

**COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW COMMISSION
of the City of Richmond, California
(CPRC)
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, October 1, 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 Garcia, Carol Hegstrom, Andre Jackson, and Daniel Lawson

Absent: Oscar Flores (Vice Chair) and Marisol Cantú

Staff: Nicole Williams - Present

Council Liaison: Claudia Jimenez – Present

City Attorney's

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

II. STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Legal Counsel Floy Andrews advised that there was no conflict of interest for the meeting.

III. AGENDA REVIEW

Legal Counsel Andrews noted with respect to the last item on the agenda for the September 3, 2025 meeting, that the CPRC had passed the new Public Comment rules prior to taking public comment. As such, the vote would have to be retaken at the next CPRC meeting and the old Public Comment rules would apply for this meeting. As such, the Report by the Chief of Police would occur after the Public Forum, after which the CPRC would then move into Old Business, and after each Old Business item there would be public comment. New Business would then be considered after which there would be public comment, the Training Session and Closed Session preceded by public comment. The Closed Session would then occur followed by a Report Out from Closed Session if there was a report, and the CPRC would then move on to the final items on the agenda.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Hegstrom) to approve the agenda, as described by Legal Counsel Andrews; approved by a Roll Call vote: 4-1 (Ayes: Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Garcia; Abstain: None; Absent: Cantú and Flores).

Legal Counsel Andrews responded to a question from Commissioner Lawson and verified that after a motion if there was no interest from the CPRC to discuss an item, the CPRC could then move straight to a vote on the motion.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 3, 2025

Commissioner Hegstrom requested amendments to the September 3, 2025 meeting to correct the spelling of the term “tolled” as opposed to what the minutes had shown as “told,” in the update from Bill Whalen and Associates.

In addition, an amendment was requested at the top of Page 8 of 13 for the sentence reading: “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.” She stated the CPRC had voted to change the Statement of Purpose, which had never been brought to the City Council. She asked how that decision would ultimately be made and by whom.

Chair Martinez clarified that the City Attorney had suggested that the language in the current Statement of Purpose was already good enough and there was no need to amend that language.

The sentence in question was amended to read: “Further, the existing language in the Statement of Purpose is currently sufficient.”

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hegstrom/Martinez) to approve the minutes of the September 3, 2025 meeting, as amended; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Garcia, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Cantú and Flores).
--

V. PUBLIC FORUM

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that Commissioner Jackson had been reappointed to the CPRC at the September 23, 2025 meeting of the City Council. He added that he would be talking to the Richmond Youth Council at the end of the month to encourage youth to fill the remaining two vacancies on the CPRC given the importance of youth representation and participation. He also invited everyone to the Council of Industries Boat Tour on October 24, 2025, at 1:00 P.M. at the Harbormaster’s Building, and there was no charge. He also invited everyone to the Mayors Conference on December 4, 2025 in the City of Pinole, \$70 per person, RSVP required.

VI. REPORT BY CHIEF OF POLICE

Given some technical difficulties connecting to Assistant Police Chief Timothy Simmons filling in for Police Chief Bisa French, the CPRC moved on to Old Business, Discussion Items at this time.

VII. OLD BUSINESS, DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Ad Hoc Committees

Chair Martinez stated the Outreach Ad Hoc Committee had not met and there was nothing to report at this time. She recommended that a meeting be scheduled soon to discuss any needed follow-ups. The Policy Review Ad Hoc Committee had also not met and there

would be no report, and the Investigator Search Ad Hoc Committee had met and a report would be provided for that item on the current meeting agenda.

CORDELL HINDLER clarified the requirements for ad hoc committees in terms of Brown Act compliance.

b. Update on the Process of Hiring a Permanent Investigator

City Council Liaison Claudia Jimenez read a report from the Byers Group, the recruiting firm for a permanent investigator and reported that on September 9, 2025, the Byers Group had conducted confidential investigator interviews. She advised that five highly-qualified candidates had been interviewed, she identified the interviewers, and noted that a selection was expected to be made soon.

