

COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW COMMISSION
of the City of Richmond, California
(CPRC)
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, November 5, 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: Floy Andrews, City Attorney's Office - Present

II. STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Legal Counsel Floy Andrews advised that she was unaware of any conflict of interest.

III. AGENDA REVIEW

Legal Counsel Andrews offered a suggestion to reorder New Business Items a and b by considering Item b prior to Item a.

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

<p>ACTION: It was M/S/C (Martinez/Lawson) to reorder the agenda to consider New Business agenda Item b prior to Item a; approved by a Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Garcia, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None).</p>

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 1, 2025

<p>ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú/Lawson) to approve the minutes of the October 1, 2025 meeting, as submitted; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0-2 (Ayes: Garcia, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: None; Abstain: Cantú and Flores; Absent: None).</p>
--

V. REPORT BY CHIEF OF POLICE

Assistant Police Chief Tim Simmons reported he had been designated Acting Police Chief while Chief Bisa French was away. He updated the CPRC on the Richmond Police Department's (RPD's) staffing situations as of this date and explained that while the RPD was authorized for 147 sworn personnel, only 122 of those positions were filled. He noted that 12 new police officers had been hired this year. There were 25 vacancies; six sergeants and 19 officers. There were currently eight officers in the training program and those officers should be released from training by the end of December or early January, and there were six trainees in the police academy. The RPD was also authorized for 71 professional staff members and 54 of those positions were filled. This year 14 new professional staff members had been hired and the vacancies that remained were for two jailer positions, one network specialist, two record specialists, one communication supervisor, five dispatchers, one assistant property technician, three crime scene technicians, one parking enforcement officer, three cadets and three crossing guards.

Highlighting community events, Acting Chief Simmons stated the RPD just finished Cops and Goblins for Halloween, which had been a smashing success where hundreds of families had come through the RPD and over 400 lunches had been served. On December 18, 2025, there would be Shop with a Cop, an event that many families relied on for the Christmas holiday; and December 20, 2025 would be the Annual Police & Fire Toy Drive & Giveaway where close to 1,000 families would be served this year.

Acting Chief Simmons presented the ShotSpotter report where there had been 12 recorded shots fired, with 29 activations through the ShotSpotter system, which reflected a month-over-month reduction for both; down 14 percent for calls from residents and 12 percent month-over-month for activations, with year-to-date 16 percent down for shots fired calls and 21 percent down for activations.

With respect to crime incidents, Acting Chief Simmons referred to shootings that had occurred and stated that while no person had been injured, there was property damage involved. He reported a 100 percent increase in shooting incidents from eight to 16 from one month to the next. The RPD was working with the Contra Costa County Major Crimes Task Force and others to identify the impacted areas and address the acute locations to reduce the shootings. He stated year-over-year shooting incidents were trending in the right direction, down 39 percent from this time last year.

Acting Chief Simmons referred to the crime incidents and stated that violent crime overall was trending down month over month with a 33 percent reduction from September to October 2025. He referred to his last report to the CPRC with respect to the steep spike in aggravated assaults and stated there had been a few arrests associated with those responsible for quite a few of those assaults, and consequently a 25 percent reduction in aggravated assaults had resulted in a 33 percent reduction in overall violent crime. Year to date, the RPD was keeping an eye on sexual assaults and burglaries given the upward swing. He added that given the volatile nature of sexual assaults, the Family Justice Center was working tirelessly on the issue which had a 19 percent increase year to date. He reported there had been 107 incidents this year.

Acting Chief Simmons added that burglaries were also trending up with a 17 percent increase, primarily residential burglaries, and the general crimes unit was working to determine if there was a burglary crew from other cities that targeted certain neighborhoods, which seemed to be the case here.

Acting Chief Simmons stated that sexual assaults were divided into two categories of non-forcible and forcible (which were potentially violent situations) and forcible sexual assaults were up 22 percent from this time last year. As a result, the RPD needed to find intervention and get case closure to help the victims and get them connected to services which the Family Justice Center was doing.

