



**City of Richmond  
Human Rights and  
Human Relations Commission**

**MEETING AGENDA**

*Jasmine Jones, Chair  
Joyce Harris, Vice Chair  
Betty Burrus-Wright, PhD, Commissioner  
Texanita Bluitt, Commissioner*

*Courtney Cummings, Commissioner  
Carole Johnson, Commissioner  
Crystal Johnson, Commissioner*

*Councilmember Vinay Pimple, Council Liaison  
Debra Vaca*

*Sr. Asst. City Attorney Everett Jenkins  
Jantsan Damdinsuren*

Monday, October 26, 2015 at 6:30 pm  
City Council Chambers  
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. ROLL CALL**

**C. AGENDA REVIEW**

At the discretion of the Chair, items on the Agenda may be heard in an order different from that which appears on the Agenda.

**D. MEETING PROCEDURES**

Members of the public attending a Human Rights and Human Relations Commission meeting for the first time are encouraged to read the "Meeting Procedures" information following the Agenda. Anyone who wishes to address the Commission during OPEN FORUM or on a specific item must file a Speaker's Form with staff.

**E. OPEN FORUM #1**

Members of the public are invited to address the Commission on topics that are not on the Agenda. Please note: In order to accommodate all members of the public who wish to speak, including those who are unable to arrive early in the meeting, the Commission will hold a second OPEN FORUM at approximately 8:30 PM. Please file only one OPEN FORUM Speaker's Form with staff, indicating either "OPEN FORUM #1" or "OPEN FORUM #2".

**F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

August 2015

**G. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT**

The City Council member serving as liaison to the Commission may make a report on City Council actions of interest to the Commission.

**H. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

**I. CHAIR'S REPORT**

**J. STAFF REPORTS**

**K. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

The Commission may take direct action, make recommendations to the City Council or provide direction to staff.

**K.1 PRESENTATION: YOUTH LAW CENTER (25 MINUTES)**

HEAR PRESENTATION ON SHACKLING OF JUVENILES IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY AND DISCUSS FURTHER ACTIONS

Presenter: Virginia Corrigan, J.D., Staff Attorney, Youth Law Center  
*Chairperson Jones*

**K.2 COMMITTEE REPORT: POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS (30 MINUTES)**

HEAR REPORT AND APPROVE UPDATES TO COMMITTEE'S PLANS

a. Hear Presentation from Catholic Charities on "Restorative Practices for Healing Harm in the Community" – *Presenter: Aswad Arif*

b. Police and Community Relations Regular Meeting Updates  
*Commissioner Crystal Johnson, Commissioner Carole Johnson, Commissioner Cummings, Victoria Sawicki and Chairperson Jones*

**K.3 COMMITTEE REPORT: ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING (10 MINUTES)**

HEAR AND DISCUSS COMMITTEE UPDATES

a. End of the Year Report  
*Chairperson Jones*

**K.4 COMMITTEE REPORT: EDUCATION AND OUTREACH (10 MINUTES)**

HEAR AND DISCUSS COMMITTEE UPDATES

*Commissioner Burrus-Wright and Vice Chair Harris*

**K.5 APPOINTMENT OF A NOMINATING COMMITTEE (5 MINUTES)**

PURSUANT TO ARTICLE III, SECTION 2 OF THE HRHRC BYLAWS, "THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE HRHRC SHALL APPOINT A NOMINATING COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF THREE COMMISSIONERS. SAID COMMITTEE SHALL MEET AND BRING BEFORE THE HRHRC, IN NOVEMBER, THE NAMES OF THE COMMISSIONERS AS NOMINEES FOR THE OFFICES OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON."

*Chairperson Jones*

**L. REPORTS**

None.

**M. OPEN FORUM #2 (At approximately 8:30P.M.)**

**N. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

- a. CALL FOR AGENDA ITEMS
- b. FOR THE GOOD OF THE COMMISSION

**O. ADJOURNMENT**

The next regular meeting of the City of Richmond Human Rights and Human Relations Commission is scheduled for **Monday, November 16, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.** in Richmond Room, 450 Civic Center Plaza.