CORDELL HINDLER expressed faith that the Byers Group would succeed in the selection of the right investigator for the City. He urged completion of the process to provide a permanent investigator which was long overdue.

c. Update from Interim Investigator

Ty Lewis, Bill Whalen and Associates, provided an update and stated they had been in contact Legal Counsel Andrews and had been discussing the case status of two officer-involved shooting cases from 2025; one in February and one in August. As previously discussed, the Richmond Police Department (RPD) had informed them that both cases had been tolled on their end; one investigated by the Department of Justice and one by the District Attorney's office. As part of his firm's due diligence, all reports had been collected to date along with body-worn camera footage and other evidence to review. He advised that the RPD was in a wait and hold mode while the Department of Justice and the District Attorney's Office continued to gather data. At this time, the firm was recommending that those cases be postponed until all the evidence had been collected and gathered to allow a complete and thorough review.

Mr. Lewis stated that most of the investigators' time had been spent collecting data and information. Moving on, they were currently assigned five new cases and he was currently looking at four more. Two of those cases involved a February 2024 use-of-force incident where an officer collected a fully automatic Glock pistol in a traffic stop, and a January 2025 case involving a stolen vehicle recovery and a taser deployment. He added that Mr. Whalen was assigning seven more cases.

In response to Commissioner Jackson, Mr. Lewis stated that serious events, such as officer-involved shootings, required a lot of time to complete, with witness, ballistic and tactical reviews and lots of information from the RPD. He stated the RPD was still in various timeframes to complete those investigations.

CORDELL HINDLER thanked Mr. Lewis for the update and for moving the cases along.

d. Update on Meet and Confer Process with Richmond Police Officers Association

Legal Counsel Andrews reported on the two items that the City Council had moved forward for review, advised that the negotiator and the Richmond Police Officers Association (RPOA) had three meetings in 2024, and with the newly added seven items and now nine items, there had been a meeting on September 28, with another meeting scheduled for October 24, 2025. Two additional meetings were expected in November 2025. She understood the City Council was beginning to focus on the process of the meet and confer scenario and that further action would be taken. Over time the CPRC would be looped into the process.

Commissioner Lawson asked about the length of time required to resolve all the issues, and while Legal Counsel Andrews did not know, she agreed it was important to ask.

The CPRC moved back to the Report by the Chief of Police at this time.

VI. REPORT BY CHIEF OF POLICE

Assistant Chief of Police Simmons (online) presented month over month statistics from August and September, and reported on a significant uptick in violent crime with one homicide in September in the Iron Triangle area in the same location of the previous homicide. He reported that the Iron Triangle had become an area of concern. There had been another significant shooting last night where the victim was in critical condition. The uptick in gun violence was not only in the area of the Iron Triangle but also in North Richmond as well. The RPD was focused on that area and communicating with the Office of Neighborhood Safety and the District Attorney's Major Crime Task Force, pulling on the resources to address this issue before it ballooned out of control.

Assistant Chief Simmons identified a 183 percent increase month over month in sexual assaults, with 17 reported instances of sexual assault, and stated the Special Victims Unit in the Investigations Bureau was focused on getting those cases solved to bring justice to those victims. There was a 57 percent increase in aggravated robberies (those usually with a weapon involved), with 22 aggravated robberies in September and an eight percent increase in aggravated assaults (those producing some type of injury to the victim) with 71 in September. For property crimes, there was a 38 percent decrease month over month in burglaries, down from 45 to 28; a 19 percent reduction in larceny thefts from 129 in August to 104 in September; and vehicle thefts up 32 percent (79 stolen vehicles in September). In August there were three arsons and in September there were none and an individual in custody was likely responsible for all of them. Year to date crime stats were trending down year over year. Last year there was an overall 16 percent reduction in violent crime and an overall 15 percent reduction in property crime. He was very concerned with the current month over month spike in violent crime and the RPD was trying to muster the resources to address that situation and discuss different interventions, strategies and plans.

For ShotSpotter activations, the Assistant Chief reported month over month calls reporting shots fired had 27 incidents in August and 14 in September, a 48 percent reduction in people calling, although there was a significant increase in ShotSpotter activations with 17 in August and 33 in September, a 94 percent increase that coincided with the violent crime scene in North Richmond and Central Richmond.