Acting Chief Simmons also reported there had been a spike in narcotic-related crimes and violations, up 11 percent over the course of the year, and embezzlement through businesses related to employee theft was up 17 percent. Human trafficking had also shown a 300 percent increase year over year. He referred specifically to pimps who took people across city or state lines trafficking them from one location to the next. While there had been only one case last year, there had been four cases this year coming from Las Vegas and Oakland. He characterized the cases as legitimate kidnappings, legitimate human trafficking where victims were not operating under their own will, under duress, under threat or fear of violence, and the RPD was working with the Major Crimes Task Force, the in-house detectives, 23rd Street Merchants, the Neighborhood Council, the Family Justice Center and other resources in an all-hands-on deck effort to reduce the number of cases.

Commissioner Hegstrom asked about a body that had been found at a middle school in the City and whether that was a homicide, and Acting Chief Simmons stated the incident was being investigated as a suspicious death and it could have been an overdose.

Commissioner Hegstrom also asked how a deficit of five dispatchers was affecting the other dispatchers, how many dispatchers were on the job, and if responses to calls were still being answered in a timely manner.

Acting Chief Simmons stated that stats were available on how quickly calls were being answered and dispatched given that a state standard had to be met. He would email that information to the CPRC along with the national requirement. He added that dispatchers were in a forced-overtime situation given the 24-hour, 7-day a week, 365-day a year operation. He also clarified with respect to human trafficking that the increase related to the number of cases the RPD was investigating.

Commissioner Garcia thanked the Acting Chief for the report and thanked the RPD for handing out candy to kids along 23rd Street on Halloween, which the community appreciated. He asked whether the RPD's unit that handled sexual assaults was currently properly staffed.

Acting Chief Simmons stated the special victim's unit that handled sexual assaults was appropriately staffed with detectives, although missing was the in-the-field group that would conduct surveillance and look for people to identify as suspects. That unit was no longer available and the RPD had to rely on either the availability of a county task force or tap into the U.S. Marshals Service, and the RPD could not quickly provide resolution given the reliance on other resources that did not have to be relied upon in the past.

Commissioner Cantú noted that Chief French had also provided use of force statistics and complaints, although Acting Chief Simmons explained that the Use of Force Review Board did not meet during the month of October due to staffing issues.

Acting Chief Simmons added the RPD used software called Blue Team in order to report use of force and it was an internal tracking system so that even though there could be a wait for the Use of Force Review Board to meet, there would not be a lag in finding or addressing a use of force. The next use of force report would include both months.

Commissioner Cantú referred to an earlier report related to the need to use mutual aid due to RPD staffing issues and she asked the status of that need, and Acting Chief Simmons stated he was doing everything possible to avoid the need to use mutual aid, although that was still possible. The RPD had bolstered its recruiting and outreach to address staffing issues and he was optimistic whether mutual aid would be needed.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, a member of the Park Plaza Neighborhood Council, stated the Macdonald Avenue corridor had become an issue again and he had to call the RPD about people hanging out in front of the 7-Eleven on that corridor. He described some past incidents that had been reported to the RPD and stated the 7-Eleven had done nothing for the community and he and the Neighborhood Council had been working to put that business out of business. He described the same concerns for the Palace Furniture where residents did not feel safe because of the intimidation and harassment by individuals asking for money. While he appreciated RPD's efforts, the concerns continued.

BEN THERRIAULT (online), President of the Richmond Police Officers Association (RPOA), stated there remained serious concerns about RPD staffing and the inability to conduct follow up and complete investigations in a timely manner, along with the reliance on agencies to assist victims in Richmond. He stated that issue needed to be addressed but was not being addressed fast enough from the City side and there needed to be a better and more robust strategy from the City. He added that any assistance from the CPRC would be welcome.

VI. PUBLIC FORUM

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, stated new Commissioners to the CPRC had been appointed at the last City Council meeting. He had reached out to the Youth Council to encourage it to fill the last slot on the CPRC given that youth had been impacted by police. He announced the next Contra Costa Mayors Conference on December 2, 2025 in the City of Pinole, with RSVPs required; \$70/person, which included food.

BEN THERRIAULT (online), President of the RPOA, clarified that Use of Force Board reviews were not complaints but were incidents. He commented that use of force was considered a normal course of business and duty by police officers and not everyone wanted to de-escalate situations willingly given that de-escalation took two people, and framing matters constantly from the anti-police portion of the CPRC was obvious, and the bias continued to be very reflective of ideology instead of actual rational thought. He noted that potential police officer candidates could be deterred from applying to the RPD due to the City Council's lack of support of the RPD. He encouraged the CPRC to help the RPD with recruiting, emphasized that how things were framed mattered and not putting things in a biased lens mattered, which John Alden talked about during the CPRC training session.

