meeting, as amended by Commissioner Hegstrom; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Garcia).

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (March 5, 2025)

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Flores) to approve the minutes of the March 5, 2025 meeting, as submitted; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: Jackson and Lorber; Absent: Garcia).

VI. PUBLIC FORUM

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, invited the CPRC to the Contra Costa Mayors Conference on May 1, 2025 in the City of Pleasant Hill, \$70 per person. With respect to the minutes from the last meeting, he expressed disappointment that he had been unable to speak on a number of items, which was the public's right to do. He referred to public meetings and emphasized the need for decorum in the future.

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

Chief of Police Bisa French reported, by Zoom, that the Richmond Police Department (RPD) had 124 filled sworn positions and 23 sworn vacancies out of an approved 147 positions. For professional staff, there were currently 55 filled positions and 17 professional staff vacancies. She stated the RPD continued to be short staffed in officers and dispatchers. There were six officers in field training and one dispatcher in field training, and the RPD was waiting for approval from the City Manager for a contract through the Request for Proposal (RFP) process for help with recruiting through the social media system previously used for recruitment purposes. In addition, there were eight officers out on injury leave.

Chief French reported that for the month of February there had been no murders, although there had been 10 sexual assaults, which was double the month of January; 27 robberies, 47 aggravated assaults, 23 burglaries, 112 larceny, 57 vehicle thefts and three arsons. For the use of force, there had been 19 incidences in February; two taser deployments, four taser surrenders, three WRAP use and 14 incidences where body force had been used, and one bean bag deployment.

Chair Martinez asked why the 8401 Report (police reports) were not provided to the CPRC, and requested that the report be provided to the CPRC in the future.

Chief French explained that the report was shared with the City Council and made available to the public through the City Council agenda packet, with a presentation to the City Council each year. The report and presentation could also be made available to the CPRC.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS, DISCUSSION ITEMS

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

Legal Counsel Dykzeul understood that the status of the proposed revisions to Chapter 3.54 were still with the Richmond Police Officers' Association (RPOA) for the meet and confer.

Commissioner Lawson requested that an action item be placed on the next meeting agenda to recommend some action be taken on the proposed revisions to Chapter 3.54.

b. Update on the Electronic Submission of Complaint Forms

CPRC Staff Adam Cunha reported that the complaint forms were live in English and Spanish and there had been two complaints received under the new process to date.

Chair Martinez pointed out some changes that had been made to ensure the text of the new pdf electronic complaint form was consistent with the older written forms.

c. Interim Investigator Hiring

Legal Counsel Dykzeul stated the Human Resources Department was currently working with staff to review a proposal from one of the candidates for the interim investigator position, and was still negotiating terms. The item was expected to go to the City Council for approval in late April 2025.

d. Permanent Investigator Recruitment

Legal Counsel Dykzeul stated that the HR Department had the packet together and was also working on the recruitment for a permanent investigator, which was also pending.

Chair Martinez offered her understanding of the status of the recruitment brochure and revisions that were to be made to the brochure that had been expected by March 31, although those revisions had not yet been provided.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, speaking to the interim investigator hiring, was pleased that an interim investigator would soon be hired and he was also pleased that the Byers Group was working on the recruitment of a permanent investigator.

BEN THERRIault, President of the Richmond Police Officers' Association (RPOA), commented that he had his hand raised to speak to the reports but had not been called upon, which was a Brown Act violation.

LISA JOHNSON, unincorporated Richmond, reiterated what Mr. Therriault had stated that public comments could not be prevented on agenda items and the agenda did not indicate that public comments would not be allowed, which was discrimination against the public. She added that two Brown Act violations would be filed as a result.

IX. 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 be Changed to “The purpose of the Community Police Review Commission is to build public confidence by increasing transparency and accountability through independent, impartial, and fair investigations of complaints and to review Richmond Police Department policies, practices, and procedures. The Commission also advises the City Council, City Manager, and Chief of Police on all matters pertaining to the administration of the Richmond Police Department.”