**P. MEETING PROCEDURES**

Speaker Registration

Anyone who wishes to address the Human Rights and Human Relations Commission (HRHRC) on a topic that is not on the Agenda and is relevant to the Commission's purpose may speak once in either of the two OPEN FORUM sessions, but not both. Please file a Speaker Form with staff PRIOR to the announcement of that section of OPEN FORUM.

Persons wishing to speak on a particular Item on the Agenda must file a Speaker's Form with the staff PRIOR to the Commission's consideration of the Item. Once discussion on the Agenda Item begins, only those persons who have previously submitted Speaker's Forms will be permitted to speak on the Item.

Time Limits

Individual public speakers shall have a maximum of two (2) minutes to address the Commission.

If all Agenda Items are not completed by 9:30 pm, the Items remaining shall be continued to the next Regular Meeting, unless the Commission votes to extend the meeting.

Cell Phones

Please silence all cell phones, pagers, and other electronic devices during the meeting.

Persons with disabilities, who require auxiliary aids or services in using City facilities, services or programs, or who would like information on the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 may contact (510) 620-6509 for assistance.

# **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*Attachment(s):  
- August 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes*



**City of Richmond  
Human Rights and  
Human Relations Commission  
MEETING MINUTES**

*Jasmine Jones, Chair  
Joyce Harris, Vice Chair  
Betty Burrus-Wright, PhD, Commissioner  
Texanita Bluit, Commissioner*

*Courtney Cummings, Commissioner  
Carole Johnson, Commissioner  
Crystal Johnson, Commissioner*

*Councilmember Vinay Pimple, Council Liaison  
Debra Vaca*

*Sr. Asst. City Attorney Everett Jenkins  
Jantsan Damdinsuren*

Monday, August 24, 2015 at 6:30 pm  
City Council Chambers  
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The Regular Meeting of the Human Rights and Human Relations Commission on August 24, 2015 was called to order at 6:30 pm by Vice Chair Joyce Harris.

**B. ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Vice Chair Harris, Commissioner Burrus-Wright, Commissioner Courtney Cummings, Commissioner Carole Johnson, and Commissioner Crystal Johnson,  
ABSENT: Chairperson Jones and Commissioner Texanita Bluit

**C. AGENDA REVIEW**

Agenda adopted as presented.

**D. MEETING PROCEDURES**

Members of the public attending a Human Rights and Human Relations Commission meeting for the first time are encouraged to read the "Meeting Procedures" information following the Agenda. Anyone who wishes to address the Commission during OPEN FORUM or on a specific item must file a Speaker's Form with staff.

**E. OPEN FORUM #1**

N/A

**F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

None

**G. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT**

N/A

**H. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

N/A

**I. CHAIR'S REPORT**

Chairperson Jones was not present.

**J. STAFF REPORTS**

No report.

**K. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**K.1 COMMITTEE REPORT: EDUCATION AND OUTREACH COMMITTEE (15 MINUTES)  
REVIEW AND APPROVE UPDATES TO COMMITTEE'S PLANS**

a. Education Forum – Saturday, September 12, 2015 at Lovonya DeJean Middle School

a. Forum Theme: Reach One, Teach One, and Save a Child

*Commissioner Burrus-Wright and Vice Chair Harris*

Commissioner Burrus-Wright framed the item and reported latest updates. A conference spearheaded by the HRHRC's Education and Outreach committee on protecting the rights of the child is taking place on September 12 at Lovonya DeJean Middle School. Confirmed speakers and discussion topics include presentation by RPD Officer Lynette Parker on community engagement, presentation on "Commercially Sexually Exploited Youth" by Lucia Ray-Guillen from Community Violence Solutions, and "Let's Talk" Sex Literacy presentation by Commissioner Burrus-Wright.

Organizers arranged coffee and pastry donation from Starbucks in Pt. Richmond. Staff was directed to promote the event on different media outlets and newsletter including Mayor's e-Forum, City Manager's Report and marquee.

