

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

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Chair Carmen Martinez in the Richmond Room at 450 Civic Center Plaza, 1st Floor, at Richmond, California.

Present: Carmen Martinez (Chair), Marisol Cantú*, Oscar Garcia, Carol Hegstrom, Andre Jackson*, Daniel Lawson and Rachel Lorber
*Arrived after Roll Call

Absent: Oscar Flores (Vice Chair)

Staff: Nicole Williams - Present

Council Liaison: Claudia Jimenez – Not Present

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

II. STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Floy Andrews, Legal Counsel, Aleshire & Wynder, LLP, advised there was no reported conflict of interest.

III. AGENDA REVIEW

There were no changes to the order of the agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (May 7, 2025)

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

V. PUBLIC FORUM

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that he had again spoken to the Youth Council about filling a vacancy on the CPRC. He invited everyone to the Contra Costa Mayors Conference on September 4, 2025 hosted by the City of El Cerrito, \$70/person for dinner, RSVPs required, with more details to be provided when available.

OSCAR GARCIA, speaking on behalf of the 23rd Street Merchants Association, stated the Association had recently learned about the proposed changes to the CPRC ordinance where the Richmond Police Department (RPD) would no longer be involved.

Mr. Garcia explained that the Association was concerned the RPD would not be involved in the CPRC if the proposed changes were approved since it relied on a strong RPD to ensure parking enforcement, traffic control, and assurance that their businesses would be safe. The Association requested that the RPD be engaged in updating anything that affected the RPD's work in the community and wanted to see RPD involved in the process.

Commissioner Jackson arrived at 7:05 P.M.

LISA JOHNSON (via Zoom), noted at the May meeting there had been public comment allowed on each and every item on the agenda so that there was adequate input from the public, consistent with other Boards and Commissions in the City of Richmond given that there had been multiple Brown Act violations filed against the CPRC from the March and April meetings. By omission, she stated the very fact that public comment was allowed on each item was an admission that there were Brown Act violations. She urged that adequate public comment time be allowed members of the public for each item on the meeting agenda.

Staff Liaison Nicole Williams read one public comment received by email, as follows:

Dear Community Police Review Commissioners, as a fellow police oversight entity, we commend your continued efforts to update and strengthen the training requirements for the Community Police Review Commission. On behalf of the Office of the Director of Police Accountability, we are pleased to invite you to a public demonstration of the VirTra Scenario Based Training System. This session will be open to the public and is part of our ongoing efforts to promote transparency and community engagement. The VirTra Training System provides realistic scenario-based simulations designed to enhance the escalation skills in critical decision making. We believe this is an invaluable tool that can assist us in our training to ensure we can accomplish a timely, thorough, complete objective and better investigation into the complaint and achieve overall officer accountability. By attending and participating in our demonstration you will gain insight into how we utilize this tool in our training program and have the opportunity to consider how a similar approach could support your own training efforts. We would be honored to have members of the CPRC join us and welcome the opportunity to answer any questions about our training programs or oversight work. The demonstrations will be held on Saturday, July 19 at 1:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M.; Monday, July 21, 6:30 P.M. to 8:30 P.M.; and Wednesday, July 30, 6:30 P.M. to 8:30 P.M. They will be held at the Office of the Director of Police Accountability located at 1900 Addison Street, Berkeley, California on the third floor. We will follow up in separate email with registration details for demonstration but wanted to share these dates in advance to give you the time to plan accordingly. Office of the Director of Police Accountability.

Legal Counsel Floy Andrews responded to one of the public comments and stated as the attorney she did not believe there had been any Brown Act violations and she had responded to the letters that had come in suggesting that there were.

Commissioner Lawson requested that the submitted written comment be submitted to CPRC members.

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

Chief of Police Bisa French (via Zoom) provided RPD statistics and reported there were currently 123 officer filled positions with 24 vacancies; eight officers on injury leave, three on administrative leave and two on military leave. Four police officers had graduated from the police academy this date and a fifth had graduated from the Sacramento Police Academy, and all would be sworn in on July 3, 2025. There were also currently three officers who had graduated a couple of weeks ago and an additional three officers in the training program. She also reported that during the month of May, Captain Eric Smith had retired and his vacancy had been filled by the promotion of Lieutenant Moody, who had been promoted from Sergeant, and Officer Guzman had been promoted to the rank of Sergeant. She noted that Officer Guzman was a home-grown officer in that he had started with the RPD as an Explorer and had moved up from there.

