

COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW COMMISSION
of the City of Richmond, California
(CPRC)
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, September 3, 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), Oscar Flores (Vice Chair), Marisol Cantú, Oscar Garcia, Carol Hegstrom, Andre Jackson, and Daniel Lawson

Absent: None

Staff: Nicole Williams - 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

Christopher Dykzeul reported that he was unaware of any conflict of interest.

III. AGENDA REVIEW

Chair Martinez advised that Item VIII b. NACOLE Webinar Series – *Hate Crimes, Explicit Bias, and Implicit Bias: Evolution of Standards for Decertification of Peace Officers in California*, had been removed from the agenda given some issues related to broadcasting the webinar.

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

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 2, 2025

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Garcia) to approve the minutes of the August 2, 2025 meeting, as shown; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None).
--

V. PUBLIC FORUM

CORDELL HINDLER, reported that he had attended the Richmond Youth Council meeting on August 27, 2025 when he had encouraged members of that group to fill the vacant positions on the CPRC. He also invited everyone to the Contra Costa Mayors Conference on October 2, 2025 in the City of Martinez, \$70/person with RSVPs required; the Spirit & Soul Festival on MacDonald Avenue on September 20, 2025, with a classic car show from 11:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.; and the Richmond Rotary Club Weekly meeting on September 19, 2025 at 12:30 at the Richmond Country Club, \$35/lunch. He also commended the CPRC training last month.

VI. REPORT BY CHIEF OF POLICE

Assistant Police Chief Timothy Simmons (online), filling in for Chief Bisa French, identified the events the Richmond Police Department (RPD) had recently been involved which included National Night Out when 35 officers had been involved visiting neighborhood parties across the City. The RPD had been invited to participate in the Festival Fiestas Patrias on September 13, 2025, the 23rd Street parade when informational booths and tables would be set up; and had been invited to participate as honored guests in the 25th Anniversary of the Latina Center on September 25, 2025.

Assistant Chief Simmons presented the ShotSpotter stats and reported that activation was down 27 percent month over month and down 11 percent year to date, trending in the right direction. Activations throughout the City were spread evenly throughout. There was a shooting in the Iron Triangle that accounted for a few ShotSpotters but the data did not point to an ongoing problem or a back-and-forth related feud that might be ongoing. With respect to crime statistics, violent crime month over month was down 22 percent, year to date down one percent; property crime was a problem month over month with a 27 percent increase, an unusually high spike from one month to the next. Year to date property crime was down 19 percent. The most significant areas of concern were from violent crime and property crime; the cause for the rise in violent crime had been sexual assault and aggravated assaults. He reported there was a subject in custody on the three sexual assaults in the Point Richmond Tunnel incidents. Charges had been filed and sexual assault stats should drop. Aggravated assaults were up significantly month over month and year to date. He pointed out there were other partners in the City to help address those stats.

Regarding property crimes, Assistant Chief Simmons reported that grand theft and vehicle theft had increased. Most of the grand thefts were in businesses and with labor workers whose equipment and tools were being stolen out of trucks parked in driveways. The RPD was working with crime prevention to get information out to the community about better securing those items and getting tools and equipment indoors to better protect that equipment. He added that vehicle thefts continued to be a problem.

Assistant Chief Simmons reported on the use of force statistics for July and stated the WRAP had been used three times, the bean bag one time, there had been three taser deployments, and nine times officers had to use physical body force to overcome resistance. The August use of force stats would be evaluated at the end of the week and available at the next CPRC meeting.

Commissioner Hegstrom asked about copper wire thefts and the Assistant Chief stated that copper theft continued to be a problem but not as broad as it had been in the past, although it was still being stolen out of street lights.

Commissioner Lawson commented that he had attended the Richmond Independence Day fireworks display and he wondered how decisions were made regarding police personnel deployment to such events because he suggested there were too many officers who had too much idle time at that event.