**K.2 COMMITTEE REPORT: PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION (15 MINUTES)  
HEAR AND DISCUSS UPDATES**

a. Developing Human Rights Survey

*Chairperson Jones*

Staff was directed to circulate results from the 2015 city-wide community survey.  
*Continued to September 28, 2015 Meeting.*

**K.3 COMMITTEE REPORT: POLICE AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS (15 MINUTES)**  
**HEAR AND DISCUSS UPDATES**

- a. Police and Community Relations Regular Meeting Updates
- b. West County Detention Facility Expansion Updates
- c. Urban Shield 2015 – September 11-14

*Commissioner Crystal Johnson, Commissioner Carole Johnson, Commissioner Cummings and Chairperson Jones*

Commissioner Crystal Johnson framed the item. The PCRC meets regularly on every third Monday of the month. Next meeting of the committee is on September 21<sup>st</sup> at 6 pm. The committee is working on getting more clarification of the Police Commission's role in community and police engagement.

Commissioners provided an update on West County Detention Facility expansion. The Board of Supervisors are concerned about securing the required matching funds for the expansion to complete. More updates will be provided at the next meeting.

The HRHRC recently became aware of "Urban Shield," full-scale preparedness exercise assessing police departments' response and capabilities related to multi-discipline planning, policing, policies, and training. Police departments in the Bay Area are participating in this exercise in Alameda from September 11 – 14. In response to HRHRC's inquiry to Chief Chris Magnus regarding Richmond Police Department's participation, he indicated that Richmond PD participates in emergency response trainings and not looking to host Urban Shield in Richmond. Discussions ensued on the role of School Resource Officers and safety plans for merging of Richmond continuation schools. The Commission requested the PCRC to invite Chief Magnus to the September Regular Meeting.

**K.4 3<sup>RD</sup> NORCAHRO REGIONAL CONVENING OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMAN RELATIONS ORGANIZATIONS - ON SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 19 IN SAN JOSE (10 MINUTES)**  
**DISCUSS ARRANGEMENTS FOR ATTENDANCE**

*Chairperson Jones*

The 3<sup>rd</sup> regional convening of human rights and human relations commissions will take place on Saturday, September 19 in San Jose. Goals for the conference are to establish and support local and regional networks of HRHRCs, and to build the capacity of organizations addressing human rights and human relations issues.

The following commissioners expressed interest to participate: Commissioner Courtney Cummings, Commissioner Carole Johnson, Commissioner Burrus-Wright, and Vice Chair Harris.

**K.5 LETTERS TO FAMILIES OF CHARLESTON SHOOTING VICTIMS (5 MINUTES)**  
**REVIEW AND APPROVE LETTER**

*Chairperson Jones*

A motion was made by Commissioner Burrus-Wright, seconded by Commissioner Carole Johnson, to approve letters to families of Charleston shooting victims and Charleston Mayor. The motion was passed with the unanimous vote of the commission.

**L. REPORTS**

None.

**M. OPEN FORUM #2 (At approximately 8:30P.M.)**

N/A

**O. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the Human Rights and Human Relations Commission's Regular Meeting on August 24, 2015 was adjourned at 8:45 p.m. and to meet again on Monday, September 28, 2015 at 6:30 pm in the City Council Chambers.

# K.1

**PRESENTATION: YOUTH LAW CENTER (25 MINUTES)**

HEAR PRESENTATION ON SHACKLING OF JUVENILES IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

AND DISCUSS FURTHER ACTIONS

Presenter: Virginia Corrigan, J.D., Staff Attorney, Youth Law Center  
*Chairperson Jones*

*Attachment(s):*

*1.1 – PRESS RELEASE: “Youth Law Center Demands an End to Indiscriminate Shackling of Juveniles Being Transported to Court in Contra Costa County”*

*1.2 – DEMAND LETTER to Contra Costa County from Youth Law Center (08/24/2015)*



## Press Release

**Embargoed until 10:00 A.M.  
Monday, August 24, 2015**

**Contact: Sue Burrell (415) 543-3379 x3911  
sburrell@ylc.org**

**Maria Ramiu (415) 543-3379 x3908  
mramiu@ylc.org**

### **Youth Law Center Demands an End to Indiscriminate Shackling of Juveniles Being Transported to Court in Contra Costa County**

**(San Francisco, California – August 24, 2015)** – The Youth Law Center sent a demand today to Contra Costa County, calling for an end to the indiscriminate shackling of juveniles being transported to and from court hearings. The demand urges the county to institute individualized determinations of the need for shackling.