Chair Martinez advised that she and the Vice Chair had worked on the current language because it did not include all of the CPRC’s responsibilities and functions and there was a need to highlight oversight, transparency and accountability, which needed to be clearly stated to have a better relationship with the community and the RPD.

Commissioner Hegstrom recommended that the text stating that the purpose of the CPRC was “to build public confidence by increasing transparency and accountability” should more specifically state “to build confidence in the Richmond Police Department.” She suggested the City Council would likely debate the wording of the statement of purpose which may ultimately end up being different from what was recommended..

In response, Commissioner Cantú clarified that all the recommendations to make changes to Chapter 3.54 would all have to be reviewed and approved by the City Council. Further, that the statement of purpose was for the CPRC, not for the RPD, in that the CPRC was independent from the RPD.

Commissioner Jackson suggested that everyone involved should be transparent; the community, the police, and the CPRC. He wanted to be fair to everyone and he commented that the statement implied that the CPRC was anti-police. He recommended more diversity on the CPRC.

Vice Chair Flores suggested building confidence with what the CPRC was doing and what it stated it would do, and it was not anti-police but is anti-police misconduct.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, stated that having a mission statement was critical and he supported the mission statement, as submitted, in the knowledge that it could be changed by the City Council.

LISA JOHNSON agreed with Commissioner Hegstrom in that the test in the statement of purpose was to build public confidence, although it did not identify in who or in what. She suggested it could be the public confidence in the CPRC and in the police, and noted that former Investigator Threet’s resignation letter had raised significant concerns about the CPRC’s ability to render impartial, fair, and unbiased decisions.

Ms. Johnson added that in other cases Mr. Threet had raised ethic concerns, which was missing in the statement of purpose. She added that community policing was embraced by Richmond and its residents and was in the title of the Commission, and part of community policing was to create and help foster positive relations, which would come from holding people accountable. She suggested that removing positive relations from the statement of purpose was anti-community and she urged the CPRC to consider that.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of the RPOA, appreciated some of the comments, recognized that some people hated the police, noted the ordinance was already coded for transparency and investigations of things that occurred with police officers in the City, although now people were openly indicating their disdain for the police. He suggested the current CPRC was the anti-police commission.

AMBER HATFIELD, Richmond, was pleased to see the CPRC recently begin to take steps to bring the ordinance up to the standards of other cities in the Bay Area. She supported the update to the statement of purpose for the CPRC shifting the stated goals of the CPRC away from a goal of serving as public relations for the RPD and toward true police accountability. She noted the RPD had a marketing department as well as the Police Activities League (PAL) that served a community relations purpose. She stated the CPRC should be independent and provide community members with access to independent and fair review when they had been harmed by police upholding values of transparency, fairness and impartiality to ensure justice. She urged the approval of the new statement of purpose.

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, supported the item to change the current one-dimensional statement of purpose. He referred to the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement's (NACOLE's) website, which was an important resource that listed 13 benefits of having civilian oversight of the police, only one of which was to improve relations between the police department and the community. He noted the new statement of purpose still included improving relations and in terms of problems with the current statement, he emphasized that the CPRC needed to be impartial, distant and independent from the RPD and the proposed new statement captured that.

Motion by Commissioner Cantú, seconded by Commissioner Lawson to approve a recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to be changed to "The purpose of the Community Police Review Commission is to build public confidence by increasing transparency and accountability through independent, impartial, and fair investigations of complaints and to review Richmond Police Department policies, practices, and procedures. The Commission also advises the City Council, City Manager, and Chief of Police on all matters pertaining to the administration of the Richmond Police Department."

During Roll Call of the above motion, Commissioner Hegstrom commented that the purpose statement had been written in two different ways in the agenda packet. She supported the second version as being more appropriate. As a result, she made an amended motion to support the second version of the statement of purpose.