Overall, shots fired calls and ShotSpotter activations were down year over year 14 percent and 22 percent, which was trending in the right direction.

Assistant Chief Simmons reported eight shootings during the month of September, with victims, a 60 percent increase month over month but year over year shootings were down 49 percent. He characterized the spike as an “all hands-on deck” situation.

Monthly use of force looked at a total of seven use-of-force incidents during the month of August; with two taser deployments and five body force, and a WRAP had been used once. The RPD was also “all hands-on deck” in funeral planning with a sudden unexpected loss of a police officer on September 26, with a memorial service scheduled for October 4, 2025. On that day between 2:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M. officers from the cities of El Cerrito and San Pablo would be providing mutual aid to cover the City’s calls for service so that RPD officers could attend the memorial service.

Commissioner Hegstrom verified with the Assistant Chief that the 17 aggravated sexual assaults in September were from throughout the City of Richmond in a variety of locations.

Assistant Chief Simmons advised that an individual was in custody for the incidents that had been happening in the tunnel at Point Richmond, a person who had confessed to all of the incidents, and charges had been filed. At this point, he could not identify any similarities in the 17 aggravated sexual assaults. He confirmed that the number of cases was unusual and the RPD was also working with the Family Justice Center to help sift through all of the details on those incidents.

As to staffing, Assistant Chief Simmons stated that out of 147 authorized officers, there were 108 actives from the Chief of Police on down, and 44 officers were working patrol where 60 were ideally needed. The RPD was now below the threshold where mutual aid was required to cover some of the larger scale issues. He noted he had a consultation with Vallejo PD last week, which had approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Solano County Sheriff’s Department and the City of Vallejo, which would see Sheriff’s deputies responding to the City of Vallejo’s calls for service. While the RPD did not want to go the same route, the intent was to identify the options available to ensure the appropriate law enforcement services were provided to the City of Richmond. He explained that the RPD was aggressively recruiting officers and emphasized the need to work with the Human Resources Department and the recruiting team to focus on the recruitment of lateral officers, the retention of current officers and to stop losing current staff.

Assistant Chief Simmons added that he had just given conditional offers to two lateral officers and one more would be re-interviewed. He also emphasized the need to recruit quality, well-trained working officers who met the RPD’s standards, which standards remained even though the RPD was short staffed.

Commissioner Garcia expressed dismay and frustration that the Iron Triangle was taking the brunt of the uptick in gun violence and historically the central and north of the City always had issues, and he expressed disappointment that the RPD did not have the resources to resolve those issues. He noted there had been reports that US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) operations had been conducted in Richmond and he asked for clarification.

Assistant Chief Simmons confirmed that ICE had been in Richmond and had conducted an enforcement operation on Humphrey Avenue, which was all the information the RPD had. He stated the RPD did not inquire from ICE and did not ask what they were doing, but had reached out to get confirmation that ICE had been in the City of Richmond, which

was the extent of any RPD involvement with ICE operations. He emphasized that RPD officers were not engaged in any way, shape or form with ICE.

Commissioner Garcia was pleased with the confirmation that RPD was not involved in that the community was a Sanctuary City, and particularly a predominant Latino community, and it was important that folks needed to have the trust to make calls to police when needed, particularly in domestic situations. He was also pleased to hear that the City was not involved in ICE because he had heard statements of Commissioners that the RPD was coordinating with ICE, which was very troubling.

Assistant Chief Simmons re-confirmed that the RPD had absolutely no connection to ICE whatsoever, did not and would not coordinate with ICE, and stood behind the Sanctuary City policy that had actually been codified in RPD policy as well. The RPD was in solidarity with the City of Richmond in that regard.

Commissioner Lawson requested a future agenda item where Commissioner Garcia could expound on this new information that there were Commissioners who were alleging false information about the RPD and ICE, which was very problematic.

Chair Martinez agreed with the request for a future agenda item as suggested.

Legal Counsel Andrews stated the request could be noted and Commissioners were all free to fill out the agenda reports and put in suggested items for the Chair to review. She added that the City Attorney was available to help with that.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, a member of the Park Plaza Neighborhood Council, expressed concern with the situation on 23rd Street, specifically the 7-Eleven, which site was problematic because of loitering, people begging for money, prostitution, and due to the speeding in the area along 24th Street and Macdonald Avenue.

