

This transcript was exported on Oct 19, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

Jose Dorado:

Good evening. This is the Oakland Police Commission Meeting, regular meeting of October 14th, 2021. And we're going to dive right into a welcome to everyone and a roll call in term of our quorum. So starting with Commissioner Gage. Are you here?

Speaker 1:

Present.

Jose Dorado:

Commissioner Sergio Garcia is excused as is our Chair Regina Jackson. Commissioner Harbin Forte.

Speaker 2:

Present.

Jose Dorado:

Commissioner Jordan.

Speaker 3:

Present.

Jose Dorado:

Commissioner Milele.

Speaker 4:

Here.

Jose Dorado:

Alternate Commissioner Jesse Hsieh.

Speaker 5:

Present.

Jose Dorado:

Alternate Commissioner Marsha Peterson.

Speaker 6:

Present.

Jose Dorado:

We have a quorum. Let's move then to Open Forum. Ranya.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you so much, Vice Chair Dorado. Members of the public wishing to make a public comment on this item in public forum. Please raise your hand and I'll call on you in the order that they've appeared. I see Rashidah Grinage. Give me just one moment. I will get your timer going. All right, Ms. Grinage. I've unmuted you when you are ready.

Rashidah Grinage:

Thank you. I sent you all a message today via email about the Instagram situation with OPD, which is actually a misnomer because Instagram only revealed what lay beneath of the surface, which is far more urgent and to the point. And I have to say I was disappointed that the Commission did not give more attention to it when it was raised at the last meeting. Instead, you focused quite a bit of very intense attention on which vehicle to replace the Bearcat with.

Rashidah Grinage:

This is a matter of great urgency with respect to your function as overseers of the Police Department. I hope you read the report that was commissioned by Judge Oark which details the seriousness of the multiple behaviors of the department. And I hope that you will take the time to listen to the discussion of this at the Public Safety Committee yesterday. I sent you the link to it. That's the discussion that I would've hoped would've occurred with the commission. That is your role. That's why you were created. And instead you punted and left it to the Public Safety Committee of the City Council to pursue. I'm very disappointed. And I think others are as well. And I hope that you'll rectify the situation by asking some very detailed questions of the Chief when he appears. Thank you very much.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms. Grinage. Ms Maria Arroyo, When you are ready, I think I have unmuted you. [inaudible 00:05:34] Ms Arroyo, can you hear us? Ms Arroyo, I'm afraid I can't hear you. I don't know if you're trying to talk to us. I'll skip you for just a second. Please keep trying. I'm going to call the phone number ending in 5802, so the number ending in 5802, please unmute when you are ready and I will start your timer.

Selene Bay:

Yes. Good evening. Celine Bay, 100 black men of the Bay Area. Every day more racist evidence comes out about the current OPD and yet there's no movement by this OPC to do anything about it to address it or even to hold the current OPD leadership accountable. Right now I'm speaking directly to the new members of the OPC. The Roth Investigation was paid for by this OPC to investigate Bay cases and complaints from 2004. And to answer one question, is there enough evidence to reopen and investigate these cases? These cases involve multiple black community murders connected to OPD misconduct. This includes Chauncey Baileys assassinated to stop his investigation of OPD's role in these shooting deaths.

Selene Bay:

The Independent Investigation was given enough evidence to prove this beyond a shadow of a doubt. The answer has been given to the OPC and it is yes, this answer is being suppressed by the current OPC leadership. Yes, there is systemic racism and racial and religious profile currently in OPD. And the Alden led CPRA is part of the coverup. The new commissioners will see that corrupt commissioners will fight against investigating these cases, but why?

Selene Bay:

Because it helps them politically to hide the truth about these murders. How long will you cover up the Roth Investigation by Mo balling it in a closet while you meet about non-controversial things and actually do nothing using the power of the people granted you or release the 2021 Instagram investigation. Yet our 2014 based case is still under seal. And the current OPC leadership is lying to the public that it needs to remain sealed. Racial profiling is the main reason for the creation of the OPC. Yet there is no effort to address it when evidence is presented to this body, I'm speaking directly to the new commissioners that if you do represent the community, please look at the evidence honestly, and not politically. Thank you.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Mr Bay. I'm going to go to phone number ending in 0185. Phone number ending in 0185, I'm unmuting you. Please unmute yourself and talk when you're ready.

Mary Vale:

This is Michelle Lasonia spokes in front of Van De Valde family in regards to the negotiated Settlement Agreement. OPD still remains out of compliance with five tasks. Two of the tasks are completing internal affairs investigations within a required timeframe and internal affairs complaint procedures. Jonathan Van de Velde's father made his formal complaint on September 17th, 2019. He received one telephone call from the intake officer and one follow-up email, and then 298 days passed by with absolutely no communication from OPD. It wasn't until I emailed the new Internal Affairs Deputy Chief that we received the case closure letter. The letter was dated July 10th, 2020, but the Van De Velde family didn't receive their copy until 15 months after it was complete. Why didn't they receive it? OPD's old policy stated recommendations for time limits, completion of eternal affairs investigation should occur as rapidly as is reasonably necessary at least within 180 days. Informal Complaint Resolution Distribution said they would forward copies of the approved informal complaint resolution to the subject matter employee and to the complainant in person or via mail.

Mary Vale:

The new draft policy that you came up with that was adopted August 2021 says that the IA intake specialist is responsible for this duty, and it says that he or she saw draft the closeout letter, type it and forward it to the complainant, but it doesn't specifically say how. And I'm suggesting that you update it and change it that already in communication to the complainants regarding any internal affairs complaints are via certified mail. That way everything is tracked and date stamped. When there is an issue where there's a returned mail back to OPD and internal affairs employee needs to tell on the complainant and verify the address in order to ensure he or she receives the important correspondence in a timely manner. This is not acceptable, and if this family didn't stay committed to updating the missing person's policy and everything that goes along with it. They would've simply never known that the case closure had even happened, that is despicable and not acceptable. And I'm asking you to update the policy and add something that's specific to how the correspondence is sent from OPD to complainant.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms Lasonia. I'm so sorry to have to cut you off, but your time is over. I'm going to restart the clock, Ms maria Arroyo I see you. Let's try this again. I've unmuted you. Try speaking and I'll start your time. I'm sorry, Ms Arroyo. I still can't hear you. So we'll try and get you back on. I wonder if you can dial

in using your phone. Vice Chair Dorado. That was it for public comment. I will make sure that we elevate Ms. Arroyo just as soon as she's able to come back, it's back to you.

Jose Dorado:

Thank you, Ranya. Let's move on to Item three on our agenda update from Chief Armstrong. Chief.

LeRonne Armstrong:

Good evening.

Jose Dorado:

Good evening.

LeRonne Armstrong:

Commissioners. Chair Dorado. Today I'll be presenting some information and updates from the Oakland Police Department. First, I want to say sadly, I won't spend a lot of time on crime, but I will speak too. We currently have 110 homicides citywide that has been nearly a 40% increase as well as over 450 shootings. That is also a 40% increase. We continue to see our robbers trending up significantly with the 14% increase. We've had nearly 2000 robberies so far this year, although overall crime has down out 5%. The reduction really comes from property crime, including residential burglaries. Really was pulling down the numbers. Our violent crime percentage is that we are up 11% with the month that coming off a very difficult month. The month of September was the most violent month we've had all year was 17 homicides in the month of September. We continue to try to address group and gang violence, still utilizing our cease-fire strategy.

LeRonne Armstrong:

We have a call-in coming up in November, which will call in again individuals involved in violence. We currently have recovered nearly over 900 firearms this year. We continue to trend similarly to the numbers that we have last year. So continue to see a proliferation of guns in the community we have been working with not only the ATF, but we also have been pushing forward with legislative changes in Sacramento. Also, the City Council has decided to support the Ghost Gun Legislation that has been approved in the city of San Francisco. So we look forward to additional legislation that will help to outlaw the goliveration of those guns, which has had a pretty significant impact in our community.

LeRonne Armstrong:

Our current homicide closure rate is as around 42%. So we have had some success closing some homicide investigations. We continue to follow up on cases and continue to communicate to the public our need for more information, to help us solve our homicides. Our main focus in addressing violent crime has been focused enforcement efforts, as well as seeking the help of community members to be more involved in helping solve these homicides, and most importantly prevent these homicides from occurring. So we really have begun to look more towards a preventative approach as well, to see if we can identify those involved in the homicides and try to address it from not completely reliant on the enforcement, but trying to get in front of it through prevention. And that comes from working closely with the Department of Violence Prevention and their violence interrupters, utilizing our protocol of calling them out to homicide and shooting scenes to begin to provide violence intervention directly on the scene.

LeRonne Armstrong:

So we will continue to use that as well as appealing to the community and strengthening our relationships with the families of homicide victims we've been working closely to provide victim support to those families as well making sure that we continue to highlight those that have been victims of homicide to ensure that they know that those cases are continuing to be investigated.

LeRonne Armstrong:

Bridget Cook is our violent crimes liaison. She is providing family support for those victims of violence and helping them secure resources when a tragic incident does occur. One of the things that you'll see in the packet today is three of our press releases for missing persons. I do want to compliment the Police Commission and community members that have been helping the department improve its missing process by the better utilization of social media, more quickly pushing out information via social media, to our community that asks for assistance and located individuals. I think that is something that really was born out of police, commissioning communities recommendations.

LeRonne Armstrong:

So the three missing persons flyers that is included in tonight's agenda packet, all three of those missing persons were actually found and due to the quick release of this information to the public, as well as to use social media. They were found within one to two days. So quickly utilizing social media has been effective and we continue to participate in the missing person ad hoc committee in order to continue to improve our policies.

LeRonne Armstrong:

A couple of upcoming ad hoc policies that we look forward to is the social media ad hoc. We spoke with chair Jackson, we'll be starting at next month to begin to create the Department's first social media OPD specific social media policy, which will govern all use of social media within the Oakland Police Department. And we do have a series of policies that have come out of the Instagram investigation based on the recommendations that came out of that investigation. We are moving forward on a new policy that governs the use of internal cell phone and digital devices. So whether that be cell phones, computers, or any devices that the department issues to its members, they will now be governed by policy or no allowance for personal social media or inappropriate social media use, so that policy will be coming out of November.