Legal Counsel Dykzeul advised that the Roll Call on the current motion would have to be completed, although Commissioner Hegstrom could vote no on the motion and if it did not pass, she could propose a new motion.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Lawson) to approve a recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to be changed to “The purpose of the Community Police Review Commission is to build public confidence by increasing transparency and accountability through independent, impartial, and fair investigations of complaints and to review Richmond Police Department policies, practices, and procedures. The Commission also advises the City Council, City Manager, and Chief of Police on all matters pertaining to the administration of the Richmond Police Department;” approved by a Roll Call vote: 4-2 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Hegstrom and Lorber; Abstain: Jackson; Absent: Garcia).

Commissioner Hegstrom made an amended motion to the just adopted motion to change the language of the statement of purpose slightly to approve the wording shown in the body of the agenda report.

ACTION: It was M/S/F (Hegstrom/Lorber) to approve a recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to be changed to “The purpose of the Community Police Review Commission is to build public confidence in the Richmond Police Department by ensuring transparency and accountability through independent, impartial, and fair investigations of complaints. The Commission is also responsible for reviewing and evaluating the policies, practices and procedures of the Richmond Police Department. Additionally, the Commission advises the City Council, City Manager, and Chief of Police on matters related to the administration of the Richmond Police Department;” FAILED by a Roll Call vote: 3-3 (Ayes: Hegstrom, Lawson and Lorber; Noes: Cantú, Flores and Chair Martinez; Abstain: Jackson; Absent: Garcia).

Commissioner Lorber recommended another amended motion to approve the original statement of purpose, as shown on the meeting agenda, with the replacement of the word “increasing” transparency on the fourth line of the ACTION, to *ensuring* transparency.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lorber/Lawson) to approve a recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to be changed to “The purpose of the Community Police Review Commission is to build public confidence by ensuring transparency and accountability through independent, impartial, and fair investigations of complaints and to review Richmond Police Department policies, practices, and procedures. The Commission also advises the City Council, City Manager, and Chief of Police on all matters pertaining to the administration of the Richmond Police Department;” approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Lawson, Lorber and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: Jackson; Absent: Garcia).

- d. 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 Issue Subpoenas to Compel the Production of Books, Papers, Documents, and Other Evidence

Chair Martinez pointed out that while the ordinance did not specifically state or allow the CPRC to issue subpoenas to compel the production of evidence, the proposed amendment to Chapter 3.54 would allow the CPRC the ability to fulfill its duty, enable more comprehensive and thorough investigations, and better align with best practices for police oversight throughout the State of California.

Commissioner Cantú suggested the absence of the ability to issue subpoenas to compel the production of evidence had been a clerical error in that other police oversight bodies included that ability in their ordinances.

Commissioner Lawson verified that the CPRC currently had the power to subpoena witnesses but that power was not explicitly stated in the City's ordinance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

JULIE SOLOMON, Richmond unincorporated, agreed with the need for the CPRC to have access to evidence and stated it was important to get it codified.

EMELIE ROSS, Richmond, supported the amendment to Chapter 3.54 to ensure that the CPRC had the tools it needed to conduct investigations.

ANDREW MELENDEZ, Richmond, supported the proposed amendment to Chapter 3.54 to ensure the CPRC had the ability to subpoena hard evidence, particularly evidence like reports, photographs and video footage. He supported full subpoena power to ensure that the CPRC had all the necessary materials it needed to fully assess a situation and make full and formal recommendations on police misconduct incidences.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Lorber) to approve 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 issue subpoenas to compel the production of books, papers, documents, and other evidence; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Garcia).

- f. Discuss and Vote on a Recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to Ensure all Commissioners Receive Annual Training and Specialized Training as Needed, that Prepares Them to Make Well-Informed, Fair, Equitable, and Unbiased Rulings

Commissioner Cantú explained that the item had been proposed as a result of the CPRC meeting in October 2024, at which time a discussion had developed about what needed to be changed with respect to the CPRC. She had reached out to the ad hoc committee comprised of Chair Martinez and Commissioner Garcia that had been charged with addressing the need for training and had consolidated all the recommendations from the CPRC around training.