For more than a decade, Contra Costa County has shackled every child during transportation, irrespective of their alleged offense or personal history. Under written policy, a child who possessed a can of beer is treated the same way as someone being held for murder. There is no individualized determination whether or not the young person is a threat to public safety or poses a risk of escape.

“This is like a chain gang for children,” said Youth Law Center Staff Attorney Sue Burrell. “How can the county be so insensitive to how this impacts the young people in their care?” Youth are transported several miles from the county’s juvenile hall to the courthouse in downtown Martinez. They get out of the county van wearing leg shackles that hobble their steps, and with their hands cuffed to a waist restraint. They shuffle down and across a busy street in full view of the public, up the stairs of the courthouse, and down an open hallway to the courtroom. There, they sit in shackles until their case is called – sometimes for hours. When their case is called, their hands are released, but they must attend their court hearing in the waist and leg shackles.

The demand letter notes that shackling causes youth to lose respect for the legal system, because they know that they are being treated in a way that is so clearly unfair. It also interferes with helping youth develop the kind of positive self-image needed as a part of the rehabilitative process.

Youth Law Center Managing Director Maria Ramiu points out that youth consistently report and experts confirm the psychological and physical harms of shackling young people. “Shackling signals to youth that they are no better than wild animals that

cannot be trusted to control themselves while being escorted down the street, through a public corridor or into a courtroom. Improperly applied restraints can cause bruising or lacerations and even when properly applied can cause injuries from falls or the unnatural balancing required to navigate the environment in handcuffs, belly chains and leg irons. Youth feel like they are being treated like mass murderers and unfairly punished by the system before their cases are even adjudicated.”

Relatively few of the youth held in Contra Costa County Juvenile Hall are held for serious or violent offenses. The county reported that in 2014 only 17% of those held before adjudication were held for violent offenses, while 37% were held for status offenses, and 19.5% were held for misdemeanors. Also in 2014, nearly 25% of the youth detained pending adjudication had their cases closed or dismissed.

California regulations prohibit the indiscriminate shackling of youth in juvenile facilities and appellate case law prohibits it in court proceedings. David Shapiro, who leads the Campaign Against Indiscriminate Juvenile Shackling, observes that “the reasons youth should not be shackled in transportation are compelling. Children and adolescents shackled in transport suffer embarrassment and humiliation, in addition to the potential reactivation of childhood trauma. Shackled children are more subdued, and appear detached in court. The shackles are demeaning and harmful in transport, and often cause cuts and scarring as children must shift uncomfortably in vehicles and move slowly through public courthouses, in a sort of sick parade.” Shapiro adds that he knows of “no instances where the limitations on shackling of juveniles have endangered a courtroom or increased flight risk.” He blames the continuing use of shackles on “a juvenile justice system that is still shackled in its own way to a punitive approach, and stakeholders who resist changing the status quo.”

The demand letter notes that there is no justification for the Contra Costa County Probation Department’s ongoing refusal to screen youth to prevent indiscriminate shackling. The Department regularly makes other kinds of individualized determinations, including whether to detain youth, where to house them in juvenile hall, and what level of disposition to recommend to the court. The Youth Law Center seeks an immediate termination of the indiscriminate shackling policy

The demand letter is directed to Contra Costa County Chief Probation Officer Philip Kader. It gives Chief Kader two weeks, until September 8<sup>th</sup>, to respond before further legal steps are taken.