Chief French reported there had been ten uses of force during the month of May; eight body force, two the use of the WRAP and one taser deployment. She referred to a case that had arisen during the month of May at south First and Cutting at the PG&E power lot when the RPD had been alerted to a subject who had climbed onto a PG&E tower. Officers responded and the individual refused to come down, power had been cut off at the structure affecting areas surrounding the lot, the Fire Department also responded to assist in removing the subject from the structure, and after hours of fruitless negotiations the subject still refused to come down. Over the next several days working with PG&E, Contra Costa's A3 Crisis Response, and Michael Romero, Program Manager of the Community Crisis Response Program (CCRP), the subject was finally convinced to come down from the tower after four days.

Chief French stated that with the training scheduled with members of the CPRC, she also looked forward to some ridealongs.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, commented that the whole 23rd Street corridor was a concern given that people had been hanging around the senior center creating an unsafe situation and he requested some control in the area and urged some patrols at that corridor. He also referred to former sting operations along that corridor and the Veterans Hall and asked that those operations be resumed.

Chief French responded to questions from Commissioner Lawson and explained that the 24 vacancies were not due to a lack of a budget to fill them in that they were authorized positions to hire. She explained there had been a difficult time recruiting officers to work in the City of Richmond. She also understood the CCRP was in the process of hiring eight more workers and looked forward to working collaboratively with the CCRP, when fully engaged, for assistance in situations such as the PG&E tower incident.

When asked by Commissioner Garcia when 145 police officers had been authorized given his concern for 24 vacancies, Chief French reported that in 2021, 145 police officers had been authorized. The RPD had been fully staffed at 145 and the positions taken for reallocation had been above that 145 total; the vacant positions. The current authorization was for 147 police officers in that two positions had been added since that time.

In response to Commissioner Lorber as to the homicide rate this year, Chief French reported there had been zero homicides this year and there had been no homicide since October 2024.

Chief French clarified for Chair Martinez that the statistics provided to the CPRC were from the month of May in that the statistics for the month of June were not yet available. Since the CPRC met the first week of each month prior to the availability of the statistics from the prior month, her reports were generally two months behind.

VII. OLD BUSINESS, DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Meet the New Interim Investigator (via Zoom)

Legal Counsel Andrews introduced the new Interim Investigator Bill Whalen.

BILL WHALEN, the Interim Investigator (via Zoom) introduced himself and provided some background for the CPRC. He explained that he had started his firm in July 2021 after he had retired from 32 years in law enforcement, having spent most of his time in Orange County but most recently serving as Police Chief in a small city in Las Angeles. After retirement, he had started doing misconduct investigations given his experience that it was difficult to get good investigations done. His firm had grown to the point that additional investigators were needed and the firm now employed three, soon to be four other investigators who had predominate law enforcement backgrounds. The firm serviced a number of clients and focused on allegations of misconduct predominately in the public sector but worked with non-public entities as well. He verified that other of his investigators would also work on the Richmond project given his understanding of a considerable backlog of cases in Richmond.

Commissioner Hegstrom welcomed Mr. Whalen and asked how he would determine which of the backlog cases would be investigated first, to which Mr. Whalen stated that while he had no knowledge of the backlog of cases involved given the confidential personnel investigations involved and the inappropriateness of the knowledge of that information prior to the execution of a contract, there would be several factors to consider given the Statute of Limitations.

Mr. Whalen identified factors such as severity of the case involved, community impact of the case, a significant use of force in the community, and if the allegations were sustained that would result in significant discipline, for instance. He noted that once the more acute cases had been resolved the other cases would be considered. He understood that approximately 26 cases were involved and it would take some time but in collaboration with the CPRC and the City Attorney his firm would prioritize and start the investigations right away. He also clarified that any new cases coming along during the process to clear out old cases should also be considered based on the gravity of the case.

As to when the process would start in response to Commissioner Lawson, Mr. Whalen stated he had signed his side of the contract and as soon as the contract was fully executed, he and the Chair and the City Attorney would consider a date to triage and assign the cases. He was hopeful that could be done before the end of the month to get the investigators working on the most serious of the backlog.