Recognizing the concern around the recommended 40 hours of training, Commissioner Cantú had recommended 10 hours of training required within a year of appointment. She identified the proposed curriculum consistent with the Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Outreach (IOLERO) and NACOLE standards.

Commissioner Cantú explained that the process also needed to identify who would provide the training and she referred to consultants and trainers through IOLERO and NACOLE. She still included the ridealongs as an option, and she described how the proposed training could be provided in phased, mandatory eight hours with an optional two hours for extended training. She clarified the CPRC was being asked to recommend a requirement for annual training and specialized training, as needed, only because everything else would be subject to budget, contracts, and City Council discussion. The training would also be open to the public.

Chair Martinez thanked Commissioner Cantú for the proposal that appeared to capture the feedback offered last October. She suggested it would be critical to start off with the investigation review, automatic triggers, and police union contracts.

Commissioner Hegstrom expressed concern with eight-hour minimum training since there was currently not eight hours of classes potentially available. She recommended some flexibility in the system given that a lack of meeting the minimum requirement would result in a CPRC member's inability to vote or hear cases. She supported mandatory training but not an eight-hour requirement.

Commissioner Jackson asked if there was a choice to take the training and the consequences of not taking the training, and Commissioner Cantú explained that the recommended action was to receive annual and specialized training without specifics.

Commissioner Cantú added that if the recommendation was adopted, anyone appointed to the CPRC after that adoption would have to adhere to the amended ordinance. In the case of training, members would have a year to adhere to any requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, commented that other City Boards and Commissions had similar training requirements and he liked the concept for required annual training that would be open to the public, although he questioned whether or not eight hours would be excessive. He suggested that four hours might be more appropriate.

AMBER HATFIELD, Richmond, urged support for the proposal to bring the CPRC up to the standards of other California cities that provided comprehensive training on police procedures, civil rights, best practices and other topics, which would strengthen the CPRC, improve the efficiency of the work and build confidence in community members who could provide invaluable perspective, especially youth and other community members who had been impacted by police violations and incarceration

ANDREW MELENDEZ, Richmond, also supported the item to provide relative training to all members of the CPRC, especially when reviewing police misconduct cases and allowing the CPRC to be as effective as possible. He suggested that would open up the capacity for more members of the community to get involved in the CPRC in meaningful ways, particularly those who did not have the necessary training or time to learn about the CPRC and its procedures.

LISA JOHNSON, Richmond, supported CPRC training and recommended that ethics be a topic included in that training.

Ms. Johnson recommended rethinking the ridealongs and suggested that ridealongs be a required level of training to offer a better way to know officers and to be aware of officers' experiences.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Martinez/Flores) to approve a recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to ensure all Commissioners received annual training and specialized training as needed, that prepares them to make well-informed, fair, equitable, and unbiased rulings; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Garcia).

- a. Discuss and Vote on a Recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to Empower the Commission, at its Own Discretion and on an As-needed Basis by Majority Vote, to Obtain Legal Advice from Outside Attorneys Who Do Not Represent the City

Commissioner Cantú stated currently the CPRC must rely on the City Attorney for any and all legal advice and the proposed amendment would allow the CPRC to submit legal questions to independent counsel for any reason a majority of commissioners believed was warranted. She stated the City Attorney was the attorney for the entire City and all of its employees and had the duty to protect the City's and employees' interests while the goal of the CPRC might not always align with the City Attorney. She recommended it was critical with a new investigator that if there was a conflict of interest the CPRC would be allowed to seek legal advice. She explained there was legal precedent in that the Rent Board had its own independent legal counsel.

Commissioner Lawson added that the proposed amendment was not intended to impugn the integrity of the City's attorneys and was the opposite because it was their responsibility to protect the financial interests of the City of Richmond, and it was possible that in the conduct of business some of the CPRC's decisions could open the City up to litigation.