VII. OLD BUSINESS, DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Ad Hoc Committees

Chair Martinez reported that there was no update from the Outreach Ad Hoc Committee.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, stated that the Brown Act Handbook had indicated that ad hoc committees could be comprised of two people. He looked forward to updates from the ad hoc committees.

BEN THERRIALT (online), President of the RPOA, stated his only concern was that there was some type of record of what was occurring with the ad hoc committees and that discussions were being held in accordance with the Brown Act.

b. Update on the Process of Hiring a Permanent Investigator

Legal Counsel Andrews read a report from the City's Human Resources Director Sharrone Taylor, who suggested that recruitment for a permanent investigator was progressing and there would be more information for the CPRC at its December meeting.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, stated he had complete faith that the Byers Group would be able to finalize the recruitment in the next thirty days or so. He appreciated and looked forward to the updates.

BEN THERRIALT (online), President of the RPOA, asked about the input provided by the entire CPRC and whether that had happened or whether only a select few were involved. He asked if a selection had already been made, and if so, why it had not been reported out after the City Council's closed session.

c. Update from Interim Investigator

Ty Lewis, Bill Whalen and Associates, reported that strong progress was being made in clearing some of the backlog in investigations, some of which went back to 2024. Currently, the firm was investigating seven different complaints submitted to the CPRC regarding various allegations of police conduct from use of force to bias to other types of complaints. The firm had focused on the older high-priority complaints involving serious allegations. As earlier reported, there were two officer-involved shooting cases from 2025 that had been tolled in accordance with what was going on with the RPD and their investigations with the California Department of Justice. There were nine active investigations ongoing, two of which were use of force allegations that should be wrapped up in the next week, with reports to the CPRC for review.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Lewis and appreciated the work.

In response to questions as to when the cases might be submitted to the CPRC, Mr. Lewis stated the other five current investigations were waiting on responses from some of the complainants, which was problematic given the age of the complaints and the reliability of the contact information.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, thanked Mr. Lewis for the updates to the CPRC in a timely manner.

LEISA JOHNSON (online), asked Mr. Lewis about the process of training Commissioners before they were allowed to have access to confidential information and she recognized the six hours of training on August 2, 2025. She asked: whether the training would be tracked so the public would know which Commissioner had received training on what dates and what items; when all eight hours would need to be completed; whether that would be an annual process; what qualified in place of a ridealong; how new Commissioners would be trained before being allowed access to the documents and participate in a closed session discussion and vote; whether new Commissioners would be required to view the six hours of training from August, which had been recorded on Zoom, and if so how that process would be monitored; whether the training would need to be completed annually; and since documents were tracked through Drop Box with the prior investigator and the public was interested to know how those documents were being tracked with the new investigator, whether that Drop Box would still be utilized and how access would be monitored by what Commissioners and whether information would be allowed to be downloaded, printed, or screen shot, and if so had those procedures gone through meet and confer with the RPOA and the Richmond Police Management Association (RPMA).

BEN THERRIault (online), President of the RPOA, noted that oftentimes people made frivolous complaints, fake complaints and baseless allegations, and did not want to follow through on it because they lied. He urged the CPRC not to discount that possibility. In addition, it was important to know whether the process was transparent all the way through and what the CPRC received if, when and how the process played out, especially those police officers affected since it affected their jobs.

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

Legal Counsel Andrews reported there had been two meet and confer meetings so far, and the next meeting was scheduled for November 24, 2025. She noted the process was a two meeting per month schedule, although there would be only one meeting in November given the various holidays. The City had responded to information requests and had made information requests of its own; the parties were tackling half of the items that the CPRC had brought to the City Council, which the City Council had approved for the meet and confer process this year. The second half of the items would be in discussions in November or December and were wrapping in the two older items from last year into the process. She stated progress was being made. On December 3, 2025, the lead negotiator would meet with the CPRC in closed session to give a more detailed update. The City Council was responsible for directing the negotiator in the negotiations.