LeRonne Armstrong:

We also will be bringing force additional training internally. We are now seeking to bring in professional trainers to address sexual harassment in the workplace. We're going to have training and for all members of the organization. We'll be modeling the city's AI 71 racial discrimination policy in creating the internal policy specific for OPD employees. That updated policy is currently happening as well. I personally will be meeting with all commanders as well as sergeants in group meetings to talk about the social media investigation and the recommendations out of that investigation, as well as expected behavior for those that are members of the Oakland Police Department moving forward, reinforcing our values and our zero tolerance for any races or sexist or homophobic behavior or images or any social media comments.

LeRonne Armstrong:

So we'll have those discussions both internally with every member of our supervisory and command staff, as well as pushing it down to our officers. So we are taking a recommendation seriously; we are taking investigations seriously, and we are following all those recommendations and implement them immediately. So we do take it seriously. It was a serious investigation and we had continued to meet with police commissions body on white supremacy as well, led by Commissioner Dorado. So we have continued to stay abreast of the issues related to social media case, and we will continue with that.

LeRonne Armstrong:

I will submit our current staffing levels now. We are now at 684 officers. We have had over 50, both resignations and retirements over the last six months. So we are at the lowest numbers that we've had in nearly 10 years. So we are trying to increase our recruitment. We're trying to also work on and retention within the department, coming up with new strategies to help keep the officers that we have trying to improve our work environment by making some modifications to our health and wellness unit. We are preparing to do some listing sessions and some focus group sessions to hear about officers and members of the organization's concerns to see if there're things that we can do to improve the department.

LeRonne Armstrong:

So that is something that we are working diligently on, I think is important that we maintain our current staff and see what is the drivers of people's Exodus from the department? We have instituted mandatory exit interviews, those exit interviews prior to anybody leaving the department. They have to participate in the exit interview where we solicited a series of questions to better understand what was with the underlying reason for their departure.

LeRonne Armstrong:

So we are producing those quarterly staffing reports at public safety in that. The data that comes out of the exit interviews is included in that as well. Our next academy will start in early November. We currently have already over 32 people in that academy, we have about a month left to continue to add additional officers into that training officers into that academy. We hope to get that to a minimum 36, but we will continue to work towards that. So the staffing issues are concerned, but there are things that we are working through to help improve that. And with that, I'll submit my report.

Jose Dorado:

Thank you, Chief. Questions from commissioners, commissioner Milele, you're muted.

Speaker 4:

Thank you. I have two questions for you, chief. Could you say more about your retention strategies and also, can you give us a preview of some of the trends you're seeing in those exit interviews?

LeRonne Armstrong:

Yes. So our retention strategy started with a meeting with our command staff and essentially meeting with our bureau chiefs in particular, who are the first to be notified that an officer is preparing to resign from the organization. And what we're doing is mandated that command staff conduct meetings with their staff to begin to better understand what concerns they have regarding the organization, and then be able to provide a written response as to address that officer's concerns to see if there is an

opportunity to deal with whatever issues they may have challenges with. And to actually clear up what I see sometimes as misunderstandings or maybe things that people might believe are different at other organizations. I think there's a call across the country for all departments to reform in some way. I think sometimes officers believe that it's just Oakland, but really all departments are hearing the call for reform. So you know, as organization, we are first making sure that our command staff is doing that.

LeRonne Armstrong:

We also have taken on the couple of the critical things that have come up in the exit interviews. First, we have been hearing about internal morale. So we have a focus group focused on how we can improve internal morale. We also have heard from our staff that we have been focused so much on, and this is just from what we're getting from our staff is that it seems like we've been so focused on recruiting officers that we haven't spent enough time trying to retain our officers. And they would like to see the department do something intentionally to make sure that for those that are remaining with the department, that we show them some level of appreciation or at least give them a voice as about the internal changes that are occurring. So we have a focus group to sort of hear directly from our officers about things within the organization that they think could be changes that could be made to help improve their work environment. So there's a focus group around that as well.

LeRonne Armstrong:

There's also a focus group that we've created around leadership and development. So one of the things we also heard is to ask for more leadership and development training for those that are interested in moving up within the organization and better understanding what that path looks like for them to move up within the organization. And then the last focus group is centers around the current issues that we are facing within the Oakland Police Department. That includes compliance; that includes discipline; that includes all of the administrative tasks that they're being asked the focus group to really help us understand a better way that we're able to communicate all of these things within the organization. So meaning is it appropriate for us to do a weekly newsletter on some of the ideas that they've come up with? Is it appropriate for us to push out more internal information regarding our compliance efforts, but trying to figure out what are some of the ways in which we can provide more information to our staff about current pressing issues that the department is trying to manage?

LeRonne Armstrong:

So we have focus groups for each one. They'll be meeting with officers throughout the department and they have been tasked with drafting a strategy that we could implement to help resolve some of these issues.

Speaker 4:

Do you feel like reform is one of the major factors?

LeRonne Armstrong:

No, I don't feel like it's a major factor. I think reform is such a broad statement. What does that mean? You know, I mean I think the focus groups I hope will help us better understand what portion of reform, what does that mean? Does that mean policy change? Does that mean level of discipline? Does that mean what administrative workload that we're asking officers to do? We just want to better understand what portion of reform, what does that mean? I think sometimes people equivalent reform with discipline and that doesn't always mean that it could mean I think a variety of things.

Speaker 4:

My last question, I promise, is there any sort of internal practices that you've flagged that might be decreasing morale?

LeRonne Armstrong:

I think better explanation about the discipline matrix and how we arrive at discipline. I think a better understanding of how our investigations and CPRA's investigations and discipline recommendations actually work. And so I think there's an education component when it comes to measure LL and S1 that we probably need to take on within the department so that every member of the department sort of understands both internal affairs role versus CPRA's role and how these are independent investigations and independent discipline recommendations.

LeRonne Armstrong:

But how the process works in terms of if there's not concurrence and what happens then, and sort of how do we come up with a recommendation versus CPRA and let officers know that we're both using the same discipline matrix. And so I think process wise, I think we can do a better job of explaining to people how we derive at a discipline number if you would, what the level of discipline that is administered. How did we get there? And how can we make sure that they believe that discipline is fair and equitable? So I think that's something that we need to work on internally more. Make the process a little more transparent so that people at least they may not agree with the discipline and that's okay but at least they understand how we derive to that discipline and they understand that the process is fair and equitable.

Speaker 4:

Thank you.

Jose Dorado:

Any more questions? Thank you. Commissioner Milele. Any other questions from commissioners for the Chief? Okay. If there are none, let's then move to public comment. Ranya.

Rania Adwan:

Forgot to unmute myself. Thank you for that. Members of the public wishing to make public comment on this particular item, please raise your hand and I'll call on you in the order that you have appeared. Vice Chair, I see four hands. Let's get started. Give me just a second. G, I'll be starting with you. Give me just a minute and I will set your timer. All right. G, I muted my end. Please try and talk and I'll get you going. Nope, no luck I'm afraid. G, please keep trying. I'm going to move on to Rachel Beck. Ms Becky When you are ready, please unmute.

Speaker 7:

Hi, my name is Rachel Beck. I'm a District One resident, and I have two questions for the Chief through the Chair. First at public safety, Tuesday, October 12th, AC Allison when asked about the timeline for OPD's internal investigation of the crime reduction team. Instagram page said he didn't want to get into who knew what when and quote, "I very much do want to get into that. If leadership was informed about the page by Intel in September as the investigation report indicates and took no action until December when it became clear that an embarrassing news story was about to break that merits some

explanation, especially since a large part of the page was about the page's administer contempt for reforms that you all purport to care about. I would like to know who knew what, and when? I would also be interested in comment from the Chief on the mercury news story that broke yesterday, October 13th, about collaboration between police leadership in Richmond, Oakland, and Vallejo to apparently help the Richmond Chief settle a personal score with the family member in Vallejo. Thank you. "

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms. Beck and Jens. When you are ready, please unmute. And can you hear me? Ooh, something's in the stars today. Okay. We'll come back to you, Ms. Resa, when you are ready, I've unmuted you, please go ahead.

Speaker 8:

Hi. Yes, thank you. This is Resa Jaffy. I would like to second the questions asked by Rachel Beck. I keep hearing about the social media policy, but very concerned that will just create people being just better at hiding. I would like to know what specific questions are going to be asked and screening police officers who are currently on the force and who are going to be hired going forward to make sure that we don't have racists on the police force and people who are misogynist. We have to get them out and a social media policy will not do that. Thank you.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms Resa. Up next, Miss Asata Alicbona. I've unmuted you when you are ready.

Assata Olugbala:

Don't answer any questions about Richmond and that wasn't a family member, that was her child, her daughter. Leave it alone. Last night at the School Board Meeting Police Chief Armstrong, the OK program, which is the men toring program with the community and the police for mentoring of African American male boys was voted down. And so I'm hoping that there must be some type of misunderstanding within the thinking of the board members around just having police officers in this.

PART 1 OF 6 ENDS [00:34:04]

Assata Olugbala:

... the board members, around just having police officers in the school, that we can get to some of them, and perhaps get that program back in the schools, to work with our African-Americans, boys, around leadership and academics, and this program has been in place for a long time, but it appeared that they probably didn't have correct information when they voted not to renew the program for another year. So I hope you'll do some follow-up as you see fit, because any outreach to our African-American males, I really appreciate, and we do need to continue to try to build relationships with our police officers in the community. That's my only concern. Thank you.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Miss Olugbala. Next up, Jennifer Findlay, I've unmuted you my end.

Jennifer Findlay:

Hi. This is Jennifer Findlay. I'm calling primarily about... to follow up on the Instagram account situation, and I'm going to echo what Rashidah Grinage did at the beginning of the meeting, about being very disappointed at how little detail the commission has gone into, and like [Risa 00:35:25] just said, in September, if you look at the report, in September, every sworn member of OPD staff, including all of intel, was made aware of this account, and still, they investigated it for risk to the officers and dismissed it beyond that, when it was discussed at Public Safety on Tuesday.