As to who would pay for the costs involved, Commissioner Cantú stated that all the recommendations would go to the City Council. She also noted that the next item on the agenda would discuss the budget and it was hoped that a budgetary item would be able to fund any costs associated with the proposal.

Commissioner Lorber asked if the idea was for an attorney or a legal firm on retainer to be selected by the City Council, and Commissioner Cantú suggested there would need to be a retainer and over time the CPRC could assess whether more extensive access to independent counsel would be required so that it would be similar to a pilot program to assess how and whether the project would work. It would be up to the City Council to be the deciding factor who would be contacted, usually through the RFP process and the City Manager.

Commissioner Hegstrom noted at some point a decision would be made to hire outside counsel and she asked that those details be identified and included in the proposed amendment.

Commissioner Cantú stated the decision to be made for outside hire would be through a majority vote and a process, if approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, commented that the Personnel Board also had help from outside counsel and someone from the City Attorney's office was also present at Personnel Board meetings. He supported the same for the CPRC.

LISA JOHNSON, Richmond, suggested there was a big difference with the Rent Board in that the outside counsel in that case was a full-time employee who was funded as part of the budget subsidized by landlords. She suggested that was not a fair comparison with the CPRC and no other Board or Commission in the City of Richmond had an independent outside attorney who had not been contracted specifically for a Board or Commission. As such, she suggested the proposal could become problematic.

JULIE SOLOMON, unincorporated Richmond, noted her understanding that the CPRC was seeking the ability to retain independent counsel as necessary based on a majority vote of the CPRC, which was different from placing an attorney on retainer for a specified period of time, and if there was a circumstance where the City may be sued because of something the CPRC was investigating, the City Attorney was not allowed ethically to provide advice to a body that would be adverse to the City of Richmond. She saw the proposed amendment as protection for the City Attorney.

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, supported the proposed amendment and stated it was important for the CPRC to have the right to its own legal counsel given that the Rent Board had its own legal counsel full time. If comparing the CPRC with the Rent Board, he stated the CPRC frequently confronted sensitive nuanced legal issues and could benefit from having the ability to obtain a second opinion. He suggested the proposal was conscientious with respect to City resources in that if there were particular legal questions that Commissioners wanted an opinion on from an impartial source the CPRC could get that advice, and Commissioners could feel confident that the decisions they were making were on solid legal ground.

Commissioner Jackson asked for an example of why the advice of independent legal counsel might be required, and Commissioner Lawson noted that recently the City Attorney had offered advice on an item that was different from her previous advice on the same topic, with the hint that there might be litigation on that topic, which was not identified.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Lawson) to approve a recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Amend Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code to empower the Commission, at its own discretion and on an as-needed basis by majority vote, to obtain legal advice from outside attorneys who do not represent the City; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Garcia).

- e. Discuss and Vote on a Budgetary Recommendation to the Richmond City Council to Approve the Proposed Budget for the CPRC and for Staff to Provide the Commission with Quarterly Financial Reports to Ensure Greater Transparency and Oversight of Budget Management Moving Forward

Chair Martinez stated that she and Commissioner Cantú were submitting for review the CPRC Fiscal Year Budget for 2024-2025, and had come up with a proposed budget. Given the recent changes in staffing, onboarding of new Commissioners and financial implications from upcoming budgetary needs, it was critical to approach the review of the CPRC's FY 2024-2025 budget thoughtfully and set a clear process to develop CPRC's FY 2025-2026 budget. She recommended a discussion of a budgetary recommendation to the City Council to approve the proposed budget for the CPRC and for staff to provide the CPRC with quarterly financial reports to ensure greater transparency and oversight of budget management moving forward.

Chair Martinez explained that an ad hoc committee review of the budget with Vice Chair Flores had found that some CPRC funds had not been used, such as those to fund attendance at NACOLE, and additional funds would be needed to fund a full-time investigator and for CPRC training. She described the budget line items and their purpose, and identified which line items had been increased and which remained the same for the new fiscal year budget that would start on July 1.