Commissioner Garcia was glad that progress was being made. He referred to the comment about tracking training and suggested that should be an ongoing item on the CPRC agendas and he asked about the process of doing that.

Legal Counsel Andrews explained that she had put this item on the agenda and the CPRC Chair had the authority over the agenda and could decide to agendaize items. Generally speaking, she stated if the majority of the CPRC as a whole wanted to agendaize something it could vote to do so.

On the question of whether or not Commissioner Garcia's request was a Brown Act violation, Commissioner Hegstrom suggested that Commissioner Garcia could submit an agenda report for the next meeting for discussion and a vote.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

As earlier reported, Items a and b were reordered on the agenda.

- b. Introduce Action Item on Public Comment Period Format for Future CPRC Meetings

Legal Counsel Andrews explained that the CPRC had looked at the item numerous times. She highlighted the recommendations related to the CPRC's review of public comment and the actions that had been taken to get the item to this point. She identified the recommended action 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.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, suggested that he had initiated the item because at one meeting he had been denied the ability to make comment on an item and he emphasized the right of the people to make public comment, which was particularly important after the Report by the Chief of Police.

BEN THERRIAULT (online), President of the RPOA, referred to a number of letters and requests sent to the City to cure Brown Act violations by the CPRC. He commented that he sat on a Civil Service Commission in the City of Martinez where public comment was accepted on anything. He urged the CPRC to chose the more transparent option and comply with the Brown Act to avoid getting more letters of non-compliance with the Brown Act.

LEISA JOHNSON (online), suggested that the current meeting had run effectively, smoothly and in a timely manner and she asked why that needed to be changed. The CPRC was all about accountability, transparency and being there for the community. If being there for the community, the CPRC would value input in real time and on every single item, which was what the Brown Act assured.

Ms. Johnson stated the City was notified it was in violation of the Brown Act. She had a conversation with the City Attorney this date and had provided every statute in which the CPRC had violated the law, although the City Attorney could not provide one statute that defended her position. She noted the City Attorney had disagreed and her interpretation of the Brown Act sufficed. She objected to that response and stated the CPRC should demand better transparency and that the public should be allowed to comment on each and every item. She quoted from the Brown Act that before or during consideration of each agenda item the public must be given an opportunity to comment on the item. With respect to any item which is already on the agenda or in connection with any item which the body will consider pursuant to the exceptions contained in Section 54954.2(b), the public must be given the opportunity to comment before or during the legislative body's consideration of the item.

Ms. Johnson stated 'consideration' was important because in this context it encompassed the entire process of a legislative body's review, discussion and deliberation of an item regardless of whether a formal vote was taken. She asked the CPRC if it really wanted to be the only Board in Richmond that had changed the public process when the CPRC was all about accountability.

Commissioner Hegstrom stated in preparation for her agenda item she looked through the Commissioner Handbook which held all the rules for holding meetings and she stated that Ms. Johnson brought up legitimate concerns about public comment. She commented that while the new format for public comment was consistent with the Brown Act, she did not understand why the item had been brought up in the first place given the functional public comment process that had prevailed for some time. Unless there was something wrong with it she saw no need to change it.

Commissioner Lawson made a motion to approve the proposed public comment period format for future CPRC meetings. The motion was seconded by Chair Martinez.

Commissioner Lawson argued in favor of the motion, stated the issue had been discussed, there had been a vote that had passed and it was only back on the agenda to make sure everything was procedurally correct. In response to Commissioner Hegstrom's request, in his opinion the legal opinion of the City Attorney was all the legal opinion needed. While he supported a discussion, he requested there be as little redundancy as possible.

Commissioner Jackson commented that since February 2025 when he had asked why the public format was changing, he had not gotten a fair answer. He suggested the voting process was one-sided and he asked again the real purpose of the change.

Commissioner Garcia stated he had also looked at the Brown Act and had zeroed in on the area quoted that for every agenda item for regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public before or during the legislative body's consideration of the item. He stated that statute, Section 54954.9(8), was clear and that was the only section relevant to the discussion. He asked who would get in trouble whenever there was a Brown Act violation.

Legal Counsel Andrews understood that the City Attorney would be the party subject to the violation. She noted that the section's reference to public comment 'before or during,' meant either at the top of the meeting within the all-inclusive public comment period, or during the meeting.