LEISA JOHNSON (online), expressed her condolences on the loss of the RPD officer. With respect to staffing and with only 44 officers out of 60 for patrol, she asked for clarification of the current average number of officers per shift for the nine beats. For the updates on the trends for the month versus the year, and while she understood that property crimes had decreased and were trending down year over year, she was also aware the RPD had deactivated online police reporting out of concerns for ICE having access to certain information. She now saw that the RPD had reactivated online reporting called Abel Citizen, and she asked when that had been activated and whether at some point the community and the CPRC could be educated on that program.

Commissioner Lawson asked about the statistical reporting and whether the Assistant Chief could explain the changes that had been made to the program Abel Citizen.

Assistant Chief Simmons explained the customized program for the City of Richmond was currently in Beta mode and was not yet ready to go public. Once certain the program worked as it should, a full announcement would be made to the City Council, the CPRC and others to identify the on-line reporting program known as Abel Citizen.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Introducing the Training Item to Be Presented by the Richmond Police Department

Chair Martinez introduced those who would be introducing the Training Item as Assistant Police Chief Timothy Simmons, Captain John Lopez, Lieutenant Carl Dean, and Sergeant Miles Bailey.

Assistant Chief Simmons highlighted the presenters at this time and clarified the roles of each. As the Assistant Chief, he was responsible for the day-to-day activities of the RPD and ensuring things were running as they should. Captain John Lopez was responsible for the Patrol Bureau, everything essentially community facing, the patrol beats, traffic officers, cadets, parking enforcement and most of the personnel interacting with the public on the public facing side of the organization. Lieutenant Carl Dean was the SWAT Commander and manager responsible for the less-lethal and use-of-force program. Sergeant Miles Bailey was the First-line Supervisor who had collateral responsibilities in regards to the use-of-force review and to the less-lethal options.

Assistant Chief Simmons presented a high-level overview of the less-lethal options that RPD had available, the policies that insulated, surrounded and informed how those tools were used, the overall use-of-force policy, and how the policy was regulated, evaluated and what the policy was for, and when use-of-force situations were evaluated the US Supreme Court standard and the direction from the Supreme Court, which had been in place for decades, was used. When evaluating a use-of-force incident, he clarified that the law advised to look at the situation through the eyes of a reasonable officer at the scene, not the benefit of hindsight. He noted the difficulty of that process and clarified that the benefit of hindsight was used for training and tactical purposes. The question would be “Given what the officer knew at that moment and the pressure they faced, was the use of force reasonable, and was it necessary?”

The Assistant Chief provided the history of the use-of-force process that had been developed from the Supreme Court case of *Graham v. Connor* in 1989, which determined that excessive force claims must be judged under the Fourth Amendment’s objective reasonableness standard (focus on the facts and circumstances as they appeared to a reasonable officer), keeping in mind that the officers were authorized to use only the minimum force necessary to carry out a lawful arrest and overcome resistance.

Assistant Chief Simmons highlighted three key points to guide police departments, which points were also codified by RPD policy and used in its training:

1. How severe was the suspected crime?
2. Did the suspect pose an immediate threat to the safety of the officer or of the public?
3. Was the suspect actively resisting arrest or trying to escape?

The Assistant Chief explained that those key points allowed the RPD to fairly and lawfully evaluate whether the force used was reasonable and necessary under the circumstances.

The Training Session commenced with Captain John Lopez, Patrol Captain for the RPD, a 24-year RPD officer raised in San Pablo, a Police Explorer at 17 and a Police Officer at 21, who presented the Richmond Police Department Less-Lethal & Use-of-Force Training. A copy of the presentation had been included in the CPRC packet.

The agenda for Captain Lopez’s presentation was as follows:

- Summary of the Use-of-Force Policy
- Less-lethal options accessible to law enforcement officers
- Guidelines, constraints and protocols for each resource
- Factors influencing decision-making
- Oversight & Transparency
- Requirements for reporting and review procedures
- Address questions and facilitate discussion

Captain Lopez clarified a reference in the presentation to SRT team members, as a Special Response Team consisting of a mobile field force, SWAT team, tactical response team, aerial scouting team and the crisis negotiation team.