Jennifer Findlay:

There was no mention, even, of the anti-reform and insubordinate content, along with racism and sexism, and it was as if that wasn't worth addressing, and it clearly very much is, especially when we're talking about retaining staff, when we're talking about recruiting people. The report asked, "How does one account for the gaping blind spot, especially in the face of recent efforts by OPD to acknowledge implicit bias in policing, and train officers to address it?" I would like an answer to that. I would like to know what changes are going to be made, because the report attachments today list a tech policy, social media policy, new limits on phones and computers, and a zero tolerance memo, basic harassment training.

Jennifer Findlay:

Quoted from the report, "Changing these attitudes will require more than lip service to principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion. The department must implement and enforce policies that one, put officers on clear notice that any engagement with hateful, subversive messaging may be grounds for discipline, and erect a framework for identifying, evaluating, and responding. Tasks must be undertaken immediately, and owned by department leadership, including the chief of police." How has Chief Armstrong witnessed this and addressed the culture of insubordination and anti-reform at the department?

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Miss Findlay. Sorry to cut you off. Your time is up. Up next, phone number ending in 5802. I've unmuted you my end. If you can unmute your end, I will start your timer. 5802.

Selene Bay:

Yes, good evening. Selene Bay, 100 black men of the Bay Area. The OPC has been feckless on the Instagram and the racist and religious profiling evidence in the Ross independent investigation. We also want to say if you bring in new officers/academy into a current toxic OPD work environment, you will make more racist and sexist officers. Historic OPD leadership sets the racist tone, and OPD leadership fails, year in and year out, going back to before the Panthers. The racist environment that Chief Armstrong was promoted in, and never complained after being promoted.

Selene Bay:

The chief is also criminally ignoring that my brother, [Wajid 00:38:11] Bay's case files were stolen by an ex-OPD officer, [Brock 00:38:15] for over 10 years, and OPD to this date has never done an investigation. If you have a racist zero tolerance, why do we not hear about racist and sexist issues within OPD coming out and resulting in firing or discipline? Why isn't OPD chief talking about the racist and religious profiling found in the Ross report? Oakland is not unique. Violence and murder is up across the nation, and OPD has failed year in and year out in the black community. The community has continued to request that the chief and OPD provide data regarding crimes in communities by victims of crimes by

race. This will show that OPD's misuse of resources, that are not being used to reduce crime in the heaviest hit black communities, are being used elsewhere, and violence increases are being blamed on the fact that they don't have enough officers. OPD's not using the officers that they have correctly.

Selene Bay:

I don't see this OPC as concerned about stopping racial profiling, which is codified in Measure LL as the core reason for the creation of this OPC. OPD can't come into compliance with the 2003 NSA in 2021, and yet here we are, still finding out OPD is currently racially and religiously profiling in Oakland. That's a failure on the OPC to not be making this a-

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Mr. Bay. I'm sorry to have to cut you off. Your time is up. I'm starting the timer again, and I'm going to take caller, phone number ending in 1779. I've asked to unmute. When you're ready, please unmute yourself, and you can start.

Mary Vale:

Yes, this is Mary Vale, and I submitted on the Instagram matter, advanced email testimony, which I hope staff distributed for the commissioners. I would second all of the comments made. I just am stunned, but sadly not surprised. When you have the OPD had its 2015-16 rape scandal, and there was a cover-up, and no one was ever able to, including I guess the federal court, sort out who orchestrated the cover-up. Now we have this situation, where we have a passive cover-up, looking away from the situation, mischaracterizing it, doing nothing when an informed second- or third-grader could see these statements were racist, anti-reform, misogynistic.

Mary Vale:

You know, you don't need a written social media policy, and an attack on what the chief says is the department's values, in terms of nondiscrimination, and engagement with the community, and honesty, and equity. You know, we have a race and equity department. You have these posts that were against that, and then you had more seriously, and it looks like they're going to get off the hook again, unless the commission does its job, because we only learned these facts when the new report came out. They did nothing, you know? They wanted it to go away. If the reporters hadn't found it, it would have... We never would have known. And then, well, we have to do something. They make up this fairy tale about it was sponsored by community members who were anti-police. I mean, give me a break. You know, a year ago, during the-

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Miss Vale. Sorry to have to cut you off. Your time is up. Anne Janks, let's try again. I have unmuted my end. See if you can do it yours.

Anne Janks:

Yay!

Rania Adwan:

Well done. When you're ready.

Anne Janks:

Thank you. To Chief Armstrong, I really think you want to stay away from phrases like, "Zero tolerance." This entire matter demonstrates a tremendous amount of tolerance for misogyny, racism, and thumbing your nose at every policy and procedure that exists within the OPD. I'm a little concerned that your solution to this is training, given that the officers who are apparently still in the department talked about training very casually, made it very, very clear that they don't take it seriously. They talked about clicking through training in 10 minutes, which you can do kind of mentally if you're forced to sit in a room as well.

Anne Janks:

I want to see anybody who saw this and failed to report it disciplined. I don't just want to know who they are. I actually don't want to know who they are, because I'm not allowed to know who gets disciplined. I'm a little concerned about the exit interviews, because I don't really want you to change any policies based on officers who are bad officers who are leaving, so I'm wondering if the exit interviews include some evaluation if it's a person you want to keep before deciding to take seriously why they're leaving.

Anne Janks:

I have asked previously, twice, and I twice have been told I was going to get an answer, what the instructions or policies are for officers when they're making statements that are clearly political, about what council members have and have not done, and I would also like to know what the process is going to be for the community to be able to engage in the social media policy, although I agree that this is not at the heart of what's going on. Thank you very much.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Miss Janks. We're going to try G one more time. G, when you're ready, I see that it seems like you're using an older version of Zoom. You might need to upgrade your zoom. I've certainly unmuted you my end. No luck, I'm afraid. We can't hear you unfortunately, so please try using another device and come on back in. Vice Chair Dorado, it's back to you, and I see Commissioner Hsieh has his hand up. Thank you.

Jose Dorado:

Okay, thank you Rania. Chief, there was a whole list of questions. I don't know any of them that you want, that you can address. Certainly, you can't address any personnel matters, but any of those that you feel that you can comment on, I would urge you to do so.

LeRonne Armstrong:

Okay. Like you said, I can't speak to any discipline matters, and I think that's why some of the questions that have been asked, I am unable to answer. I will say, from information that we have released publicly, that as a result of the investigation, nine individuals were sustained, two of which are no longer with the department. They already have left for other law enforcement agencies. We have reached out to those law enforcement agencies to advise them of our investigation. We have administered discipline as a result of this investigation, as some fairly significant discipline has been administered to those that were found to be sustained for findings, so you know, that was an independent investigation that was also done by CPRA as well.

LeRonne Armstrong:

There was concurrence on the investigation, and concurrence on those nine sustained individuals. And there was concurrence on discipline as well. The discipline matrix was used as the guiding decider of discipline, and we followed the entire process. As far as insubordination, insubordination is a violation of department policy and is thoroughly investigated, and if found that the person engaged in that behavior, they would be sustained and face significant discipline, up to termination.

LeRonne Armstrong:

Second question is I can't speak to the Richmond investigation in particular, because that is not an Oakland-related investigation. I think from the Oakland standpoint, all I can say is we've released our press release that indicates that the department was notified about an investigation in Vallejo. We did follow department policy and opened our own internal investigation into the matter. That's about as much as I can speak to related to the Richmond investigation.

LeRonne Armstrong:

Screening of officers. In particular, our screening process I think is really important. Do you think that it's important that you look closely at those that you hire? A couple things that I've done since taking over as chief is, within the process, I have issued and created a mandated form that any candidate for police officer has to follow a zero-tolerance form and submit to the fact that they have no relationships or connection to any white supremacist or any extremist groups, or any sexist or homophobic groups, have not participated in any of that behavior, and we also do a social media scrub of the particular candidate's social media platforms, where they have to divulge those platforms, and we do scrub those to look to see if there's any history or any information that would be in violation of that policy.

LeRonne Armstrong:

We do that, as well as one of the other areas that I've created is that we now have a chief's interview, so every candidate, the final stage in the hiring process is that they actually have to meet, the candidate has to meet with one of the chiefs, either me personally or one of our deputy chiefs or assistant chiefs meet with the candidate, and we speak to the candidate about the OPD values, and we make sure that their values are aligned with the department's values before hiring, and we do that through asking a series of questions. If they do not fit our values, they will not be selected to be a part of our organization, and there has been candidates that have made it all the way to the chief's interview and have not been selected.

LeRonne Armstrong:

Then lastly, at the OK Program, the question that was asked, the department is a full supporter of the OK Program and the mentorship program that is provided to African-American boys in the city of Oakland. We have been providing officers to work in the program, that are working in the district and mentoring young people, so we as the Oakland Police Department continues to be a strong supporter of the OK Program, and it will continue. And I will submit, my responses with that [inaudible 00:49:34]

Jose Dorado:

Thank you, Chief. Commissioner Hsieh.

Jesse Hsieh:

Thank you, Vice Chair. Through the chair, Chief, just a couple of thoughts. I'm not going to blow you up on this, but I think in hearing the community concerns tonight, it's clear that this social media policy that we're going to be working on is just a medium. It's not the actual issue. An anti-discrimination policy, that's going to be the baseline, but certainly is not going to be what changes things in the department. I think what everyone is saying here is that they're disappointed that that culture change hasn't happened, and they want it to.

Jesse Hsieh:

I suppose what thoughts this brings to mind is, and I don't know if you can answer this tonight or you can maybe bring your thoughts back to us in two weeks, we need to know what strategies you and the department are taking to address implicit bias, to pave the way for reporting of issues like what underscored this particular controversy, and to actually have command staff recognize when there is a problem and to take it seriously. I think all these things are what the community wants. It's what we want, and I think we need some answers about how you're going to do that, outside of internal and external anti-discrimination policies, which really do nothing but set a baseline.