Assistant Chief Simmons explained that a manager was responsible for analyzing and approving citywide events and there was an analytical process or threat assessment involved where other entities were brought into the equation. He stated the analysis had to do with the expected size of the crowd. The population around that crowd was also analyzed to account for those who lived in the area who might not physically be attending that event but there was a need to address public safety concerns if a potential evacuation was required or if a fire truck or ambulance was involved, the staff needed to move people and shut roadways. He added that third party entities could be asked to provide security to augment RPD staff to make sure that public safety was addressed, which usually involved over staffing giving the planning for what could happen. He cited the New Year's Eve incident in New Orleans as an example of not being prepared and noted lessons learned from other events that had taken place to ensure better preparedness.

Assistant Chief Simmons reported that the RPD was at critically low staffing levels. The threshold for active staff who were capable and able of working was 90, and when dropping below that number the RPD would have to consider augmenting RPD officers with officers from the Sheriff's Department and the California Highway Patrol (CHP). Currently, the RPD was at 81 active officers (the Police Chief on down) who were able to work and the RPD was starting to look at what Vallejo and other cities had done to augment their patrol. He stated the RPD had just put out the mandatory overtime lists and officers were having to work four mandatory overtime assignments each month, which was the most he had seen in his 17 years with the RPD.

Assistant Chief Simmions noted he had approved and read one academy background and one lateral background, and there were three other lateral police officers in the background phase. He highlighted laterals because an entry level candidate was not considered able to fill a patrol beat until 14 to 15 months after hire. The laterals represented individuals who could be hired and working in six to seven weeks with appropriate training and experience.

Commissioner Garcia noted his understanding there was a backlog of cases on hit and runs.

Commissioner Cantú referred to the 35 officers reportedly being on patrol for National Night Out and she expressed concern given that would likely cause more overtime. She did not want to overwork the officers who could be better used to address hit and runs, sexual assaults and violent crime, and not by attending community events. She wanted to make sure that the main goal of protecting and serving, especially around violent crimes was being maintained, although she suggested it could also possibly be causing more overtime.

Assistant Chief Simmons stated that part of the RPD's mission was to engage the community in a relational manner and community events was one of the major core principles. Taking that element away would create a major gap in how the RPD provided service to the community.

The Assistant Chief noted there were few of those kinds of events and the officers being used were not from the Investigational Bureau, they were patrol officers whose job was to engage with the community and there was no gap in terms of addressing the more complex crimes. He added that those events were never mandatory and officers participating chose to do so with their discretionary time, more a reflection of their desire to be police officers and have human interaction with people. He stated the best way to be community-oriented was to be able to be like-minded with the community and engage on the human level.

Chair Martinez noted that to engage with other law enforcement agencies there had to be Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs).

Assistant Chief Simmons confirmed the RPD had not contacted any outside agency at this point but was clarifying what other agencies had done to see what could be done in Richmond. He emphasized that no contact had yet been made. It was more of a study session. He confirmed that an MOU would have to be created to allow that to occur but the MOUs did not restrict the outside agency's policies; it would dictate the scope of work asked to be done and the charges for that work. He characterized it as more about logistics at this point.

CORDELL HINDLER, a member of the Park Plaza Neighborhood Council, referred to the 23rd Street corridor and the problems he had reported to the RPD with respect to loitering, which made him feel unsafe, and he asked for extra patrols at 24th and MacDonald due to a fear of accidents given the speed of traffic along that corridor. He had also reported a gold van that had been parked for over 72 hours, which he had reported, and in that case people did not feel safe because of that van.

VII. OLD BUSINESS, DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Ad Hoc Committees

Chair Martinez stated that last year on November 6, 2024, the City Attorney clarified the differences between subcommittees (ongoing and limited in terms of scope and time and Brown Act entities with some staff and legal support) and ad hoc committees (limited duration and limited scope, a subset of the Commission and not a Brown Act committee).

Chair Martinez stated that the Commission had expressed a desire for an ad hoc committee meeting with no limit and with a report back to a full CPRC, with the ad hoc committee to have a very specific purpose; one that could eventually turn into a standing subcommittee. In March 2025, a proposal to discuss goals and create ad hoc committees had been established for training. The Training Ad Hoc Committee was comprised of Chair Martinez, Commissioner Cantú and Commissioner Garcia, and training had been held in August 2025. She reported that the Outreach Ad Hoc Committee was comprised of Chair Martinez and Commissioner Hegstrom, and Commissioner Cantú and Commissioner Lawson had proposed two other ad hoc committees to potentially create the framework and guidelines for ongoing work to convert those ad hoc committees into actual standing subcommittees.