Captain Lopez concluded the training and responded to questions.

Commissioner Hegstrom referred to the presentation and the statement that not all officers were trained on the use of less-lethal weapons. She asked if all officers were trained on more lethal weapons, such as guns.

Captain Lopez clarified that the use of a firearm was a form of lethal force. He stated the RPD was one of the rare agencies that conducted monthly training on firearms with emphasis on proper firearm training, de-escalation techniques, shoot/don't shoot scenarios for officers and other less-lethal training.

Assistant Chief Simmons stated that all officers were trained with firearms. All officers were trained with some form of less-lethal. Every officer was issued a taser and there was specific separate training on tasers. All officers were issued the collapsible baton and specially trained through the academy and the use-of-force training throughout their career in the RPD on how to use their baton. Not all officers had a bean bag shotgun. Not all officers had a 40mm launcher. Not all officers had access to the chemical weapons. Those particular less-lethal options required additional specialized training and were used in unique specific one-off type of situations not commonly found in the day-to-day patrol operations. Patrol officers would not deploy gas unless trained on how to use it on an SRT team and the situation called for it. Based on assignments to specific teams, there would be specific training. Every officer was trained on some form of less-lethal option and all had at least two that they carried with them all the time. He added the RPD was in the process of procuring the 40mm sponge rounds that every officer would be trained to use, although that would take time and money and more staff.

Chair Martinez asked to what extent canines were trained to let go of a subject, and Captain Lopez stated that would be on command and there were ways that canine handlers used to get a canine off a subject. He stated once the force was no longer needed, the canine handler would give an off command and the subject would be taken into custody.

Assistant Chief Simmons added that unlike other police departments, the RPD also deployed e-collars that would deliver a level of shock that the canine handler had access to remotely to activate the canine e-collar. In addition, in order to release there was also a physical grabbing of the dog that would force it to release automatically, although he had not heard of the use of that application in a long time in that the e-collars had proven to be very effective.

Commissioner Lawson asked about the bean bag shotguns that reportedly had a maximum effective range of 60 feet, and he asked the minimum safe distance and whether officers were trained to avoid shooting too close or to avoid specific areas of the body to avoid it being a lethal weapon.

Sergeant Miles Bailey, who provided less-lethal bean bag shotgun training, advised the minimum safe distance for training was 21 feet and a stand-off distance that officers were to enforce that less-lethal tool in that anything within that distance or in close quarters made that tool ineffective in that particular situation. As to the targeted areas, he stated the primary target area for the bean bag shotgun were the legs and lower extremities to avoid hitting a vital organ or anything else.

Chair Martinez asked the impact of an officer launching a shotgun and what it would produce; a bruise or a broken bone or something else, and Sergeant Bailey stated the intention was to cause bruising. In his experience he had not seen a bean bag shotgun cause anything other than bruising, although other injuries had occurred in other jurisdictions, which examples had been used as part of the training to ensure officers adhered to the City of Richmond's standards and policies. As to what an injury would be if a suspect was shot too close, he stated there had been an incident in Southern California where the actual bean bag round had penetrated a person.

Commissioner Garcia noted that prior to COVID the RPD used to offer force-option training to the CPRC and he asked if the RPD was still offering that training, to which the Assistant Chief confirmed that at the will of the CPRC the RPD would offer force-option training any time the CPRC was ready, and that training was also offered in the community safety academies as well.

Commissioner Garcia stated he would follow up to request that training for the CPRC.

Commissioner Lawson referred to the presentation related to de-escalation and the sentence in the first bullet that "Nothing in this policy shall be construed to limit an officer's authority to use reasonable support force when interacting with a person in crisis." He asked if that sentence was part of the RPD Policy Manual under Section 300.3.4.

Sergeant Bailey reported that everything in his slides had come from policy and he would find that reference for clarification purposes and provide it to the CPRC.

Chair Martinez asked about the use of tasers and asked how far away an officer had to be from an individual to be safe.