Jesse Hsieh:

On that particular note, I would also say that, you know, it'd be really great if we could see those internal policy documents, or those documents, so that we know what you're working with, and so that we can have input on it. Those are the thoughts that I have. Thank you.

Jose Dorado:

Thank you, Commissioner Hsieh. Any other questions for the chief, from commissioners? If not, we're going to go ahead and move on. Thank you, Chief. Appreciate your time and your report, and we're going to move on to item four, review of ad-hoc committees and standing committees.

John Alden:

Good evening, commissioners. I think that's a call to me to start, Vice Chair?

Jose Dorado:

Yes, it is.

John Alden:

Thank you, sir. Commissioners, you had asked at a previous meeting if we at CPRA and your staff, Miss Adwan could bring to you a report describing the resources that are currently available for standing committees and ad-hocs, and some idea of costing, or how much of those staff resources are required for those kinds of committees, so that you could better consider how you want to move forward with standing committees and ad-hoc committees, and how you might want to use them. For example, how many standing committees you might want to have, and what sort of structure you might have for ad-hoc committees, recognizing that we've tried lots of different structures for different ad-hocs so far over time.

John Alden:

The first thing I want to note to you is as we considered how to present this material to you, it became clear that the financial costs of some of these models and the staff time costs really have very little to do

with each other. There's very, very little overlap between those two, and we're still getting some information from Department of Finance about carry-forwards from last year, meaning money left over from last year's budget, so it might take a little bit of time for us to really have a thoughtful product for you about financial costs.

John Alden:

But it also became clear to us that staff time was really the bigger factor. This is the bigger limiting factor. Frankly, despite our best efforts at the staff level, I think the level of demand that we have for both standing and ad-hoc committees significantly exceeds staff time, so we need to figure out, collectively, how to prioritize staff time for such committees, whether they're standing or ad-hocs, with the understanding that there just isn't enough time to do everything that we want at the same time.

John Alden:

One of the things that's particularly awkward about this is that when S1, Measure S1 was going on, about last year, this commission had advocated for staff to the commission, to report to the commission, to be accountable to the commission, to be directed by the commission, so that you, the commission, could inform staff, your own staff directly, how you wanted to divide up this time. That was not the measure that we got. Measure S1, as it was put on the ballot and approved by the voters, has the one staffer that you currently have, your chief of staff, reporting to the CPRA executive director.

John Alden:

Now, I know, for those of us who were here at the time last year, that wasn't the model that we were seeking, but that is the model that we have, and I think as a first step, it's important to recognize that that's the model we have. That is a little uncomfortable for me, because naturally, you have a chief of staff. All of you, the commissioners, have things that you might need from the chief of staff. I find it is suboptimal for me to be telling your chief of staff how to prioritize those particular requests from each of you, and from each of the ad-hocs. Honestly, that's a model that doesn't make a lot of sense to me, but it is the model we have, so I'm trying to be thoughtful about bringing this issue to you early, so that you and I collectively can come up with a set of priorities to convey to your staff, and then hold them accountable to, whether that's Miss Adwan, someone else who's in that position in the future, or any other staff who we might add on in addition to your current chief of staff position.

John Alden:

Part of the purpose of tonight's conversation is that I really need some direction from you as a group, not individually but as a group, about what your top priorities are for use of committees, because we simply can't staff all of the priorities that we've gotten from each of you individually. I think there are some guiding principles we can see there, and I'm going to make three points to you about that, but that's really the conversation that I think we're going to have tonight. We have an agenda in front of you for the rest of the evening, that is relatively light compared to most of your meetings, and one of the reasons for that is we wanted to ensure that we have robust time, ample time for all of you to ask questions, have conversation, and reach some understandings as a group about how to move forward here. And I hope you'll take advantage of that time.

John Alden:

Three main points I'd like to make sure that I emphasize from this memo that you already have in front of you. First, given that there is not enough time to do all of the staff work for all of the committees that

you have, we would recommend that you think carefully about which committees you see as the highest priority right now, with the understanding that other committees that we might not be staffing right now could be staffed at some point in the future, when some of the committees that you have working on right now naturally wind down because the projects they're working on finish.

John Alden:

For example, the inspector general hiring ad-hoc will eventually be done, and probably in the near future. Some of the policy revision ad-hocs that we're working on will eventually arrive at a final policy product and be able to pass that on, and then they'll be able to wind down. So, I think part of the question here is not which projects do we do, but when do we do them? Some of these ad-hocs, we might not be able to staff for six months or eight months, but we will be able to eventually, so putting these in some kind of an order of operations, I think would be useful.

John Alden:

In that regard, our overall perspective is first that standing committees require more resources than do ad-hocs. To the extent that standing committees have some Brown Act requirements that allow for more public participation and more transparency, you could imitate those in an ad-hoc any time you might want, or not if you have an ad-hoc that's not particularly suited to that purpose. So there's much more flexibility with ad-hocs, and the amount of staff time required can be tailored according to the needs of that ad-hoc.

John Alden:

Standing committees are much more staff time intensive, regardless of the subject matter of the standing committee. So as a general rule, it was our observation that this commission could complete much more work more quickly if it uses ad-hocs, and frankly avoids using standing committees. Now, that is ultimately a decision for this commission, and if the commission does have reasons why it prefers standing committees, we will absolutely do our very best to staff those, but I do want to make sure I've clearly conveyed that they are simply more resource intensive, particularly because of the Brown Act requirements, and it's harder for us to get room space for them. I think that's the reason why I would urge you to think carefully out whether any particular topic really requires a standing committee, or simply requires an ad-hoc that has a great deal of public transparency.

John Alden:

The second point I wanted to make is that this is an opportunity for you to ask for staff. There is no question in our minds, between Miss Adwan and myself, that the amount of work that we've detailed in the memo you have in front of you tonight shows that here, just two months into taking onto this job, Miss Adwan's plate is totally full, with the four ad-hocs she's doing now, this commission, and the other support work that she does for the police commission.

John Alden:

That said, you know, your chief of staff position is a very high-level classification, which allows you to hire people with a great deal of skill, and ability, and experience, who can provide you with solid strategic and tactical advice about how to marshal your resources best. It would be cost effective if you were going to add more staff, to bring in someone who is support staff to your chief of staff, to take some of the more routine tasks off the chief of staff's plate, and better position the chief of staff to really use the skills that you were looking for when you created this position.

John Alden:

An office assistant, for example, is a classification that exists here in the city of Oakland. If we were to ask in the budget requests for this next coming fiscal year, starting next summer, for an office assistant to assist the chief of staff, that would really expand the number of ad-hocs that we could have your chief of staff working on. So I hope that you will think, in the course of this conversation, about asking for more staff. That is, of course, ultimately dependent on the city's finances, and the very difficult choices that the city council has to make about priorities here in the city of Oakland, where our needs almost always outstrip our resources. But that said, I think this is a good time for you to have that conversation yourselves, and provide some direction to staff about what kind of additional staff you'd like us to ask for in the budget process. That budget process starts getting going just in the next two months, so this is a particularly good time to do that.

John Alden:

The third and final thing that I would suggest is that as you're considering priorities among these committees, there are many ways that you might choose to prioritize them. I would suggest you at least consider whether you might prioritize them according to whether they're helping you accomplish one of your charter-mandated tasks. And I mention that because periodically, according to measure S1, this commission is supposed to be audited by an outside auditor, as to whether it's complying with the charter, and I think it would be effective, it would be positive in the eyes of an auditor, and frankly, it would be compliant with the wishes of the voters, who approved measure S1, if we were prioritizing those tasks that are directly related to a charter mandate.

John Alden:

For example, the work of hiring the inspector general is a charter-mandated duty of this commission. I think it was wise that the commission chose to invest resources in an ad-hoc committee on that topic, because that is one of your core duties. No one else can do it. It must be done here, and it's urgently needed. I hope that you'll use a similar thought process as you consider what other ad-hocs you might want to prioritize. Now, there may be a wide variety of other priorities as well, so I don't mean to be negative about any of those other priorities, but from a staff perspective, I would say that's clearly one that should be at the front of the queue, we think. And as you consider other priorities to include as well, we hope you'll keep that one in the list.

John Alden:

That said, I think those are the three main points that I'd make to you about what we've presented. I do think that the lesson we've learned so far is that the four ad-hocs described in the memo are about as many as we can staff right now, and I would be interested in hearing what the commissioners think about the questions we've raised, particularly which ad-hocs to prioritize right now, which ones to perhaps put off to a slightly later date, and which ones should be standing as opposed to ad-hoc committees. I'd be happy to answer questions. I'm sure there must be a lot, because I've laid out a lot of material to you, and I appreciate your patience with this fairly complicated presentation about an otherwise kind of mundane question about figuring out staff resources.

Jose Dorado:

Thank you, Director Alden. Questions from commissioners? Commissioner Gage and then Commissioner Peterson.

Henry Gage III:

Thank you. Excuse me. Thank you, Vice Chair. Director, can you give a sense of a number for us? I can certainly appreciate that staff time is limited. I'm trying to get a sense of how many committees the commission can run effectively at any given period of time.

John Alden:

Sure. I can tell you that our experience to date has been that the four ad-hocs that are underway right now, with staff support, are as many ad-hocs as we think we can run with staff support. Right now, that's the inspector general hiring ad-hoc, the community policing policy review ad-hoc, the missing persons policy review ad-hoc, and the chief of police performance goals ad-hoc. These are all very different ad-hocs, and you know, the chief of police performance goals ad-hoc, for example, does have some personnel-related issues involved in the nature of that ad-hoc, so not all of those meetings are going to be public. The missing persons policy review ad-hoc, on the other hand, has been very public, right? And has had many sessions with robust public participation, in my opinion.

John Alden:

So, the nature of the work has varied from one ad-hoc to another, but those four are about as many as we could staff. If we were to start providing staff support for another committee, whether ad-hoc or standing, we really would need one of these ad-hocs I just mentioned to complete its work first. I expect that's probably going to be the inspector general hiring ad-hoc. If we were to do standing committees, then the number we could support would probably go down. If we had regular meetings of standing committees, that does increase the workload by, we estimate, 10 to 16 hours per meeting, so if we had a standing committee that was meeting once a month, we might need to wind down two ad-hocs to make that happen.