Commissioner Cantú expressed an interest in a use of force policy, although Commissioner Lawson expressed a preference to begin that work once there was the

support of an independent investigator who could help with the expertise. He preferred to start off with an ad hoc committee and eventually work into a subcommittee.

CORDELL HINDLER stated that the Brown Act standpoint had indicated that an ad hoc committee was comprised of two to three Commissioners and he wanted to make sure there were no Brown Act violations. He understood an ad hoc committee meeting could work outside of the parent committee, with the desire that those meetings be open to the public.

b. Update from Bill Whalen and Associates

Bill Whalen, President of Bill Whalen and Associates stated his firm had been retained to provide independent investigative services for an Interim Investigator pending the recruitment of a permanent investigator. He explained that Ty Lewis and Phil Goncheck of Bill Whalen and Associates had been present during the interview process with the City Council but had not been present at the last meeting with the CPRC, and the CPRC had requested to meet the additional staff. He reported that Ty Lewis was a retired police chief and city manager in California, and Phil Goncheck was also a retired California police chief and had gone on to be a county administrator in Colorado.

Mr. Whalen stated that he had been asked to discuss the triaging that had been done based on the current backlog in investigations and investigations in general. He reported that analysis had been done, the framework was the community impact by the nature of the allegation if proven true, and he described the types of complaints that would have a high community impact such as extreme uses of force, allegations of unlawful imprisonment and officer involved shootings. He explained that based on the complaints, as written, and the availability of evidence and the time factor, several cases were pushing up against the statute of limitations in that the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights stated that any discipline for an allegation of misconduct must be issued within one year of someone authorized to do the investigation upon the time that information was received.

Mr. Whalen noted that the CPRC's charter had incorporated the same rules under the Government Code. He offered examples of a recent officer-involved shooting as well as one that had occurred in February, and stated both had reached the top of the priority list and were currently being investigated, and both were under review by the California Department of Justice (DOJ), which limited his ability at this point to conduct his own independent investigation, and he was limited to the evidence independent of the officers involved because of the DOJ. In order to do a thorough investigation, he would need access to the information that the Department of Justice had and had been in discussions with the CPRC attorney to see if the investigations would be "told" or if the evidence available was sufficient enough to render a finding to meet the City of Richmond's elevated standard of clear and convincing evidence. If that could not be done to render a valid finding for the CPRC to use, he would recommend the cases be told and move on to the other cases.

TY LEWIS, a special investigator, introduced himself and stated he was a former police chief in law enforcement for 25 years in the central coast and central valley of California before becoming a city manager before retiring.

Mr. Lewis explained that he had gone into private investigations and had an extensive background in all aspects of policing. His interest in this assignment was to make sure

the profession was held to the highest standards to show communities that police departments could be trusted. He was working on the two officer-involved shooting cases and hoped to proceed through the cases quickly to the satisfaction of the CPRC.

PHILIP GONSHAK, a special investigator, highlighted his 25-year career in public safety as police chief and county manager in both California and Colorado. He was excited to work to make sure the accountability of the profession was held to the highest standards. He stated it was always important to support Richmond's commitment to transparency, integrity and community service as the utmost importance of his organization and his rule was to offer independent and thorough investigations and actionable insights to ensure that the decisions were both informed by national best practices and the realities to the organization.

Commissioner Hegstrom referred to the large Spanish-speaking population in the City and asked the investigators if they spoke Spanish.

Mr. Lewis stated he spoke Spanish but was not a certified translator and his practice was to rely on a professional translator.

Vice Chair Flores referred to the one-year timeline and asked for clarification of when that timeline would start.