Commissioner Hegstrom was pleased to see the new transparency related to the budget. She recommended the strategy of asking for more in the budget as opposed to less, and sought assurance that funding in the budget would remain with the CPRC if not immediately used by the CPRC.

Commissioner Cantú explained that the budget funds had come from the General Fund and if not used by the CPRC during the fiscal year, any unspent funds would return to the General Fund. As such, she encouraged the use of the funds in the final budget. She added that the proposed budget would also have to include independent legal counsel, if approved by the City Council.

Chair Martinez clarified that the proposed new budget included line items not previously included, such as outreach materials, translation and interpretation services, training consultants, and independent consultations. On the discussion of whether or not City Council approval was required to spend unused funds, another question was raised as to who would make the ultimate decision about budgetary spending.

Given the lateness of the hour and the need for a motion to extend the meeting, a motion was made by Commissioner Lorber to extend the meeting for as long as necessary to finish the current item under discussion. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lawson.

On the motion, Commissioner Hegstrom noted that Cinco de Mayo was next month and the CPRC would have to make determinations at this meeting whether or not to participate, and if so, the schedule and participation of CPRC members had to be discussed.

Legal Counsel Dykzeul described the actions the CPRC could take to represent one or more motions to amend.

ACTION: It was M/S (Lorber/Lawson) to extend the meeting for as long as necessary to finish the current item under discussion. There was no vote on this motion.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Lawson) for an amended motion to extend the meeting until 9:35 P.M.; approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber and Chair Martinez; Noes: Hegstrom; Abstain: None; Absent: Garcia).

Commissioner Lorber recommended that the translation/interpretation line item also include transcription services, and she questioned whether there would be costs related to subpoenaing records and copies needing to be made.

Staff Liaison Cunha added with respect to the on-line submission forms, there was a contract for verbal translation but nothing about written translations, which might need to be specified in the budget.

Legal Counsel Dykzeul advised that the ultimate decision about budgetary spending would come from the City Council when approving the budget, and when it came to spending within the allocated categories, the CPRC would have authority to do that although it would be beholding to the ultimate categories presented and ultimately approved. He explained that anything over \$10,000 must be approved by the City Council while anything under \$10,000 could be approved by the City Manager, and the CPRC would have the authority to propose the expense.

On the discussion of specific budget amounts, it was recommended that salaries and wages be increased to \$263,000 to include a permanent full-time investigator, while payroll/fringe wages; professional and administrative services; other operating expenses; cost pool expenses; tabling event fees; NACOLE Conference fees; NACOLE annual membership dues; travel, lodging and transportation expenses; outreach materials; and training, consultants and education costs would remain the same in the proposed budget. The Translation/Interpretation services would remain the same at \$10,000, although it would be renamed to Translation/Interpretation/Transcription services, and independent legal counsel would be added for \$10,000, subpoenaing documents at \$2,000, and outreach materials would be increased from \$500 to \$2,000 since the logo alone was \$500.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, asked that filling the position of the CPRC's full-time Administrative Analyst be added to the budget.

RAYMOND WENDELL, San Pablo, suggested the CPRC was an investment for the City and an investment in giving the community a greater voice in public safety in Richmond, which could only happen if there was an investment of financial resources rather than just the time and efforts of volunteer community members. He hoped the City Council would appreciate that and approve the budget and he urged the CPRC to ask for as much as it thought it might need.

Chair Martinez advised that the City was considering the hiring of a part-time office aide and recommended a budget allocation of \$5,000.

Mr. Cunha described the options that had been discussed at the City for months related to a part-time office aide, although he had no update at this time.

Commissioner Cantú stated she had reviewed the numbers again and without the office aide the proposed 2025-2026 budget was approximately \$340,000.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Hegstrom) to approve a recommendation to the Richmond City Council to approve the Fiscal Year 2025-2026 budget for the Community Police Review Commission in an amount of \$400,000, and for staff to provide the CPRC with quarterly financial reports to ensure greater transparency and oversight of budget management moving forward; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Garcia).