John Alden:

It also depends on how often the ad-hoc meets and how robust the ad-hoc engages the public. And of course, engaging the public is vitally important, but the more work that the ad-hoc does in that regard, the more staff time it takes of course, and then we'd have fewer ad-hocs at any one time. So, I would say four, three if they have really robust public participation, as two of these do, perhaps less if they're standing committees instead of ad-hocs.

Henry Gage III:

Director, does that analysis... Okay, so going back to the issue of charter-mandated committees, we have the issue of irregular discipline committees, which need to be staffed regardless of resources. Then we have two current standing committees that could have staff support at any given time, but I'm not quite sure about how often they're meeting now. Then we have four ad-hoc committees with current staff support, so that's seven committees with varying levels of staff support at present. Is the thinking that that seven is sustainable for now, but we can't add any additional ad-hocs or standing committees? Am I understanding that correctly?

John Alden:

No, I would actually say four, because three of the ones that you mention in your list of seven, we're not actively using right now. So, the personnel committee-

PART 2 OF 6 ENDS [01:08:04]

John Alden:

Mentioned in your list of seven, we're not actively using right now. So the personnel committee hasn't met in the last year and a half, perhaps longer. And then we have another standing committee having to do with outreach to the public that I understand is looking to start up again soon, but hasn't met for some time. So in the last, certainly in the last two months, and I think even more broadly in the last year, we haven't devoted really any staffing resources to either of those two standing committees, because they just haven't been meeting. So if we start using those two standing committees again, we will need to wind down or take staff support away from the ad hocs I just mentioned. The discipline committee only meets periodically. I think we have only used it twice in the last couple of years. And so we haven't actually dedicated any staff to that as yet. So that's an important factor. The current staffing level that we're running on is maxing out our staff support without really having any reserve for a discipline committee.

Henry Gage III:

Can you read out the four ad hocs that are currently receiving staff support again?

John Alden:

Sure. They're on page five of the memo, I will read them out, but just so the audience is following, they're also on page 27 of the packet and those four are the inspector general hiring ad hoc, the community policing policy review ad hoc, the missing persons policy review ad hoc, and the chief of police performance schools ad hoc. Each to varying degrees of staff support.

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, Director. Commissioners, I wanted to flag the discipline committee recommendation in this report, particularly because for starters, it's very clearly a charter mandated duty of the commission and I'm particularly concerned both with commissioners being trained to serve on discipline committees as well as, if we do need to have a discipline committee meet, the scramble that often takes place to get commissioners to serve on that committee is not a place we really want to be, because it raises the specter of commissioners actually being unavailable on short notice when we need to get that work done.

Henry Gage III:

I would highly recommend that if we do nothing else, we take serious action to schedule discipline committees as a recurring standing committee. If we do have to cancel them, that's fine, but it would be nice to have all of us on notice, on a rotation, if we need to be serving on a discipline committee for any given year, quarter, semi-annual. That needs to be done as quickly as possible. I'm curious to hear what other commissioners have to say as to committee prioritization. Quite frankly, I'm all ears, but that discipline committee issue is one that I feel very strongly we should address immediately. Thank you. Thank you, vice chair.

Jose Dorado:

Thank you, Mr. Gage. Commissioner Peterson, did I see your hand up?

Peterson:

Yes you did. Thank you. With respect to the committees and the ad hoc, what I'm hearing is that the ad hoc committees are addressing the issues that are currently in need of action or recurring action. But yet there are committees, for example, the disciplinary committee, that also should be staffed with commissioners, notwithstanding whether they are actively engaged right now. So is there a concern that perhaps we need to at least establish, no, assign commissioners to all the necessary standing committees? So that as Commissioner Gage said, we can hit the deck running when need be, or we haven't staffed them because we don't have commissioners because we don't have staffing support. And I do want to say that Miss Adwan has been just a tremendous help in her role.

Peterson:

And I know she's stretched very thin because I'm working with her on the IG and the chief performance ad hoc committees. I know she's currently just a contract employee, not even an employee. I wouldn't use the word employee, but she's working contractually. Is there an active recruitment to fill her position permanently? And do we have budget currently to hire additional staff? Or are you saying we need to request additional staffing positions? And I know I've probably joined too many things together, but I'm trying to understand how the commissioners are staffing these committees and whether there is staffing ability to support these committees.

John Alden:

Commissioner, I think those are great questions. I'm glad you're asking them. I'm going to try to make sure I hit all of them. Please let me know if I miss one. For the first question, I believe you asked, have we stood up all the committees that need to be stood up? I would say that at least according to charter, the only committee we absolutely have to have is a discipline committee. And the discipline committee is only triggered under very specific circumstances. And typically those are two, a very specific set of unusual cases that sometimes will trigger a discipline committee, like a level one use of force case where the commission takes the initiative, to want to have a discipline committee around it. And then secondarily, where CPRI and the Chief of Police disagree. Now that is a committee that we've been using only as needed.

John Alden:

And we did suggest in our memo and Commissioner Gage also suggested in his comments, that we perhaps should have that on a regular rotating basis. I think that would be much better. I think it would be more likely to be available when needed and easier for the commissioners to staff if each of you knew when you'd be on it. There are two things that make that committee very different from all the others. One is that while it's technically not a standing committee, we have learned that it is subject to Brown Act requirements. So we do have to post the meeting, take public comment and then go into closed session to have the meeting. So it requires a little bit more staff resourcing than some of the ad hocs, which might not have any public facing component. The other thing that's unusual about the discipline committees is that by charter, they're made up of only three commissioners, but those commissioners are supposed to rotate periodically. The rotation isn't described in the charter, but just the concept that they should rotate, must rotate in some way, is laid out in charter.

John Alden:

So we need to make sure that the membership changes in some periodic fashion. And I think we have a fair bit of discretion about that. These other committees have no rotation requirements, commissioners

aren't required to rotate through them. We could choose to do that or not choose to do that as we see fit. So I think that discipline committee is really the only one we have to really be sure we staff. All of the others, even the standing committees, are optional. As you saw earlier, in my response to Commissioner Gage's questions, even the standing committees, at least one of them we haven't been using in some time. And there's no requirement that either of our current standing committees meet on any particular schedule. So we could certainly rearrange those any way we want or simply not use them if we prefer. You also asked about Ms. Adwan's status, she is an employee of the city of Oakland, but she is not a permanent civil service employee.

John Alden:

She is in a, I think I would call it a posture called ELDE, meaning extended but limited duration employment. She can stay with us for a year, up until the anniversary of her original hire date. In the meantime, we are doing a recruitment as you described, and I've actually been working on that this month, in fact. I expect that recruitment will probably open up in the spring and then we'll have an opportunity to make a permanent hire in that position. So down the road, there'll be opportunity to make a permanent selection there. I think I answered all of your questions, please let me know if I missed any.

Peterson:

Just have one question. Is that the only position, meaning the chief of staff position, the only one that is currently budgeted even in this ELDE?

John Alden:

Yes, it is.

Peterson:

I see.

John Alden:

Yes, it is. That position is what we call permanent funding in the city of Oakland, meaning it's a staff position that is part of the budget. It's supposed to be ongoing from year to year. It is not merely contracting funds that are available just in one specific year and then might not be available the following year. But hers is the only staff position we have in that regard. If we wanted to bring someone else on, in a permanent position, we would have to have the city council approve creation of that position and the funding for it. And then we'd have to go through a hiring process to fill that position with an actual person to do the work.

John Alden:

On occasion, there are ways that we can hire staff for very short periods of time. If we happen to have some extra money for salary, sometimes we have a little bit of such money just because we have some vacancy that has taken some time to fill. Usually when that happens, we're only able to bring someone on for a very short period of time, like six months or the like. And those are never permanent positions. So it's too early in our fiscal year for me to know whether we might have budget, because of salary savings, to bring on a very short term employee of that kind. That would be great if we could, and I continue to watch our budget figures so we can figure out if that's a possibility later in the fiscal year.

Peterson:

So did I hear you say, though, earlier, that this is the time we should request any additional positions to support the commission for request-

John Alden:

Yeah.

Peterson:

Okay.

John Alden:

Yes. Sorry to interrupt. But yes, this is a good time. I know that in November, December, January, the city will begin the process of starting to figure out what budget proposals the city administration wants to move forward to the city council in the spring. So this is a good time for us to think about what position we'd want to request and what our argument is in favor of creating that position, why we can justify that it's necessary. I certainly think the experience we've already had with Ms. Adwan tells us that there's far more hunger from the public, from the commission, frankly, from the federal court with respect to development of policy under the NSA, than we have staffing to readily accommodate as quickly as we would like. And so I do think that, particularly given that policies must go through the commission, if we want to have any thoughtful deliberation on those policies at the commission and get those done in a timely fashion to satisfy our NSA requirements, I do think we are going to need some more staff for the commission to do that.

Peterson:

OK. Thank you.

Jose Dorado:

Thank you, Commissioner Peterson, Commissioner Hsieh.

Jesse Hsieh:

Thank you, Chair. Couple of questions. I guess the first is whether having the discipline committee be a standing committee occurring every two months, is sufficient to meet deadlines that are mandated by charter or other timelines. What you think a reasonable target goal for budget increase in staffing might be. And what that represents. When you think staffing support is most important in considering whether ad hocs may even need the staffing support versus when they absolutely do. And in terms of just the number of ad hocs that we have or standing committees, what if any opinions, and I'd open this up to the entire commission, might be the maximum load for any particular commissioner.

John Alden:

Great questions. Let's start with the discipline committee. I do think if we had a discipline committee meeting every other month, so six times a year, that ought to be sufficient for our needs. By charter, we should be getting investigations done at the 250 day mark, which leaves a three month window between the time the investigation is finished and the time that the 33 or four deadline would force us to be done with the case by state law. So with that 90 day window, if you're meeting every two months, you're always going to have a meeting within that window, right?