Mr. Whalen explained that the Government Code and the California Peace Officer Bill of Rights codified within the Government Code applied to police departments, and there was nothing that he had seen that applied to police commissions. The CPRC had chosen by ordinance to adopt the Government Code to do investigations, where as written, one year from the time someone at the RPD who was authorized to conduct an investigation learned of the allegations, there would be one year to issue a final Notice of Discipline or perhaps a Notice of Intent to Discipline. He offered examples to identify how the initial date of the complaint might be established and explained it would not be the date of the incident itself; it would be when someone at the RPD who was duly qualified and tasked with conducting misconduct investigations learned of the allegation.

Commissioner Cantú asked about tolling, and Mr. Whalen stated that the Government Code identified certain exceptions to the one-year time limit, and in particular if there was a current criminal investigation, which did not mean a crime was committed. In any officer-involved shooting, he stated there would be several concurrent investigations. He explained that in such a case if a gun was not found on the decedent, the State of California would take over the jurisdiction for the criminal investigation, and tolling would mean that the one-year statute of limitations would be suspended while the criminal case was ongoing. Once done, the meter would start again and the investigation would have to be finished.

Commissioner Hegstrom stated the CPRC could not impose discipline, which had to be imposed by the Police Chief, although the time limit for the Chief to do that may be different.

Mr. Whalen understood that if there was a reason for tolling, the one-year statute of limitations would be suspended for that period of time, but the disciplinary process had to

occur within the statute of limitations, and if that was not done they would be barred from disciplining the officer.

Mr. Dykzeul stated that anyone with questions could ask but he confirmed that it would all be included in the Peace Officer Bill of Rights, which was in the Government Code.

Commissioner Cantú requested a written analysis of that process, to be submitted to all CPRC Commissioners. She also asked how all those moving parts would be communicated to the families of the victims to understand the process and their rights. She asked whether the families had been notified that there would be ongoing investigations and that these two items may be **told** because of the DOJ.

Mr. Whalen stated that he did not know what the City had done but his firm had not had that level of communication with the families.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Whalen and stated the City had not had an investigator for a year. He looked forward to addressing the backlog and was pleased to know that one of the investigators was a Spanish speaker.

Commissioner Lawson stated the City Council had recently approved the changes to the standards of evidence and the Richmond CPRC would be using, at some point, a preponderance of evidence rather than clear and convincing evidence, and he questioned how that would impact the investigations.

Mr. Dykzeul noted that there was a meet and confer to the next item on the agenda and the issue was undetermined at this time.

Mr. Whalen was asked the number of cases in the backlog and he suggested there might be 20 or so cases in the backlog. Right now, at least for a bulk of cases that rose on the metrics, he would reach out to the complaining party and do a preliminary assessment and there may be some cases that could be dispositioned quickly. He expected a third investigator to come onboard in a month and start talking to the complainants to hear what they had to say. If the decision was made to **told** the officer-involved shooting investigations, Mr. Lewis's time would be freed to work on more of the backlog complaints.

Commissioner Hegstrom noted that some of the complaints were clearly out of the CPRC's jurisdiction and she asked if those cases had already been eliminated, and Mr. Whalen explained the investigators were still in the process of working with legal counsel to determine how to deal with that, with a preliminary assessment or based on what the complainant wrote, to dismiss it outright, although that decision had not been made.

Commissioner Lawson referred to the tolling and asked if the timelines could be **told** and how that would be done, and Mr. Whalen advised that would best be answered by legal counsel.

Vice Chair Flores asked if the CPRC would get reports on all the complaints, even those that might be eliminated, and Mr. Whalen stated they would provide reports on each complaint, even if the report was not a full investigatory detailed report. If there were cases where a complaint might be withdrawn, an executive summary report would be submitted to the CPRC.

CORDELL HINDLER agreed with the need to be able to accommodate the Spanish speaking complainants or witnesses, and stated the report had been very helpful.

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

Chair Martinez stated she had made a presentation to the City Council on August 19, 2025 and the City Council had voted unanimously to pass all the CPRC's recommendations. She understood the process was at the stage of waiting for a meet and confer. There were a couple of recommendations that were already being addressed, such as required training and a full-time investigator, which was why those recommendations had not been put into motion, along with recommendations that the City Attorney deemed to be duplicative, such as the automated review of specific devices without filing a complaint. It was also mentioned that the CPRC currently had the power to review the RPD policies, and the weapons used were already in the RPD Manual. Further, the existing language in the Statement of Purpose had already been included, and one that was not currently feasible. Those recommendations had not been included in the meet and confer process.