The Youth Law Center is a San-Francisco based nonprofit legal organization that protects the rights of children in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

<http://www.ylc.org>

The Campaign to End Indiscriminate Shackling is a project of the National Juvenile Defender Center in Washington, D.C.

<http://njdc.info/campaign-against-indiscriminate-juvenile-shackling>



200 Pine Street, Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Phone: 415.543.3379  
Fax: 415.956-9022  
www.ylc.org

August 24, 2015

Executive Director  
JENNIFER RODRIGUEZ

Senior Director  
Strategic Initiatives  
CAROLE SHAUFFER

Managing Director  
MARIA F. RAMIU

Staff Attorneys  
SUSAN L. BURRELL  
ALICE BUSSIÈRE  
DEBORAH ESCOBEDO  
JOY SINGLETON  
TYLER WHITTENBERG

Equal Justice Works Fellow  
VIRGINIA CORRIGAN  
Sponsored by:  
Baker & McKenzie & Intel

Julius Glickman Fellow  
CATHERINE McCULLOCH

Special Projects Manager  
BENJAMIN RICHEDA

QPI Coordinator  
DAVID BROWN

Administrator  
MEHRZAD KHAJENOORI

Administrative Assistant  
ROBIN BISHOP

*Via email and U.S. Postal Service*

Philip Kader, Chief Probation Officer  
Contra Costa Probation Department  
50 Douglas Drive, Suite 200  
Martinez, CA 94553

RE: Demand to Cease Indiscriminate Shackling of Youth Transported  
from Juvenile Hall

Dear Chief Kader:

We are writing to formally demand that the Contra Costa County Probation Department immediately cease its practice of indiscriminately using handcuffs, waist restraints, and shackles when transporting minors from juvenile hall, while minors are awaiting court proceedings, and during hearings. The indiscriminate shackling of youth in such situations violates young peoples' constitutional rights, is contrary to the rehabilitative purpose of the juvenile court, and violates youths' right to confidential juvenile court proceedings. If the Probation Department is not prepared to end this practice and to adjust its policies to require individualized determinations of need prior to placing a young person in shackles, we will have no choice but to pursue our available legal remedies to address this issue.

The Contra Costa Probation Department's current policy and practice is to handcuff, use a waist restraint (which affixes the youths' cuffed hands to a belt), and attach metal shackles to their legs and ankles for all young people detained in juvenile hall whenever they are transported anywhere – including to hearings occurring at the Wakefield Taylor Courthouse – unless medical conditions or public transportation disallow it. Young people transported from the juvenile hall to the Wakefield Taylor Courthouse are routinely exposed to public view while wearing handcuffs, a waist restraint, and leg shackles. To enter the courthouse, young people must cross a busy street in full public view. Once they have entered the courthouse, they are then taken to the courtroom in which their hearings are to be held. Members of the public are told to stand or sit against the wall as these young people pass by in juvenile hall uniforms and full restraints. Once in the courtroom, youth must sit in handcuffs, waist restraints, and shackles until their case is called, sometimes for a matter of hours. All court personnel, individuals involved in other cases, and witnesses can see the youth in this condition. In cases involving offenses listed under section 707(b) of the Welfare and Institutions Code, members of the public may be admitted to the courtroom as well.

Philip Kader, Chief Probation Officer  
Contra Costa Probation Department  
August 24, 2015  
Page 2 of 4

This indiscriminate shackling of young people in Contra Costa is unnecessary and irrational. Young people are placed in handcuffs, waist restraints, and leg shackles regardless of whether there is any reason to believe they are a threat to the safety of themselves or others. Young people detained in juvenile hall vary widely in their characteristics, their alleged offenses, and in the reasons for their detention. Some young people who are shackled in this way have not been adjudicated delinquent and may not have engaged in any delinquent behavior. Contra Costa County has reported that of the 841 young people who were detained pending adjudication in 2014, 208 – nearly 25% -- had their cases closed or dismissed.