Commissioner Hegstrom suggested the full number of the backlog would likely include cases that were not legitimate complaints that could be eliminated fairly quickly. She and the Chair noted that the number of cases was already in flux given that the staff person who had updated the complaint log was no longer with the City and the accuracy of the actual total number was in flux.

Staff Liaison Williams noted there should be someone designated soon who could keep the case log updated.

Commissioner Garcia asked whether there would be one contact with Mr. Whalen's firm, and Mr. Whalen stated the goal would be that he would present the cases along with the investigator who had done the investigation to make sure that questions could be asked of the person who had done the actual work. He verified that he would be the final reviewing authority of all investigations performed on behalf of the City.

Commissioner Cantú arrived at 7:34 P.M.

Mr. Whalen also clarified that two of his firm's other investigators had been part of the interview process with the City Council.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, expressed his hope that Mr. Whalen's firm would provide accurate information.

LISA JOHNSON (via Zoom) was pleased to hear that there was an investigator on board to support the CPRC. She commented that throughout the process of reporting that an investigator would be hired, the City had never indicated that a firm of investigators would be hired. As such, she requested that someone on the interview committee verify that a firm was involved given that the public had not been so informed. She wanted to make sure that the public, the CPRC and the RPD were confident in the transparency of the review process.

BEN THERRIAULT, President of the Richmond Police Officers' Association (RPOA), also expressed surprise that a firm was involved and wanted to make sure that all those involved were aware of California's regulations.

Commissioner Hegstrom stated she was not aware that a firm was involved.

Commissioner Cantú requested that the step-by-step process involved with the hiring of an Interim Investigator be provided to CPRC members.

Commissioner Lawson sought a presentation or written report from the Human Resources (HR) Department to present at a future meeting for the public record. As a member of the ad hoc committee, he understood that the Interim Investigator hire was a firm. He agreed with the need to make the hiring process clear.

Legal Counsel Andrews thanked Mr. Whalen for being present and looked forward to working with him. The CPRC membership concurred.

- b. Status of the Commission's Proposed Revisions to Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code

Legal Counsel Andrews clarified that the difference between Items b and c on the agenda were that Item b related to the two items the CPRC had passed more than a year ago that were in the middle of the ongoing meet and confer process while Item c represented the newer recommended revisions to Chapter 3.54. She reiterated that the two earlier items were still in the meet and confer process and there was no further update.

Commissioner Lawson sought more information on the status of the meet and confer process and why the process had not been concluded.

Ms. Andrews stated up until the time when the CPRC was beginning to create a list of new items that would go into a new meet and confer process, staff was working with the HR lawyer at the City who was working with a negotiator, and while negotiations were happening the time in between meetings appeared to be lengthy. With the new list of items, it made sense to work with the full list of approved items and to be more forceful in terms of working through a meet and confer process. She noted that the City Attorney had stopped forcing the issue because it didn't make sense to move through a meet and confer process when there would be a follow up with another meet and confer process in short order.

Commissioner Hegstrom verified that the two issues related to Item b had to do with the definition of serious bodily injury, and a clarification related to prior changes to the ordinance that expanded the scope of the CPRC relating to appeals where any decision of the RPD could be appealed with the exception where a case had already been heard by the CPRC first.

- c. Update on Status of Additional Proposed Revisions to Chapter 3.54 of the Richmond Municipal Code, and Other Procedural Changes to the Procedures and Processes of the CPRC

As to the status of the additional proposed revisions, Legal Counsel Andrews stated those revisions had been brought to the City Council at two different Council meetings.

Having attended those City Council meetings, Chair Martinez reported that the revision related to training had been submitted to the City Council by itself on June 24, 2025 for the first reading, but had not included the minimum requirements recommended by the CPRC and had a timeline of six months. Some changes had been made to that section and the second reading was to have been approved at the July 1, 2025 meeting but had been pulled off the Consent Calendar. That revision had included a minimum of eight hours of training and officer shadowing, which included ridealongs, the Citizens' Academy or something similar, and instead of six months had been changed to 90 days. She reported the City Council did not get to a vote on that item on July 1. She also noted that to the training already listed, the revision had added the history of the CPRC and civilian oversight of the RPD, CPRC Guidelines and the Brown Act.