Assistant Chief Simmons stated there was a distance if too close or too far away where the existing Taser 7 would be ineffective. Citing RPD's information about tasers, he stated the maximum range for the RPD's new Taser 10 was 45 feet.

If there was an individual beyond 45 feet, the taser would not be effective and it would not be used at all, although the Assistant Chief was not aware of how close an individual could be for the Taser 10.

Lieutenant Carl Dean (by text relayed by Sergeant Bailey) explained that the Taser 10 could be used point blank.

Chair Martinez asked how often new tasers came out and the Assistant Chief explained that there was no standard although it seemed as if every other year new technology would come out. He added that being able to use a taser at a closer distance was a benefit for all involved to address the potential to control someone overly violent. He described the differences between Taser 7 and the new Taser 10 and identified situations where tasers might not be effective the first time but could be effective a second time.

Commissioner Jackson asked if the RPD had mechanical equipment that could be used to identify a situation before entering a structure, and Assistant Chief Simmons advised that the RPD did not but it used small drones to clear a house, for instance, rather than sending officers in blind. There were trained “pilots” who could navigate the inside of a house and determine it was safe. The decision-maker as to whether or not to use drones would be the Duty Watch Commander or the Scene Supervisor depending upon how rapidly something was evolving.

Chair Martinez asked how often the RPD reviewed its Use-of-Force Policy.

Assistant Chief Simmons explained that every time the Use-of-Force Review Board met the policy would be reviewed in light of the situations it was reviewing, and if there was a gap in the policy, that gap would be brought to his or the Police Chief’s attention and would be addressed. He added that outside of those informal reviews, there was an annual review of all critical policies prior to going into the next year. Another review level with Lexipol itself would put out regular Best Practices and recommendations on a monthly basis, and would evaluate situations on a national level or new case law would develop that would require an adjustment to the policy that would be distributed to the RPD, which would then adopt it.

Commissioner Jackson offered his condolences to the officer who had passed away and asked if the funeral would be open to the public, which the Assistant Chief advised that it was not open to the public but there would be room for invited guests such as the City Council and the CPRC.

The CPRC thanked Assistant Chief Simmons and his team for the presentation.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, was pleased with the training and thanked RPD for the presentation. Referring to the officer training, he appreciated that officers were being trained to establish a respectful tone when working with the public.

HANSEL ALEJANDRO AGUILAR, Director of Police Accountability for the City of Berkeley, thanked the CPRC and the RPD for providing the overview on the Use-of-Force Policy. He stated the City of Berkeley conducted an annual review for its Use-of-Force Policy and tuned into other nearby jurisdictions to see where they could improve their department’s policies.

Mr. Alejandro Aguilar advised that he had been tracking the engagement of the concept of an officer-created jeopardy, the idea that an officer’s preceding actions could create or escalate the danger that necessitates the use of force. He asked if other jurisdictions were tracking the same concept. He commented that the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) had done a good webinar *The Evolution of the Use of Force* two years ago, and Cynthia Lee, a law professor at George Washington University Law School had also scrutinized the concept where she talked about the need for more conversations about an officer-created jeopardy concept. He asked the RPD if

there was any engagement with that concept and whether the City of Richmond had any training on that concept.

LEISA JOHNSON liked the informative and helpful training session and thanked RPD for the presentation. She reiterated something she had heard at the Richmond City Council meeting when Assistant Chief Simmons had offered any member of the City Council or members of the CPRC to avail themselves of any type of specialized training to undergo use-of-force incidents and what might be accounted for in the field. She suggested that specific training would be helpful and urged members to avail themselves of it.

IX. CLOSED SESSION

- a. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation, California Government Code Sections 54956.9(d)(4) and 54954.4(c): (1 case)

There was no public comment on the closed session that commenced at approximately 9:15 P.M.

Closed Session Commences

X. REPORT OUT FROM CLOSED SESSION

At approximately 9:40 P.M., Legal Counsel Andrews reported from the Closed Session that the item shown had been discussed and there was no reportable action taken.

XI. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS, STAFF, RIDEALONGS

Chair Martinez reported that she and Commissioner Cantú would be attending the NACOLE Conference soon and would report back on that Conference.

There were no comments from the public.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:41 P.M.

Carmen Martinez, Chair