Others may have been found responsible for committing relatively minor, non-violent offenses. Data reported by Contra Costa County to the state demonstrates that youth were detained for alleged offenses that included misdemeanor vandalism, petty theft, and disturbing the peace. Indeed, in 2014, Contra Costa County reported that only 17% of youth detained before adjudication were detained for violent offenses, while 37.5% of youth detained before adjudication were detained for status offenses and 19.5% were detained for alleged misdemeanors.

Still others will shortly be placed in non-secure facilities or returned to the community, where they will not be restrained in this way. The vast majority of young people who receive a wardship finding from the court will be released into the community, committed to the Orin Allen Youth Rehabilitation Facility, or placed in a non-secure foster care placement. Only a small percentage will be committed to one of the programs housed in the juvenile hall. When these young people are transported to and appear in court after such a disposition, they will not be shackled, strongly suggesting that it was unnecessary to shackle them in the first place. Simply put, there is nothing to suggest that all young people held in juvenile hall present such an elevated risk to themselves or others that indiscriminate shackling is appropriate.

Moreover, the Probation Department is capable of making individualized assessments of young people, as this is one of the Department's primary roles in providing a range of other risk assessment-based recommendations to the court, including whether the young person should be detained or released, and what level of disposition is required. Given that young people detained at juvenile hall are supervised at all times by Probation staff, ample opportunity exists to monitor behavior and assess the necessity for restraints in individual cases. The failure to do so in the face of the serious harm posed by indiscriminate shackling is a violation of youths' rights under the Constitution and under California law.

The practice of indiscriminate shackling not only create an aura of criminality wholly inappropriate to juvenile proceedings, it is also contrary to the rehabilitative purpose of the juvenile court. The purpose of juvenile delinquency proceedings is to provide care, treatment, and guidance that will permit a young person to be a law-abiding and productive member of his family and community. The primary goal of the delinquency process is rehabilitative rather than punitive. The practice of indiscriminate shackling of juveniles is contrary to that rehabilitative purpose, and indeed can impair the healthy development of a young person's identity and sense of justice.

Philip Kader, Chief Probation Officer  
Contra Costa Probation Department  
August 24, 2015  
Page 3 of 4

The process of forming a healthy personal identity and sense of moral judgment is one of the fundamental tasks of adolescence and is not complete until the early twenties. Indiscriminate shackling can interfere with this process. Appearing in front of peers, strangers, and family in shackles causes profound feelings of humiliation and shame for young people. These feelings of shame and humiliation impair positive self-development and deter constructive community participation – both of which are essential for successful rehabilitation.

Indiscriminate shackling also gives young people the impression that the adults supervising them – including the judge who is hearing their case – believe that they are dangerous criminals who are unable to control themselves. Because young people are still in the process of developing their identities, this impression can have a profoundly negative impact on their self-perception. No rehabilitative purpose is served by a practice that can lead a young person to see himself as dangerous or out of control.

Young people who are subjected to indiscriminate shackling can also lose trust in the fundamental fairness of the delinquency process. Young people who believe they are not a threat to others may experience being shackled during transportation as unfair punishment, rather than a standard policy. The sense that they are being treated unfairly, in turn, taints the court process, potentially leaving young people resistant to the rehabilitative services offered to them. Additionally, the sense of unfairness and feelings of humiliation follow children into the courtroom and interfere with their ability to communicate with counsel, pay attention to the judge, and actively participate in the case.

The practice of indiscriminate shackling can also re-traumatize juveniles who have been subjected to prior abuse or trauma and can exacerbate existing mental health conditions. Court-involved children and adolescents have experienced trauma at rates much higher than the general population. For example, a recent report by the Human Rights Project for Girls demonstrates that girls involved in the juvenile justice system have experienced abuse at alarmingly high rates, with one California study showing that 81% of girls in the system had experienced physical or sexual abuse. The use of handcuffs and shackles, especially for those who have experienced physical or sexual abuse, is likely to trigger painful memories and undermine progress made toward recovering from earlier trauma.

Shackles are likely to make children or adolescents suffering from depression feel even more worthy of punishment. And children on the autism spectrum may experience the negative effects of shackling even more severely than their peers because they are even less likely to understand the reason for being restrained and less likely to cope with the emotions caused by shackling in a healthy manner.