Commissioner Garcia asked who was involved in putting the City Council item together since he had been involved in putting together the proposed training and the item had a lot more detail than the CPRC had approved, and none of it had been approved by the CPRC.

Legal Counsel Andrews explained that the CPRC had given the recommended vote on the recommendation to move forward with the training, and through the process of working with the Council Liaison and the Council, and with her participation in the actual drafting of the agenda item, Chair Martinez was also involved as was the Council Liaison. She characterized that process as a flushing out of what the CPRC had requested.

Commissioner Garcia stated that while he had been participating in the training recommendations, he had not been consulted in any way in the final draft, and the CPRC itself had made changes to what had been proposed to the City Council.

Commissioner Cantú commented that there had been an active debate by the City Council on the item and she recommended that CPRC members watch the City Council meetings to see what had occurred. She stated City Council members had made a final decision after its active debate on the CPRC's recommendations. She again urged CPRC members to watch City Council meetings to become apprised of what occurred at that level and encouraged members to contact the Council Liaison with their comments.

Commissioner Lawson suggested this would be a good topic as part of the CPRC's training to be able to understand how legislative language was written, and that any recommendations from the CPRC, even if very prescriptive in language, would be considered by the City Council and be modified at the Council's discretion.

Commissioner Garcia reiterated that the CPRC had made recommendations, he was aware of the Council's discretion, but expressed concern that only a few Commissioners had been able to weigh in on the final draft, which was his concern and a potential Brown Act violation. He questioned the process.

Chair Martinez stated that going back and forth with the CPRC would only prolong the process and if more than three Commissioners were involved that would be an automatic violation of the Brown Act, and would require a special meeting. There was not even a staff liaison at that time to coordinate a special meeting. She asked the CPRC if it wanted to take on that process, which could be discussed at the next meeting since the item had been delayed.

Legal Counsel Andrews suggested that was not necessary. She stated the CPRC had made recommendations and she and the Chair, with the help of one other member of the Commission, had flushed out the recommendations which had been delivered to the City Council to analyze, debate and change as it saw fit.

On the discussion of what had occurred at the last meeting and the CPRC's understanding of the process with respect to the submittal of the revisions to the City Council, Legal Counsel Andrews described her understanding of what had occurred at the last meeting in that there had been a conversation during which it had been made clear that the recommendations of the CPRC were to be going to the City Council and the recommendations had been voted on by a majority of CPRC members. She stated the very proposed revisions that had been recommended and approved by the CPRC had gone to the City Council and had been put into the agenda format. As such, there was no need for an extra step, which had been clear at the last meeting.

While some Commissioners were concerned that the agenda report did not match what the CPRC had voted for with respect to the training revisions, particularly related to the period of time allowed for the training, there were suggestions that if something was missing from the CPRC's recommendations to the City Council, the CPRC could discuss and clarify its proposed recommendations prior to the City Council's final action

Commissioner Lawson verified that the CPRC's recommendations were part of the public record, posted to the website and available to every member of the public and the City Council, and as such nothing was being hidden. He suggested that the topic of the process by which CPRC recommendations were moved to and approved by the City Council could be a topic of discussion at a future meeting.

Commissioner Garcia did not see the debate in that in this case what the CPRC had proposed as a recommendation to the City Council was different from what the City Council had received as a recommendation, and he did not want that to occur again.

LISA JOHNSON (via Zoom) commented as someone who actively watched CPRC meetings and every City Council meeting, the public perception was that when the items were discussed in May, particularly the training module discussion, what had been voted on was the recommended action and not on anything in the table of information provided, which were possible things that Commissioner Cantú had put forward to consider, but that it would all come back to the CPRC for a final decision to ensure annual specialized training to make well-informed, fair and unbiased rulings. What had been presented to the City Council on June 24 was that the proposed curriculum and trainers were final and it would not be discussed further and voted on by the CPRC, which was how it came across to the public.

Ms. Johnson stated the City Attorney had told the City Council that the training had been outlined in the staff report and that the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) would be providing the training in July and August, which was factually inaccurate since NACOLE did not provide private training. She stated that was not a transparent process. It had also been brought to her attention that members of the CPRC and Reimagine Richmond knew prior to the publishing of the agenda for the July 1, 2025 meeting that there would be eight amendments before the City Council and no one knew who had authorized what eight amendments would be considered and how they had found out, which had raised serious concerns about what was happening behind closed doors, whether there were Brown Act violations, and who was authorizing that type of information, impacting the legitimacy of the CPRC and jeopardizing the public trust.