Commissioner Hegstrom asked about the required training and Chair Martinez recalled it was a minimum of eight hours of training, including some police officer shadowing with a ridealong or police citizen academy. She confirmed that aspect of the CPRC's recommendations was effective now.

Christopher Dykzeul stated to his knowledge there would still have to be the meet and confer.

Commissioner Lawson requested that on the next meeting agenda and all future CPRC agendas until the meet and confer process had concluded, there be an ongoing closed session Conference with Labor Negotiators item so that the CPRC could be apprised of the status of the process, the same as used by the City Council. He was interested in hearing what was happening and the timeline for completion.

Mr. Dykzeul advised that after there had been a change to the Richmond Municipal Code (RMC), there would be a second reading and the effect of that ordinance would take about 30 days afterward, so there was a broadcast period to make the public aware of the change.

Commissioner Garcia wanted an overview of the actual trainers involved in the training programs to be able to understand the plans for training.

Chair Martinez reported that the training with the RPD for the use of less lethal weapons would be on next month's agenda, and if she was able to reach out to the speakers within the timeframe the NACOLE item could also be on that agenda. She cautioned that meeting may be long if both trainings were on the next meeting agenda.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

a. Consider and Vote on Possible Revisions to the Structure of Public Comment During CPRC Meetings

Chair Martinez noted that potential revisions to the structure of public comment during CPRC meetings had previously been discussed by the CPRC but it had never been on the agenda as a voting item. Now it was.

Commissioner Hegstrom did not understand why there was a move to adjust the structure of public comment.

Commissioner Cantú noted her understanding that the public had indicated a problem with the public comment format at CPRC meetings and had reached out, which was why it had become an agenda item. She stated that Cordell Hindler had raised a complaint about public comment.

Commissioner Hegstrom verified that Mr. Hindler's complaint related to the fact that the Chair at that time had forgotten to open public comment after the Police Chief's report and he had been unable to make his comments, which was not a problem with the way public comment was being taken but with a situation where public comment had not been taken when it should have been taken.

Commissioner Garcia stated it was important to understand why the discussion was being pursued. After three meetings discussing the item, he remained unclear on the purpose of the potential revisions. He did not believe the complaint from Mr. Hindler was the driver for the potential change.

Mr. Dykzeul referred to the CPRC attorney Floy Andrews' statement that the Brown Act permitted various mechanisms for public comment to be heard at local agency meetings. The Commission was considering new procedures for public comment permitted under the Brown Act. The recommended action was to review and vote on the method for agendizing the public comment recommended. The Brown Act generally offered two standard methods for organizing public comment throughout a public meeting. One method (Method 1) allowed a public body, at the start of the meeting, to offer one all-inclusive public comment period on all listed agenda items, as well as on items not listed on the agenda that were within the jurisdiction of the body. Using this method permitted a body to offer one all-inclusive public comment period, which must be agendized before any action was taken at the meeting by the body.

A second method (Method 2) permitted public comment to be heard throughout the meeting, with comments on items not on the agenda at or near the beginning of the meeting and additional comment periods for agendized items throughout the meeting.

The Brown Act is arguably unclear as to the exact meaning of an "agenda item" for purposes of requiring public comment. But clearly public comment must be permitted on any agendized item prior to the body taking action on it, either at the beginning of the meeting (see Method 1), or once an agendized item is called and prior to the vote on the item (see Method 2).

When a body elected to have one all-inclusive public comment period at or near the start of a meeting, the public comment period required by the Brown Act would be satisfied, and no further comment period was required.

The Brown Act did not, however, prohibit additional public comment periods that were not otherwise required; it only set minimum standards.

Mr. Dykzeul stated at the July 2, 2025 CPRC meeting, the Commission considered various options for receiving public comment at Commission meetings going forward. As the July 2 discussion concluded, the Commission appeared to be ready to move on the following procedure now recommended by the CPRC Attorney.