Philip Kader, Chief Probation Officer  
Contra Costa Probation Department  
August 24, 2015  
Page 4 of 4

The practice of indiscriminate shackling is not only harmful to young people, it also violates youths' rights to confidential juvenile proceedings. As described above, young people who are transported to their hearings at the Wakefield Taylor Courthouse are led, shackled, through the street and Courthouse in full view of the public. In contrast to individuals who await hearings in the courthouse unrestrained and in street clothes, young people in shackles are immediately identifiable as the subjects of delinquency proceedings. There is absolutely nothing to prevent members of the public from identifying shackled minors and publicizing their involvement in juvenile delinquency proceedings – precisely the outcome that the confidentiality rules governing such proceedings are intended to avoid.

Shackling all young people as they are transported to and await their hearings violates youths' constitutional rights, is contrary to California law, is incompatible with the rehabilitative purpose of the juvenile delinquency system, and is out of line with best practices for dealing with juvenile detainees. Continuing to shackle them in the courtroom until their case is called and then unshackling them in front of courtroom personnel and others not associated with their case similarly violates constitutional and California law.

Please let us know by September 8, 2015 whether you plan to cease the practice of indiscriminately shackling young people during transport from juvenile hall and to revise applicable policies and procedures accordingly. If the Probation Department will end this practice, please provide us with the specific actions, policies, and procedures that the Probation Department will implement, including a precise timeline, to ensure compliance. We are prepared to meet with you to discuss the concerns raised above and to participate in discussions as to how the practice of indiscriminately shackling minors during transport can be ended.

Sincerely,



Maria F. Ramiu, Managing Director  
Sue Burrell, Staff Attorney  
Tyler Whittenberg, Staff Attorney

cc: The Honorable Thomas M. Maddock, Supervising Judge of the Juvenile Division,  
Contra Costa Superior Court

## **K. 2**

### **COMMITTEE REPORT: POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS (30 MINUTES) HEAR REPORT AND APPROVE UPDATES TO COMMITTEE'S PLANS**

- a. Hear Presentation from Catholic Charities on "Restorative Practices for Healing Harm in the Community" – *Presenter: Aswad Aarif*
- b. Police and Community Relations Regular Meeting Updates  
*Commissioner Crystal Johnson, Commissioner Carole Johnson, Commissioner Cummings, Victoria Sawicki and Chairperson Jones*

#### *Attachment(s):*

*2.1 – Draft questions for Chief Magnus for Nov 16<sup>th</sup> Study Session*



**City of Richmond  
Human Rights and Human Relations Commission**

**Police and Community Relations Committee REPORT  
for October 26<sup>th</sup> HRHRC Regular Meeting**

*Crystal Johnson, PhD, Chair*

*Jasmine Jones, HRHRC Chair*

*Courtney Cummings, Commissioner*

*Carole Johnson, Commissioner*

*Victoria Sawicki, Committee Member*

*Jantsan Damdinsuren, Staff*

**Draft of Questions for Chief Magnus for November 16<sup>th</sup> Study Session**

1. We understand that RPD representatives meet regularly with the Neighborhood Councils in Richmond. What other regular community-specific engagement conversations/events does RPD conduct (e.g, LGBTQI, immigrant, Native American, Latino, African American)?
2. RPD and youth. What are RPD policing policies and practices on school campuses? In the community? What has RPD involvement been in the opening of the new Greenwood Academy/Leadership Public Schools campus? How do you develop the cultural sensitivity of your officers?
3. Please provide an overview of RPD's new anti-domestic violence initiative that identifies and reaches out to the highest risk victims.
4. What is the high-speed chase policy in residential neighborhoods? (Circumstances, number of vehicles, discharge of firearms, etc.)
5. The ACLU is proposing that police departments hold open public discussion prior to the adoption of any new surveillance technology. What is the RPD position on this proposal?
6. Please describe the new mental health team approach.
7. What is the communication/investigation process after an officer-involved shooting? Is there a public hearing?
8. Tucson?