Chair Martinez announced at this point that George Perezvelez was on-line as a guest from the NACOLE Board of Directors, and he was also a member of the BART Citizen Review Board.

Chair Martinez stated with respect to the rest of the CPRC's recommendations to the City Council, essentially Councilmember Wilson had pulled the item from agenda review, seconded by Councilmember Jimenez, to postpone the rest of the CPRC recommended items.

d. Permanent Investigator Recruitment

Legal Counsel Andrews reported that the permanent Investigator recruitment was ongoing.

Chair Martinez stated that the job posting had been made live on June 12, 2025, had been posted on the City website, shared with NACOLE, posted with the California Bar Association, Association of Inspectors General and the California Minority Counsel Program, and she asked those participating in the meeting present and online who might know of potential candidates to share that information with those possibilities.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, expressed his hope that a permanent Investigator would be available sometime in the fall to help with the backlog of cases.

Commissioner Lawson asked if there was a deadline on the posting, to which Chair Martinez understood there was a deadline of July 25, 2025, but if there was no response and no applications, the deadline would be extended. She also explained, when asked, that it would be up to the City Council on the hiring but they were trying to work out whether the CPRC ad hoc committee could sit in with the first interview.

As to whether the current ad hoc committee had been established for the Interim Investigator or the permanent Investigator and whether or not another ad hoc committee would need to be appointed, Commissioner Cantú noted the confusion earlier in the meeting about who was being hired by active participants in the ad hoc committee. She suggested it might behoove the CPRC to create a new ad hoc committee, which could be agendaized for the next meeting.

At this point in the meeting the discussion became contentious and members were reminded to keep the meeting professional.

Commissioner Lawson suggested the issue of changing the ad hoc committee could be placed on the agenda and that discussion for a change or no change could be considered.

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

e. Report on Public Event Planning Process

Chair Martinez asked for clarification of the process related to the CPRC's tabling at public events, and Commissioner Hegstrom described the process where the spot had to be reserved, time slots for volunteers had to be coordinated, supplies had to be picked up and arranged, and with no staff member available to the CPRC at the time of the Juneteenth event, the CPRC had not been able to be represented.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, commented that in the past the staff liaison for the CPRC had coordinated the arrangements for tabling at public events. He urged that a staff person be dedicated to coordinating future events.

Commissioner Garcia noted that for many years he had helped set up the CPRC's tabling along with other Commissioners and that City staffing had not always been consistent, and he as a member of the CPRC had picked up the slack and had provided candy and other supplies to allow the CPRC to table at events.

Legal Counsel Andrews clarified, when asked, that e-mail blasts to Commissioners to coordinate tabling schedules for public events would best be left to the CPRC's staff liaison to avoid issues related to the Brown Act.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

a. Meet New City Staff Supporting CPRC

Staff Liaison Nicole Williams, the Human Resources Analyst for the City's HR Department, was present to support the CPRC and looked forward to working with the CPRC. She had earlier clarified her role to help with CPRC agendas and meetings and anything to do with the investigations case log would be done by someone else, yet to be identified.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, looked forward to a smooth agenda process.

LISA JOHNSON thanked Ms. Williams for running an effective first meeting and welcomed her to the CPRC.

b. Review Options Presented for Agendizing Public Comment Period(s); the Commission's Attorney Makes no Recommendation as to Which Procedure is Preferable to the Commission

Legal Counsel Andrews noted that two meetings ago the CPRC had discussed the most effective way of receiving public comment and the different options had been discussed, as identified in the staff report dated July 2, 2025. A member of the CPRC had proposed a hybrid concept where at the top of the meeting there would be public comment on anything within the CPRC's jurisdiction whether on the agenda or not, and additional public comment periods would be allowed on each action item. In that case, there would be no public comment on items that were not requesting action from the CPRC. Another version would allow the report from the Chief of Police to be placed first on the agenda to allow the all-inclusive public comment period afterward to include the Chief's report and then allow public comments on the action items on the agenda.

Commissioner Garcia asked why the change had been recommended and Legal Counsel and some members of the CPRC noted that had been discussed previously.