John Alden:

Now, sometimes that might be a little tight on certain cases, but at least it would always be available. And I also think that technically, I don't know that one would necessarily have to ask the city council to make the discipline committee a standing committee in order to accomplish this rotation we just described. But one could, if you wish, and given the Brown Act requirements that apply to the discipline committee, it's probably an academic question. It's going to look the same whether we call it a standing committee or not.

John Alden:

And as to how many committees we could staff, I do think having three or four of the sort that we've been running lately, most of which involve very frequent meetings, say weekly or every couple of weeks. And that also have robust public engagement, which takes more staff time, right? But has tremendous value. The rate of having three or four of the kind we have right now, I think, is really our maximum at any one time. So that might be a reason to think about, say, holding off on creating more ad hocs, or having more meet with intense staff support like that, until one of these others is finished, like the inspector general hiring ad hoc or the missing persons ad hoc, which last I heard sounded like it was coming close to completion.

John Alden:

See, I do think three to four ad hocs of the sort, is the maximum we can really support right now. Commissioner, I think I heard you also ask how many ad hocs can any given commissioner serve on? I don't have an opinion about that, and I haven't thought about that honestly, when I put together this material, but I think that's a really good question and I'd have to defer to the commissioners about how you feel that works, but that's a significant resource constraint too. So I think it's smart to think about that.

Jesse Hsieh:

And about what you think a reasonable target for a budget increase and what that represents and how that might expand our ability to have more ad hocs or standing committees?

John Alden:

Well, when I look at the analysis we've presented in this memo, I would say at a minimum, I think it would be reasonable for us to ask for an office assistant, one or two. Those are two different levels of that position. In order to provide support to your chief of staff. I think that would be a good place to start with an ask for a couple reasons. One, there's a great deal of work that's reflected in this memo that could be handled by someone of that classification and often is here in the city of Oakland. We might work with HR to figure out if they agree, or if there's maybe a very close, very similar classification, that would be better. But I think that's a good place to start the conversation. If we had such a person working full time, that would really substantially free up your chief of staff to be running some more ad hocs and/or some other strategic planning for you, depending on what your priorities are.

John Alden:

I also think that's an ask that is commensurate with the budget challenges that we have in the city of Oakland. I don't mean to say that there aren't a whole lot of competing needs, but what I do mean to

say is, it's a modest ask compared to other asks you could make. If we could have whatever resources we might like, and budget were no issue, I might suggest three or four people working underneath your chief of staff for a variety of purposes. Doing public outreach, putting together some advanced policy planning and the like. That doesn't strike me as realistic, given the current state of the city's budget.

John Alden:

We are still recovering from a really significant financial downturn, one of the worst you've ever seen. So I think an ask that is thoughtful, targeted, and modest, and is part of a long term building strategy, as opposed to asking for a really robust staffing increase that we know the city can't afford right now, is more likely to be accepted by decision makers. And I think also shows that we together are thinking reasonably about how we can build the system over time, but I'm entirely open to feedback from the commissioners. If that sounds too modest, I'd be happy to put forward a different budget suggestion that's more aggressive.

Jose Dorado:

Commissioner Hsieh?

Jesse Hsieh:

That's all I got for now. Thanks.

Jose Dorado:

Okay, Commissioner Gage?

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, vice chair. Director, I'd like to get a better understanding of different classifications and the sort of activities those classifications can offer. When I'm thinking about commission activities, I've been putting some of the various activities into a couple buckets. We've got the meeting minutes and agendas type of bucket, which seems fairly low level administrative. We have the policy review proposal and analysis bucket, which seems slightly more substantive in terms of administrative time. And then we have a public outreach and engagement bucket, and all three of those are needs for the commission. What I don't have a good understanding of, is which of the classifications would fill each of those buckets and the order of operations here, because I would agree that it's probably not particularly feasible to come out with an ask for the complete framework that we might want, but if we could start with a more robust agenda management and meeting minute system as a very basic foundation, that could at least get us to a place where we have ad hoc committees and the occasional standing committee that puts out that sort of documentary work on a regular basis.

Henry Gage III:

Would you mind going through those classifications and explaining what sort of, I'm losing the words here, but maybe a complement or what sort of activities each of those people could bring to the table?

John Alden:

Sure. You had first describing your three buckets minutes and agendas, and I agree, those go together in a classification that I think would best be assigned to an office assistant. I might add in there, also some of the work done in responding to public records act requests, which is a substantial part of our work.

And also some of the day-to-day work of say, paying some of the commission's bills. I would put all those together, into that first bucket you mentioned, and suggest an office assistant, which in other organizations you might call an administrative assistant or a secretary, someone that can take care of making sure the minutes are typed, making sure the agendas are correctly formatted and posted in the right places and the like. A second classification then I think we should think about, is for your second bucket policy review.

John Alden:

I think that is a wholly different policy kind of work than the minutes and agendas. That probably is going to require someone with extensive training experience in how to craft policy and try to root out what the unintended consequences of policies might be, try to study best practices in other places. That bucket we might already have covered at least in the medium term, because you have an inspector general coming on board, they can do some of that work. In our current budget, that Inspector General's office has three positions underneath the Inspector General, a mid-level manager, and two line auditors that are all set to roll on, over the course of the next nine months. And so that's pretty aggressive. I mean, that will put our new inspector general in a position of happening to figure out if they like those classifications and hiring quickly.

John Alden:

But all of those classifications, including the Inspector General, would be well suited to do the policy review. And so I might suggest that we start with seeing how the development of the Inspector General's office aids with policy review before we consider some other classifications. I think it is worth noting that the city council gave us exactly what we asked for, in that regard, in this last budget cycle. And it was a big ask and a really big give from the city council. So having the Inspector General, plus three more positions on top of that, oh, and pardon me, a fourth position, the policy analyst position, that's a holdover from the CPRB days. That's very robust staffing for that office. And so I think we should see how that develops before we think about a different staffing model there. But then the third bucket you mentioned is outreach and engagement.

John Alden:

I don't think any of the classifications I just mentioned would be quite right for that job. That's a job that might be better suited to a classification that requires a higher level of skill and training than an office assistant. And I might suggest we look around the city and see what sort of classification is used for that kind of work. I don't have a strong opinion about that classification. I have heard that there are some classifications in public information, officer shops, like admin analysts that might be suitable to that kind of work. And I think I could look to get some more advice and direction from HR about what sort of classification would be ideal there. But I think that's a great question to ask, that would be a solid staffing add to our existing contingent. Because we really don't have anyone who has the time and the bandwidth and the right skillset to do that work.

Henry Gage III:

As a brief follow-up, Vice Chair, before I return the floor. With respect to the office assistant classification, what sort of volume increase could we expect from say, one individual joining in that capacity? Would that allow us to stand up three or four additional ad hocs or one or two additional standing committees? I'm trying to get a sense of what the capacity ad would be.

John Alden:

I would estimate in that range, you are probably right there that maybe you could do two or three more ad hocs if you had that office assistant. I might have to circle back with Ms Adwan and see what that looks like. And I'd be curious to see if she has some other thoughts about that. Even right now, there are a lot of tasks we're just not getting to, with the existing ad hoc composition. So at least some of that would help us speed up, on some things we're behind on, like public records, act requests, making sure we're paying bills in a timely fashion and the like. So if we just had the office assistant, it might not be a huge add, but you probably could do a couple more ad hoc committees if you had an office assistant on board.

John Alden:

If you would like to be doing say, twice as many ad hocs as we're doing now and say, have eight or nine running at a time, I think you would need an even more robust staffing add than just that. And then maybe you do need an office assistant and also an administrative analyst who can actually be the staffer at those meetings. In addition to this odd one, your chief of staff just can't be at six or eight ad hocs and the police commission. It's just too many meetings to go to, in the course of a month. She would be at meetings all the time, and never in the office doing the preparation for the meetings, right? So you would need someone above an office assistant to get to say, eight ad hocs at a time.

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, Director. And thank you, Vice Chair.

Jose Dorado:

Thank you, Commissioner Gage. Commissioner Harbin-Forte.

Harbin-Forte:

Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair and direct question. I want to follow up on the three buckets. With respect to that third bucket, let me start and see if I can rephrase it so it's clearer. If we have the three buckets and let's say we get our office assistant and we have two other buckets to fill, would the chief of staff be working on either of those two buckets trying to do the work of those? And if we hold them out separately, we got the three buckets and someone is assigned the third bucket. What would the chief of staff then be doing?

John Alden:

Well, if I followed your question correctly, I think I have the answer for you. If we had the chief of staff and also the office assistant, I think then the chief of staff would be better positioned to help coordinate all the resources that you need for the existing priorities you have, including figuring out what policies you want to prioritize and getting some help from the Inspector General on those, figuring out which ad hocs are the most important for you, putting together your budget ask in the future is presumably a year from now, two years from now, three years from now, you'll have further work to do on your budget to help build out the system that we're trying to create. And also frankly, start managing some of the staff. If we end up say, at some point in the future, having an office assistant and then someone else doing outreach, and both of those people are reporting up to your chief of staff, then you want to make sure your chief of staff is supervising them and coordinating them.

John Alden:

And I think honestly, your chief of staff classification is one in which that kind of coordination work is the highest best use of that person. And I think proactively, giving you some feedback about how we can continue to structure your time to best meet what you as a group have decided are highest priorities. Help keep you on track, help proactively suggest things that you need to do, as opposed to reactively responding to the day-to-day needs of ad hocs, right? Which are important, but does sometimes prevent a person from thinking proactively, strategically looking at the future, trying to make sure we're spending time on what's important, not just what's urgent. I'm not sure if that quite answers your question, but-

Harbin-Forte:

It does. And if I'm understanding, in an ideal world, we'd have our chief of staff plus basically three classifications under that chief of staff, the office assistant, the policy analyst and whatever. So we'd have the three buckets and above it all would be the chief of staff, overseeing the work that would be done and assigned to those three buckets.

John Alden:

Yes. I think that would be an ideal structure.