Commissioner Cantú stated that the CPRC used to have much longer meetings and while the current meetings were not as long as they had been, with more investigations and closed sessions there would be longer meetings again, and the proposed change in format would help those members of the public who wished to make comments and ask questions an ability to do so at a reasonable time so that they could get their voices heard in an all-inclusive public comment without waiting hours to make a comment on a specific item on the agenda.

Commissioner Jackson disagreed and commented that as a long-time member of the CPRC he had never been at a CPRC meeting that had gone to 11:00 P.M., as earlier suggested.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Lawson/Martinez) to organize public comment at regular CPRC meetings, as recommended by the City Attorney, A through D; approved by a Roll Call vote: 4-3 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Garcia, Hegstrom and Jackson; Abstain: None; Absent: None).

a. Introduce Action Item on Commission Decorum

Legal Counsel Andrews advised that the CPRC did not have the authority to require a Commissioner to resign or no longer be on the CPRC. In response to questions, she stated the Mayor and the City Council appointed the body and the body did not have the authority to un-appoint or force a resignation of one of its members, although she understood that the Mayor and the City Council had the authority to un-appoint. She noted that there were some options the CPRC could pursue if it wanted to do so.

Commissioner Hegstrom stated that the decorum of some recent meetings had not been acceptable. She emphasized that all members of the CPRC were volunteers and served because they cared but members had to respect the opinions of others even if they differed. She stated that personal attacks were inappropriate and there was a need to talk about the issues without making it personal. It had bothered her that when someone had been acknowledged by the Chair to speak and if something was said that was inappropriate and a point of order was called, it would be the Chair to make a decision as to whether that point of order was correct or not and the speaker would have to adjust or not, but if the Chair was making that decision and there was no compliance there had to be some way to make sure that the members would have to comply with the orders of the Chair. She suggested the CPRC might consider whether or not to eject a non-complying member from the meeting. She added that the Chair should also be on top of the discussions and call out members when something inappropriate occurred, which would also include members of the public during public forum.

Commissioner Lawson suggested some training on how to conduct meetings should be considered to provide some basic understanding of the rules, particularly Rosenberg's Rules of Order, to help the process.

Commissioner Hegstrom stated the City of Richmond Boards, Commissions and Committees Handbook also included the rules of order. She emphasized as representatives of the community, all members needed to be respectful of each other and themselves.

Commissioner Jackson agreed with the need to respect and to be respectful of each other since it was obvious when there was no respect.

Commissioner Garcia agreed with the concern and stated it was a question of respect. He also agreed with the need to comply with Rosenberg's Rules of Orders. He was frustrated since there were times with some items on the agenda when he felt he did not get the courtesy that had been given others to answer their questions and make their comments. He did not want to be disrespectful given that the members were representing their communities and doing their best and he did not want to argue with anyone. He represented a community that was being overpoliced and he agreed with the need of being respectful. He was glad of the conversation, and also agreed the Chair needed to be mindful of those who overused the rules, which was also disrespectful if others were given the ability to make their points and get all their questions answered.

Commissioner Jackson stated that the members did not have to agree and could disagree but when leaving the meetings there should be no attitudes or controversies.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, recognized the tension in the last CPRC meeting and emphasized the need to create a more friendly and positive atmosphere to be able to work together. He suggested that the Chair coach the membership towards that theme to create a winning team. He referred to a group he was involved with and emphasized the need to listen to everybody and do their part to encourage members of the community to participate.

Commissioner Hegstrom recommended that everyone agree to read the Handbook on their own and agree to follow the Chair's direction, and if someone was out of line, a point of order could be called and it was up to the Chair as to what should be done. She recommended that everyone agree to follow the Chair's direction.

Chair Martinez recommended the establishment of bylaws for the CPRC and address the need for decorum in that document.

Commissioner Hegstrom was open to the creation of bylaws and addressing one issue at a time, such as rules and conduct at a meeting and each meeting thereafter could address other issues to include in the bylaws.

Commissioner Martinez did not want to be reactive and wanted to be preventative. She suggested that the code of conduct could be the first item to consider and then add in other topics to work off of that item.

Commissioner Cantú wanted to research bylaws from other jurisdictions, which should be shown as a staff item for the next agenda, to establish bylaws.