Commissioner Lorber recommended another change to consider because she liked the idea of the Police Chief's early report to allow public comment on that report and public comments on the action items, but recognized that members of the public would want to comment on some other items as well. She suggested an option to take public comment on all old business items and then allow public comment on the action items, public comment on the Police Chief Report, then public comment on non-agendized and agendized items, and then move on to old business but not allow public comment for every single sub section, but as a whole on all old business items, and then move on to new business and take public comments on action items prior to a CPRC vote.

Commissioner Lawson used the current agenda as an example to determine how Commissioner Lorber's recommendation would work.

Commissioner Cantú referred to the public comment process used by the City Council and the one City Council consent calendar open forum that would go into the public forum, intended to ensure public speakers would not have to wait long periods of time to go through the agenda and allow comments on other items on the agenda, then comments on old business and any new business that had a vote. She made a motion to that effect, although Legal Counsel Andrews confirmed the item had not been agendaized for action, and Commissioner Cantú withdrew her motion.

Commissioner Jackson commented that he had not been at the meeting when the issue had been discussed and he too asked what had prompted the need to make changes to the process for public comment.

Legal Counsel Andrews stated there had been a discussion about efficiency, although Commissioner Jackson was still not clear about the objective but reiterated that he had not been at the meeting where that efficiency had been discussed.

Commissioner Garcia suggested that the public either be encouraged to speak or not and putting limits on the public's ability to make comments within the three-limit period might not be appropriate. He suggested that efficiency was not a good basis to suppress public input.

While there were several Commissioners who wanted to make additional comment at this time, Commissioner Lawson recommended that since no action could be taken at this time the CPRC should move on from the agenda item to a future meeting when it could be submitted as an action item.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, characterized himself as the co-sponsor of the item given his experience through the years with the public comment process used by many Boards and Commissions in Richmond where the public was always allowed to speak on agenda items.

LISA JOHNSON (via Zoom) explained that the item had been proposed on the May agenda after the filing of two Brown Act violations because the public was not allowed to comment on the Report from the Chief of Police, which she stated was a violation of the Brown Act and inconsistent with what the City Council and every other Board and Commission did in the City and in the Bay Area. The item was on the May agenda when there had been some discussion and had been placed on the June agenda, which had been cancelled. She referred to some of the specific proposed changes and noted the inability of the public in many cases to offer public input, which did not foster deliberation or public input and which discounted the value of public comment. With respect to new business, she stated that public comment was currently allowed on all items, not just those where action was to be taken. She emphasized the value of the public's input and urged the CPRC not to become a unique board entirely to the City of Richmond that did not foster deliberation, public input, transparency and include the public in that process.

- c. Consider and Vote on a Specific Date or Dates for CPRC Commissioner Training so that all Commissioners Receive Eight (8) Hours of Training within Ninety (90) Days

Commissioner Lorber asked whether training had to comply with the Brown Act and whether it could be done on Zoom, and Legal Counsel Andrews confirmed that the training had to comply with the Brown Act in that when the CPRC met at training or at a meeting when the majority of the CPRC was in one place, the public needed to be invited to participate.

Commissioner Lorber also verified that the CPRC had an annual retreat in August when the City Council was on break.

Legal Counsel Andrews responded to questions about the training and referred to a potential schedule and a particular trainer who would be available every weekend day in August. She explained that everyone had to attend the training, suggested the full CPRC should get the same training, for efficiency' sake the training should occur at one time, and that one to two hours of that training could involve ridealongs, with a full eight hours of training required. She also clarified that this training was separate from the training revision currently being considered by the City Council, which would be a requirement for the CPRC on a go-forward basis. The current discussion of required training would count for the first year of the training piece yet to be approved by the City Council. The trainer under discussion would be relied upon to help outline the specific topics to be involved based upon the level of training required given that there were new Commissioners and due to the fact there was a new Interim Investigator where cases would ultimately need to be heard

Chair Martinez clarified that one of the trainings required during the six hours was a standard of review.

The Board discussed potential training dates on Saturdays in August, preferred to break down the hours to avoid having to sit for eight hours, requested that food be provided, asked what would happen if there was an emergency where a member could not actually attend the training, and there was a comment that the City Council had suggested that if Commissioners did not fulfill the training requirement those Commissioners would not be able to read cases or vote on specific cases.