The recommended action was to organize public comment at regular CPRC meetings as follows:

- A. Agendize the report from the Chief of Police before the open forum public comment period.
- B. Agendize open forum for public comment on any subject within the jurisdiction of the Commission, including items on the agenda and items not on the meeting's agenda, after the agendized report from the Chief of Police.
- C. Provide an additional public comment period after the presentation of all items agendized as "old business."
- D. Provide additional public comment periods prior to the Commission taking action on any agendized item. Public comment provided during these periods should be limited to the specific agenda item currently under consideration.

Mr. Dykzeul noted the CPRC's current practice was for a public comment period at the end of each item despite no action being taken. He stated any time the CPRC took an action on any item, there must be a public comment period before the item concluded. The CPRC Attorney noted that the additional public comment periods contained in C and D above were not required pursuant to the Brown Act under the public comment procedure outlined above.

Mr. Dykzeul added that although the Commission's Attorney recommended the above outlined public comment procedure for CPRC regular meetings, other public comment procedures that satisfied either Method 1 or Method 2, as described, were also acceptable.

Mr. Dykzeul stated those two methods would satisfy the Brown Act requirements and what was presented would blend the two. The current open public comment period fell before the report from the Chief of Police and the proposed change would mean that the open public comment period would fall after the Chief of Police report and be expanded to include all subject matters within the Board's jurisdiction and not just items on the agenda, and all public comment thereafter would be contingent upon the action of the Board so old business would have a public comment period at the end of all old business items (not after each item), and for new business action items there would be a public comment period as usual prior to the end of each item before a vote.

Commissioner Lawson made a motion to adopt the recommended action, which was seconded by Commissioner Cantú.

Commissioner Lawson suggested the proposal was a well-formulated and well-thought-out proposal that would offer more than the legal requirement and create a structure of how public comment would work for the meeting. He suggested it would be thoughtful, deliberate and identify fair and reasonable procedures for CPRC meetings.

Commissioner Cantú stated that the recommended action would also prioritize staff time and providing the public comment at the front would show the CPRC's commitment to the Police Chief, the RPD, and the public who specifically wanted to make comments on the Chief's report. She stated agendaizing open forum for all times offered accessibility given that CPRC meetings would often go late, and the additional public comment would be efficient. She suggested the recommended action would go above and beyond with fairness and create a community with an accessible process.

Commissioner Garcia noted that the question of what was driving the change had still not been answered over multiple meetings. He asked whether another body subject to the Brown Act was using the proposed method, found the recommended change to be very confusing, and was concerned that people who had previously had three minutes for each item on the agenda would now be limited in the time for public comment. He suggested that the CPRC needed to account for the public who wanted to make public comments on different items and he did not support the limit to public comment. As such, he did not support the recommended action.

Commissioner Hegstrom suggested the proposal was probably okay but she questioned the timing for public comment when the Police Chief may not be available after her report to respond to the public's comments.

Commissioner Cantú emphasized that the recommended action included all four items, A through D, offering more chances for public comment, not less.

Mr. Dykzeul stated the only exception would be for old business, which used to allow public comment on each item, and with the change public comment would now only be allowed after the end of all items under old business.

Chair Martinez stated that the CPRC had been following practices and not policies and the recommended action would better structure the CPRC. While other Boards or Commissions did not follow the same process, she suggested the CPRC could be the first one and she recommended that the CPRC approve the recommended action.

Commissioner Hegstrom noted that Item A under the recommended action was not clear with respect to public comment and recommended an amendment to Commissioner Lawson's motion to also allow public comment directly after the Police Chief report before regular public comment to allow people to talk to the Police Chief before she left.

Commissioner Cantú explained that public comment did not necessarily allow a back and forth between the public and the Police Chief at the meeting. She suggested that the public comment to the Police Chief could be made during the open public forum. She did not want to set a precedent that there would be automatic responses from the Police Chief since there were plenty of other ways to reach the Police Chief.