Legal Counsel Andrews noted that the City's Handbook had a section on relationships in bodies and there were six tips on the way people should act, which could be worked into the bylaws.

Commissioner Lawson still lobbied for additional training on Rosenberg's Rules of Order and Best Practices for conducting meetings.

Chair Martinez advised that another CPRC Commissioner was expected soon, and with respect to training she understood that reading the Handbook and watching an hour-long video would provide that training.

Commissioner Hegstrom referred to an email she had received and verified that other members had received the same email, which required additional training and she asked staff to look into that.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Cantú /Hegstrom) to direct the City Attorney's Office to provide a 30-minute Rosenberg's Rules of Order training in December 2025, with that 30-minutes to be counted towards the required eight hours of training, and with Commissioner Cantú to return at a future meeting with recommendations for bylaws to discuss with the CPRC, and with the bylaws to include rules of conduct; approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-1 (Ayes: Cantú, Flores, Hegstrom, Jackson, Lawson, and Chair Martinez; Noes: Garcia; Abstain: None; Absent: None).

- b. Report from Chair Martinez and Commissioner Cantú Regarding NACOLE Conference on October 26-30 in Minneapolis

Commissioner Cantú thanked the City on her and Chair Martinez's behalf to attend the NACOLE [National Association of Civilian Oversight for Law Enforcement] Conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota from October 26-30, 2025. The theme of the conference was Reckoning & Resilience in Post-George Floyd Era, five years after George Floyd's death. She stated the conference rooted them and others who had come to the work, to ensure accountability, to build trust and transparency, and offered attendees tours to the place where George Floyd was actually killed. A community organization had given the tour of the sites that NACOLE had wanted to promote and had a number of sessions with current Commissioners in Minneapolis along with the Mayor, community organizations and others on how the oversight had begun in Minneapolis.

Chair Martinez stated the five-day conference had brought together hundreds of oversight professionals from across the country and around the world. She described some of the sessions solely dedicated to the positions of the attendees themselves.

Both Chair Martinez and Commissioner Cantú reported on, and responded to questions related to, the 16 sessions they had attended over the five-day conference, which included: Approaching Conflict Productively, and Use of Force Principles Twenty-Three Core Elements to Use of Force Effective Policy.

The CPRC commended Chair Martinez and Commissioner Cantú for the very thorough, detailed and impressive presentation.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, agreed with the impressiveness of the report, and after learning that some jurisdictions paid stipends to their police boards or commissions, supported stipends for members of the Richmond CPRC.

BEN THERRIAULT (online), President of the RPOA, took issue with some of the information presented from the NACOLE Conference. He stated the argument about officer-created jeopardy violated established legal standards about *Graham v. Connor* about objectionable reasonableness and the amount of force used, and ignored the reality of policing. Police were required to make decisions that were limited and often had conflicting information and had to manage threats that popped up that were emerging or escalating while protecting victims and bystanders without the benefit of hindsight that did not exist in real world environments. Police were not afforded the luxury of perfect information and had limited time to strategize. He stated the doctrine of officer-created jeopardy had been discussed by the activist community for some time. He added that the police score card was not objective and was another thing that had presented itself as data driven but had been built on activists' assumptions, with bad data that had been weaponized for politics. It did not measure performance.

Mr. Therriault added that he was surprised with the references to Campaign Zero, which had the same approach beginning with a political outcome and tried to be justified with data that police were the root problem, and backfilled the data to support the narrative, which was the opposite of responsible policy analysis. He stated a lot of the things were old hat but did accomplish a purpose and to have those things highlighted was an issue.

Commissioner Jackson commented that he had produced music and when doing so he listened for anything out of order or anything that did not sound or feel right. He used that as an analogy to commend and congratulate Chair Martinez and Commissioner Cantú for their thorough and impressive production to report on their attendance at the NACOLE Conference.

IX. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS, STAFF, RIDEALONGS

Legal Counsel Andrews reported that she had been planning to have John Alden present a training session to the CPRC on December 3, 2025, on the subject of bias, but since the CPRC had asked her to provide training on Rosenberg's Rules of Order on that same date, she suggested both might be considered at that time.

X. ADJOURNMENT

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

Carmen Martinez, Chair