Legal Counsel Andrews noted that currently there was no provision to keep a member from participating in the CPRC if the training requirement had not been met, although that could be considered. She suggested there should be a mechanism to provide training if there was an emergency keeping a member(s) from the initial training.

Commissioner Lawson made a motion that there be a total of eight hours of training broken down into two four-hour sessions from 9:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. on Saturday, August 2, 2025 and on Saturday, August 9, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cantú.

On the question, Commissioner Garcia requested that the training be done towards the beginning of the month; Commissioner Hegstrom asked if one weekend could be considered as opposed to two weekends; one weekend for an eight-hour training over two days with CRPC members doing ridealongs as extra training was recommended; Commissioner Jackson agreed with the need to get it over with; and Commissioner Lorber recommended something similar to the use of force training that had been provided as part of a regular CPRC meeting.

Chair Martinez made an alternate motion for a six-hour training session on Saturday, August 2, 2025, with a half-hour lunch, and with one-hour sessions each at the September 3, 2025 and October 1, 2025 regular CPRC meetings. Commissioner Lawson seconded the motion.

Prior to Roll Call, public comment was taken.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, suggested another schedule for the training and confirmed that the trainings would be open to the public.

LISA JOHNSON (via Zoon) asked who would provide the training on August 2 and asked if the City Attorney's office or independent trainers would be involved. She also asked what the mechanism would be going forward for training as time went on. She noted that the City had annual Board and Commission training which should also be enforced. For a future agenda item, she recommended considering how to enforce the training requirement. She confirmed that the City Council was adamant that CPRC members could not be involved in the investigative process without the required training.

Legal Counsel Andrews reported on the trainer that staff had been working with John Alden, a member of the NACOLE Board of Directors, although a contract had not yet been finalized. He was also the Director of Sonoma County Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Outreach for the County of Sonoma. An attorney, he provided regular training in his work and between 2019 and 2022, he was the Executive Director of the Oakland Community Police Review Agency. He had experience in the area, was local, available, articulate and she stated he would be a good trainer.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Martinez/Lawson) to approve a six-hour training session on Saturday, August 2, 2025, with a half-hour lunch, and with one-hour sessions each at the September 3, 2025 and October 1, 2025 regular CPRC meetings; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Garcia, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, Lorber and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Flores).

IX. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS, STAFF, RIDEALONGS

Chair Martinez stated that as part of the Outreach Ad Hoc Committee, she had placed an order for a new banner and a tablecloth and had spent \$304 on those two items, which included the new CPRC logo. She was also in the process of getting T-shirts, displayed a picture of the shirts and sought shirt sizes from members of the CPRC.

Commissioner Hegstrom noted the CPRC had signed up to table at Soulful Softball Sunday on August 24, 2025, and she asked if anyone was interested in doing that. She commented the CPRC had not previously attended that event and expressed concern the venue might not be the best for tabling. She asked whether the CPRC wanted to consider another event.

Commissioner Cantú referred to a national event at the RYSE Youth Center on the first Tuesday in August that could be an option to consider, although it was noted that was National Night Out and not a viable option, and too close to the CPRC's training session.

Given that some Commissioners were available for the Soulful Softball Sunday event and some were not and given the limited time to coordinate an appropriate schedule to fully cover the full event and coordinate the setup, the CPRC members who were available would conduct an informal outreach and attend the event at a time of their convenience and hand out CPRC flyers.

Chair Martinez stated she would provide the flyers to CPRC members attending Soulful Softball Sunday at the training session on August 2.

Legal Counsel Andrews suggested that CPRC rules were needed.

Given that the CPRC would meet in August, Chair Martinez stated that an August meeting would allow a discussion of and an identification of those CPRC members who might want to attend the NACOLE National Conference, scheduled from October 26 to 30, 2025 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Chair Martinez announced that she had been invited to join the Bay Area Regional Planning meeting through NACOLE, and the dates would be August 27 to 28 at the San Francisco LGBT Center, registration fee likely to be between \$75 and \$100, which was another training that could be attended, and she highly recommended registering for it. She noted some of the topics that would be discussed that included actionable items that could be voted on that day. She encouraged the CPRC to be more active outside the NACOLE National Conference.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:20 P.M.

Carmen Martinez, Chair