Commissioner Hegstrom agreed that a back and forth with the Police Chief was not needed but stated it was important to allow the public to comment on the Chief's report. Commissioner Hegstrom suggested that the public comments should be restricted to ensure they specifically related to the CPRC.

Mr. Dykzeul confirmed that currently where there was a public item, the public comments should be on an item within the Board's jurisdiction, but he was not aware whether or not that was being enforced and it would be incumbent upon the attorney or the Chair to cut the comments short if they ventured beyond the Board's jurisdiction.

Commissioner Jackson suggested this had started with Mr. Therriault and he questioned whether the proposal was intended to isolate any speakers and give everyone a chance to say what they needed to say.

Commissioner Lawson called the question.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawton/Cantú) to adopt the recommended action A through D, as shown above and in the staff report dated September 3, 2025, to organize public comment at regular CPRC meetings; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-2 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Garcia and Jackson; Abstain: None; Absent: None).

CORDELL HINDLER, stated he had brought up the item because the public was concerned that it was being excluded from speaking to the reports from the Chief of Police. He agreed that the public should speak on specific agenda items.

LISA JOHNSON (online), clarified that the proposal had been spawned because of two Brown Act violations filed by more than one person and requests for cures given that after an agendized item when the Police Chief had spoken, Floy Andrews had prevented Mr. Hindler from speaking. The same had occurred at the following meeting, which was a Brown Act violation. In the City's attempt to cure that violation, it came up with a finagled plan creating a unique board from any other public body in the City of Richmond. She stated the CPRC was again tonight saying that the public could not comment when the police were there when the public would like the Police Chief to hear their comments. She suggested there were members of the Commission who had gone out of their way to alienate the Police Chief, did not encourage her to remain on the call to hear the comments and did not encourage any police to stay and hear comments. She added that the CPRC was not promoting good relations, which was the very first comment in the CPRC ordinance - - to promote positive relations.

In addition, Ms. Johnson stated that when the CPRC voted on an old business item that action was now being allowed to occur without comment from the community until the very end, potentially after action had been taken, which was suppressing free speech, transparency and democracy.

- b. NACOLE Webinar Series – *Hate Crimes, Explicit Bias, and Implicit Bias: Evolution of Standards for Decertification of Peace Officers in California*

As earlier reported, Chair Martinez had removed this item from the agenda.

- c. Discuss NACOLE Conference in Minneapolis, MN – October 26-30, 2025, Consider and Vote on Alternate Commissioner attendance

Vice Chair Flores stated while he had planned to attend the NACOLE Conference, due to work commitments he had to cancel his reservation for that conference.

Chair Martinez thanked staff liaison Nichole Williams for making the necessary arrangements to the NACOLE Conference. She reminded everyone that it had been agreed that anyone attending a training would provide a report back at the following meeting. On the discussion of an alternate Commissioner to attend the conference, there was no Commissioner interested in attending the NACOLE Conference in the Vice Chair's place.

CORDELL HINDLER liked the idea of having Chair Martinez and Commissioner Cantú attend the NACOLE Conference.

IX. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS, STAFF, RIDEALONGS

Chair Martinez reminded those assembled that there would be a presentation by the RPD at the next meeting about less lethal weapons. She estimated that the presentation would take approximately an hour. She added that Commissioner Hegstrom had recommended the use of John Alden for additional training.

Staff Liaison Williams explained when asked about the spreadsheet created to identify the backlog of cases in need of investigation, that she had updated that log and that information had been shared with Chair Martinez, Bill Whalen and Floy Andrews.

The CPRC requested access to that log and Chair Martinez requested that Vice Chair Flores and Commissioner Cantú be added to the spreadsheet, and Ms. Williams stated she would do that and resend the link to everyone.

Commissioner Garcia reported that the Iron Triangle Neighborhood Council and others had organized a National Night Out event with a great turnout, which occurred a day after the officer-involved shooting in the Iron Triangle down the street from the event. He stated the CPRC's work was relevant to that case and he hoped to get it right and that the CPRC would be able to adequately investigate that case. He hoped the CPRC was able to protect sensitive information to hold the officer accountable if that was what was needed.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

Carmen Martinez, Chair