Harbin-Forte:

All right.

John Alden:

We'll have to build toward that over time.

Harbin-Forte:

Yes, of course. Right now though, it seems that, and whenever we get to motions, I'd be prepared to make a motion to that, we ask the city council to give us an office assistant position or to authorize that. But right now it seems the most crucial need is to make we get at least an office assistant on board. Okay. All right. Thank you. Whenever there is a time, whenever you want motions, Mr. Vice Chair, that would be a motion that I would make, but I think there's a lot of other discussion as well, but thank you. I'm done.

Jose Dorado:

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hardin-Forte. Commissioner Gage.

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, Vice Chair. I wanted to talk with commissioners and open the floor a bit to talking about prioritization between ad hoc committees and standing committees. In part, because our current standing committees don't appear to be particularly active, and given that lack of activity and given our other priorities, I think it's worth engaging in some kind of dialogue about what our policy priorities are, whether we should change which committees are active in standing, how that would change our staffing and composition. I'm also particularly mindful of two things. One is that the controlled equipment ordinance is going to require a standing committee because it has a continuing subject matter jurisdiction that would make it ineligible to continue as an ad hoc. And the second is, any committee

that has continuing subject matter jurisdiction, would run into that issue. So commissioners, what say you? Is there an argument or a need for a standing outreach and a standing personnel committee? Is there an argument to swap other standing committees? And for them, I'm curious to hear what folks would like to prioritize, for those standing committees' thoughts.

Jose Dorado:

Any comments on the question, as posed by Commissioner Gage. Ah, Commissioner Jordan?

Jordan:

Yeah. So as it stands, we have two standing committees currently. And with the potential of making disciplinary a standing committee, though it is in most respects, already a standing committee. Or in a lot of respects. But one that may not be utilized and using resource on a regular basis, I've heard. So the equipment ad hoc and potentially there was conversation around rules as well. That's a lot of standing committees. I'd like to hear two things. I'd like to hear two things. I'd like to hear from Commissioner Gage, with what regularity he feels the equipment standing committee would be meeting, and why.

PART 3 OF 6 ENDS [01:42:04]

Jordan:

And why. I think I have some ideas around that, but I'd like to hear what he has to say about that. And as far as Outreach, I think that it hasn't met in quite a while, largely because... When I came on, Outreach was a priority of mine. Commissioner Dorado and I, Vice-Chair Dorado and I did meet to have a bit of a planning meeting. We had set up some groundwork and then the quarantine happened. Quarantine was specifically challenging around that we were just beginning to get into the planning phase around how to restart that. And I think, as discussed in our last meeting, there's clearly some work that needs to be done with Outreach and community engagements. So, that feels like a thing that we should consider as standing work and not ad hoc work, to my mind. I had a third point but now I'm blanking. Maybe I'll remember and get back to it, but I think that's all I have for the time being.

Dorado:

Let's go to Commissioner Shay and then we'll double back to Commissioner Gabe. He has some answers to the questions posed by Commissioner Jordan. Mr Shay.

Jesse Hsieh:

So, I think the issue for standing committees is the amount of resources that it's taken each standing committee when it meets and how often it does, in fact, meet. I do think that many of our committees are named or described in a way that generally means that they are going to have recurring issues that need to be brought up on occasion or quite often. Frankly, I'm looking at the list of committees, and a lot of these could be standing committees, CPRA director performance evaluation, the police chief goals and evaluation every time there is a new police chief or every year, God forbid. The budget for every budget cycle, the annual report for every year.

Jesse Hsieh:

I think that what we choose to be a standing committee should be perhaps graded on a different criteria or a criteria above and beyond whether there is continuing jurisdiction or need to constantly revisit

issues. I do think that Outreach and Personnel are things that are recurring issues. There's an argument to be made for, frankly, almost every committee, outside of ones that specifically deal with a specific policy. So, I, frankly, think it might be an argument for having many committees and just of irregular meeting times or many standing committees with irregular meeting times or no standing committees. I think we need to look a little bit further than just whether it's an issue that's going to come up over and over again, and having some different criteria. Thanks.

Dorado:

Thank you, Commissioner Shay. Commissioner Gage, any thoughts on the questions as posed by a Commissioner Jordan?

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, Vice-Chair. I do you have some initial thoughts on meeting frequency. And I would like to briefly say that, to Commissioner Shay's point, it's well-taken, there's an argument to be made for, frankly, having a lot of standing committees. And I think this is going to be a continuing issue for us for at least a little while because it's permissible to have ad hoc committees, but once you start getting into recurring subject matter jurisdiction, you start to get into a very gray area under the Brown Act. And we are very well into that gray area with our current composition, which is one of the reasons why I'm glad we're having this conversation, because even though we can't make everything a standing committee, we can at least start moving in that direction and gathering staff support to ensure that our most pressing needs are taken care of in public, in a way that makes sense.

Henry Gage III:

With respect to the standing committees themselves, it seems like... I'm thinking of four in particular that seem to be priorities, to my mind. The Discipline Committee because that needs to happen, and having that in a regularly scheduled meeting just seems to make sense. I know staff has recommended a meeting every other month, that may be sufficient. It might be a good idea. I'm curious to hear the director's opinion as to whether scheduling a meeting once a month makes sense, even if that meeting is canceled on a regular basis. I would argue that the controlled equipment ordinance is set up in such a way that a monthly meeting would likely be sufficient if that was made a Standing Committee. The same could be set of Rules Committee. And I'm not sure about Outreach and community engagement, and what sort of meeting frequency would work best for that, if that was also a standing committee. So, I guess, the two questions for you, Director, are: would four standing committees meeting once a month be too much of an administrative burden for our current staffing level?

John Alden:

Yes, I think so. I don't see how we'd be able to staff those and this commission meeting and do all the other administrative work behind the scenes, like Public Records Act Requests and the like that we have to do. I mean, theoretically, if we had more staff, one might be able to do that and just not have ad hocs. Yeah. A challenge, though, there is, in addition to staff time, every standing committee would, by local rules, have to meet somewhere in City Hall. The City of Oakland is now at about 30 boards in commissions, and so we're running out of meeting space, honestly, at City Hall, as I understand it.

John Alden:

So, when we were thinking of creating a standing committee, if we were thinking of creating a new standing committee in the future, we'd need to go to City Council and explain why we wanted that

standing committee. And as part of that ask, we'd need to be able to identify that we have existing staff for it, and also we'd have to be able to find a room for it somewhere at City Hall. And I suspect there probably wouldn't be enough rooms to have that many standing committees. Now, I've not asked that specific question. I have asked about room space and I've been told we're on the verge of having no for standing committees at all, just because we have so many other boards and commissions right now on the table. So, we have to ask, I think, more specifically exactly how many standing committees could we find room for in City Hall. I think that is all to say that, between staffing and rooms, I don't think four standing committees that each meet monthly is something we can do with the existing staff or meeting space.

Henry Gage III:

Given that, that list of four includes one that may not be meeting at all, would a three-plus-one arrangement be something that's feasible?

John Alden:

Well, I suppose we'd have to think about how we were to structure meeting times. That still strikes me as not something that's feasible, but I suppose if you had a plan that you were going to have one standing committee of some sort meeting every month, and then each month that was a different standing committee, so one month it's Personnel, the next month it's Militarized Equipment, if that's one that the commission chooses to have, the next month it's Outreach, that strikes me as a more realistic case, given current resourcing and the meeting room issue that I mentioned earlier. But I don't know that, that would necessarily meet the commission's needs. Once you name a standing committee, all of the meetings of that standing committee must be Brown Act-compliant and must be somewhere in City Hall. So, if that schedule, I just described causes those committees to be meeting too infrequently, not often enough, then you might have to consider ad hocs instead.

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, Director. So, commissioners, I suppose, I mean, as you can hear, we have a very real resource problem in front of us. And I'm particularly worried about the continuing jurisdiction issue, but the practical issue of our ability to staff committees is still there. Perhaps a final question, Director: would a two-plus-one arrangement for standing committees be feasible, given that we would also have a handful of ad hocs that would need various levels of staff support?

John Alden:

I think if you had two regular standing committees a month plus one that sometimes met but didn't always meet, you would have to not have any other ad hocs to make that system work with our current staffing. Then you would have staffing only for the standing committees and not the ad hocs, but that's assuming that we were able to find space for those at City Hall. And we'd have to have that conversation with the City. But I think with that number of standing committees, you just wouldn't have the staffing capacity to do ad hocs until we increased our staff. And that certainly a choice that the commission can make.

John Alden:

I might just throw in there, it is clear to me that standing committees have to either meet on a regular basis or have an ongoing subject matter jurisdiction. Perhaps it might be useful down the pike to see if we could get some more information about whether the ongoing subject matter jurisdiction requires a

standing committee on that topic, as opposed to an ad hoc. And I think there are other people that are better suited than me to maybe answer that question. I've been looking at it from the City's local rule perspective, which is, if you have a standing committee, you have to name either a regular meeting schedule or a subject matter jurisdiction.

John Alden:

I think it's interesting that you raised the Brown Act question, and I have to defer to council about whether having an ad hoc with an ongoing subject matter jurisdiction would require it to be named as a standing. I'm not sure that it does, but I'm not sure that doesn't. I would have to get some advice about that. That's a great question.

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, Director. I'd agree. It'd be nice to have some clarity on that. My understanding is that it does, but if it doesn't, I would certainly sway some of my fears on that issue. And Vice-Chair, if we could make that request through council for clarity as to whether or not ad hoc committees can continue to exist with continuing subject matter jurisdiction, that would be a very useful fact to know. And thank you. I have nothing further at this time.

Dorado:

Thank you, Commissioner Gage. Commissioner Harbin-Forte, you had your hand up.

Harbin-Forte:

Oh, I'm sorry. I thought I'd taken it down. I meant to take it down.

Dorado:

Alrighty.

Harbin-Forte:

Oh, it's down.

Dorado:

Thank you. Commissioner Shay and then Commissioner Jordan.