- c. Discuss and Vote to Approve the Establishment of an Official Calendar of Events to Guide Outreach Activities. This Will Include Formal Participation of CPRC in Four (4) Community Events per Year. The Calendar Will be Created by the Chair, Who Will Bring a Proposal to the CPRC During the First Meeting of the Year to Collectively Identify and Select Community Events for Participation. Commissioners Will Also Have the Opportunity to Sign Up for the First Scheduled Event at that Time

Chair Martinez explained that the item would establish a Calendar of Events for the CPRC, and while the CPRC had historically participated in community events, there had never been a procedural process in place. She recommended a discussion to approve the establishment of an official Calendar of Events to guide outreach activities, to include formal participation by the CPRC in four community events each year, with the calendar to be created by the chair to bring a proposal to the CPRC during the first meeting of the calendar year to collectively identify and select community events for participation.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hegstrom/Martinez) to extend the meeting pending the minimum information required for the item; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-2 (Ayes: Flores, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Cantú and Lorber; Abstain: None; Absent: Garcia).

On the discussion of the events to be considered for CPRC participation, there were recommendations for the City of Richmond MLK Day of Service, Cinco de Mayo, Juneteenth, Reentry Success Center and Public Defender's Office Clean Slate Day, Soulful Softball Sunday, and a group holding monthly meetings for those coming out of prison and on parole for the first month to facilitate reentry into the community. Given that the schedule was being set so late in the year that some events had already occurred, the CPRC decided to settle on three events for 2025, and since most members of the CPRC would not be available for Juneteenth, it was determined that the three events for CPRC participation would be Cinco de Mayo, Soulful Softball Sunday and Clean Slate Day in October.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, recommended consideration of the Home Front Festival in October and the Fourth of July.

ACTION: It was M/S (Lawson/Cantú) for the CPRC to participate in three events in the Calendar of Events for 2025; Cinco de Mayo, Soulful Softball Sunday, and Reentry Success Center and Public Defender’s Office Clean Slate Day in October. There was no vote on the motion.

Commissioner Jackson emphasized that Juneteenth was one of the biggest festivals for the black community.

Legal Counsel Dykzeul clarified the voting protocol in stacking motions where the last motion (up to three) would be decided first and where a slight change to either the first or second motion would be an amended motion and anything substantially different would be a substitute motion.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Martinez/Lawson) to amend the original motion to participate in four events in the Calendar of Events for 2025; including Cinco de Mayo, Juneteenth, Soulful Softball Sunday, and Public Defender’s Office Clean Slate Day in October, and revisit the Juneteenth item again at the next meeting to make sure that there would be a sufficient number of CPRC members available to cover that event; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Garcia).

With respect to the Cinco de Mayo event, Commissioner Hegstrom described the typical process for tabling at events and noted that Commissioner Garcia always picked up the equipment and set up the event.

Chair Martinez volunteered to pick up the equipment and to serve the first shift including setup from 9:30 to 11:30 A.M., Commissioner Cantú offered to help with that shift while Commissioner Lorber agreed to work the 11:30 A.M. to 1:30 P.M. shift with Commissioner Lawson, and Commissioner Jackson volunteered to serve the 1:30 to 3:30 P.M. shift. Commissioner Garcia would be contacted to see whether he would be able to help and whoever had the last shift would also have to gather the equipment and return it. Commissioner Hegstrom stated she would help if she could.

X. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS, STAFF, RIDEALONGS

Chair Martinez offered an update from the outreach ad hoc committee and stated that she and Commissioner Hegstrom had been working on the flyer to pass out for Cinco de Mayo, and Mr. Cunha stated he would circulate the flyer the Chair had provided and include any minor changes to the flyer so that it would be available for Cinco de Mayo. He added that he would also work with City staff regarding Cinco de Mayo registration.

Commissioner Cantú noted that the training ad hoc committee was no longer required given the approval of the proposed amendment to Chapter 3.54.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:45 P.M.

Carmen Martinez, Chair