Jesse Hsieh:

Thank you, Vice-Chair. So, I will also have my vote to having clarity on that issue. I think, from a community engagement and transparency perspective, we want standing committees because they are subject to the Brown Act procedures and they're subject to the Brown Act procedures which allow for a great deal of transparency and community engagement. But at the same time, if we're running ad hocs that do allow for a great deal of community participation and for that community engagement, my preference, frankly, would be to have more committees that have that measure of community engagement, which it sounds like we would if they were all at hocs, as opposed to just a few standing committees. I would like to maximize the amount of community engagement and in the committees as much as we can for those that they're, frankly, very important in. So, that would be my preference, even if it means no standing committees. Thank you.

Dorado:

Commissioner Jordan.

Jordan:

Yeah. So, just listening to Commissioner Shay just now, my thoughts on that are... Part of the resource issue that's being called out there is that the greater the community engagement within any meeting, standing or ad hoc, is really what is drawing on the resources. I mean, I'd personally love to see as many of our ad hocs as possible, barring any sort of legal issues related to Personnel meet as closely to the Brown standard as possible. But again, we clearly don't have the resources to manage that.

Jordan:

And honestly, what I'm hearing here, and maybe this is a compelling bit of leverage for our ask for additional staffing and funding around that, is that we're being put in a legal box that we cannot actually meet the requirements on a number of different pieces. If we do have the standard of the recurring jurisdictional issue and, therefore, need to make standing committees, which, in some ways, Commissioner Shay, is my preference, but there's no room.

Jordan:

I mean, currently, now when we were just voting to continue remotely, but this is not going to last forever. We all know that. And I, for one, am looking forward to getting out of my house a little bit more. But there's no resources for that. Additionally, there's no resources to man those meetings, and we can come up with some creative problem-solving issues around how we manage the lack of resources for the meetings themselves. I do know that there are some limitations for us such as... I was talking to with Adwan earlier this week about how much additional commissioners we, if we had capacity could take on, as far as running the meetings ourselves.

Jordan:

Police department often are hosting the teams meeting, and so there's no need for staff there if we feel like we need to sort of take minutes or develop agendas. Not every ad hoc we have has it has a clear agenda going in. I mean, they've been real hit-and-miss, as far as that goes. I think, more and more we are seeing, especially with Ms Adwan on board, we are seeing agendas before going into the meeting. But one of those limitations is that, any of those materials that we gather or put together in relation to those meetings, we're not allowed to post them on the City website. We are not City employees, therefore cannot do any sort of website management for the commission website, which is...

Jordan:

We're really hemmed in by a lot of legal requirements of us. I don't know what the answer is, but it feels like, at minimum, this is strong evidence that we need more resources to help us stay out of legal trouble and maintain a legal status around both Brown and its requirements and our own internal mandates or the mandates related to F1. So, this is very frustrating.

Jordan:

The last piece I wanted to say, the thing I wanted to say much earlier was it does sort of feel like some of these things that are being termed as ongoing jurisdictional... Sorry. Subject to jurisdiction are, though they may be a long and ongoing thing, they are finite. For instance, rules, ideally, we will come to an end

of rules. I'm sure the commissioners involved in that would love to see the day when they've come up with all the rules that needed to be ruled and you can stop. Now, those things are going to need to be revisited at some point in the future, but that feels finite.

Jordan:

And on the other hand, as the equipment ordinance is written, clearly there is an ongoing need to review that. I do wonder if that is monthly work or if there is... And some of these things where it's like, if it's an annual review to the chief or the annual report, we can stand up an ad hoc annually. It's finite. When the annual report is done, then that ad hoc's work is done for the year. The Personnel is going to rotate out. So, I mean, maybe I'm just muddying the waters here, but I do feel like some of these things, how we perceive them as ongoing, I have questions about that. That's all.

Dorado:

Thank you, Commissioner Jordan. Commissioner Harbin-Forte, I'm going to go with Rania Adwan before you, if that's permissible.

Harbin-Forte:

Yes, absolutely.

Rania Adwan:

Hi. And thank you. I even got my camera on so you can see I'm for real, not [inaudible 02:01:56] and disconnected. Thank you so much for this and thank you, Vice-Chair Dorado. In as much as it's helpful, in the short amount of time that I've been with you guys in privy to this, I would double down on what's been said. Ad hocs are much more nimble. And as a reminder, one of the reasons that this is on the agenda was because we're trying to get consistency on how we should run those ad hocs. Every one of you has asked me to ensure that things are posted, so I do see a push for transparency. The agility of an ad hoc just allows me to go right up until the last minute and then be able to fill time and go back and forth. So, I am preferring ad hocs.

Rania Adwan:

I do also want to encourage the commission to really, really think about skillsets. While I don't mind rolling my sleeves up, I knew what we needed to do to get back on track and also get tracks, really start building out processes and protocols. I think inasmuch as anyone that's worked with me or has heard me, my skill set and strong points and the bit that really turns me on about this work is actually helping you guys design the programs and design some of these efforts and also encouraging bigger thinking and forming partnerships and bringing all of that to the table.

Rania Adwan:

So, while we could switch things out and I could be running meetings more, it's not really a terrific use of what I bring to the table, so I just want us to be thinking, certainly, and especially as we start to grow out the commission, the skills and just what it is you're looking for. So, inasmuch as the commission wants those programs designed, of course, there's a moment there. And if that's not the case, then that's not the case. So, I don't want to seem like I'm forcing skills. But I just wanted it to be able to share, and also, yeah, happy to keep addressing questions. But ad hocs are definitely much easier. It's a pleasure designing some of this work with you and for you, and then doubling down and ensuring these

innovative ways to have public engagement, so whether it's a meeting, whether it's figuring out that conveyor platform that we've used, just finding other ways that we can engage a broader swath of the Oakland communities. So, thank you for the opportunity to chime in.

Dorado:

Thank you, Rania. Commissioner Harbin-Forte.

Harbin-Forte:

Thank you. Thank you. Question in terms of standing committees: why is Personnel a standing committee rather than an ad hoc? Is there any requirement that it be a standing committee? And if not, I think we could look at... It might even look better on paper if we get rid of a standing committee. And I'm assuming that Personnel issues are truly going to be ad hoc. So, is there a requirement that we have a standing Personnel com... That Personnel be a standing committee rather?

John Alden:

That's a good question, commissioner. I am not aware of any particular reason why the Personnel committee would be required to be a standing committee. My understanding is that it was created as a standing committee before I came on here, so I wasn't part of the process of making that ask. Anecdotally, I recall hearing from other commissioners that, at the very beginning of the creation of this commission, I think there was some understanding that, for whatever reason, perhaps standing committees were preferred. And so, I think the commission tried outstanding committees but then found after some time that they are actually quite resource-intensive. And we've been increasingly moving to ad hocs because they're more nimble, as Ms Adwan was mentioning. So, I'm not aware of any legal requirement for that.

John Alden:

I am really taken with the question that Commissioner Gage asked earlier, a question for which I don't have an answer, which was: is there a reason why the law, perhaps the Brown Act, for example, might require us to elevate some ad hoc that has some ongoing subject matter jurisdiction into a standing committee? That's the only thing I can think of that might be an issue there. And I honestly do not know the answer to that question. I'm glad that question came out tonight in our conversation, but I don't know the answer. So, other than that, I don't know of any reason why Personnel would have to be standing.

Harbin-Forte:

So, as we look at our committees and make changes, we perhaps could make a... Do we need to get city council approval to dissolve a standing committee? I know we have to get permission to create one, but if we don't need one anymore... If there's going to be a Personnel issue, it's going to be quick and getting in probably, and most everything is going to be confidential anyway. If something comes up and it's a standing committee, we got to follow the Brown Act on it, which is to give them notice, have public comments, then tell everybody, "This is a Personnel matter, so we got to go." We can't say anything in public and then we come out and re-report, whereas, if it's an ad hoc committee, we convene the ad hoc committee, they deal with whatever issue needs to be dealt with. And if we don't have to then give any notice or anything, we can deal with it more expeditiously.

Harbin-Forte:

Okay. So, perhaps we could look at dissolving the Personnel committee. When did it last meet? I've been on the commission for a little over a year, I don't recall there ever being any need to have a personnel committee or that we had an issue regarding Personnel.

John Alden:

I remember attending a meeting of that standing committee shortly before COVID, so that would be a year and a half ago. And if I recall correctly, I think we had a quorum problem and that meeting didn't actually proceed as scheduled. I couldn't give an exact date, but I do remember it being close in time to COVID. So, we would have been early 2020 or late 2019.

Harbin-Forte:

Okay. All right. Thank you. That was my thought. Maybe we'd get rid of at least one of the standing committees and also look in terms of... I think we've already talked about whether Outreach needs to be a standing committee or whether it could be ad hoc as well. Okay. All right. Thank you.

Dorado:

Thank you, Commissioner Harbin-Forte. Commissioner Gage.

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, Vice-Chair. So, I guess, in terms of follow-up from this conversation so far, I'm hearing two issues we need clarification from council on. One is this question of whether continuing subject matter jurisdiction will eventually mandate the creation of a standing committee. The second is an opinion with respect to the process for dissolving a standing committee. And then we also seem to require some follow-up about the job classification for an outreach and engagement compliment. And then, I suppose, finally, we, at some point, need to get to the issue of how to prioritize amongst our current compliment of committees, but I imagine that should probably wait until we have some additional information that has been brought up as a question tonight.

Henry Gage III:

Given that, Vice-Chair, I would ask that tonight's discussion be continued to a future agenda to allow Council and staff time to answer some of those questions. And I'm also curious to hear from members of the public, because if I've received a number of questions about our capacity for ad hoc committee meetings, I'm curious if the public have ideas on ways that we can run this structure in a more efficient way and what we can do as commissioners, given our current resourcing.

Dorado:

Commissioner Gage, what was that last point, the third point? One was the continuing subject matter jurisdiction, the other one was a process for dissolving a standing committee. And what was the third point?

Henry Gage III:

The third question was something Director Alden indicated he would have to take a look. It was a job classification for community outreach and engagement. That'd be a person whose job it would be to help us engage in that work. It sounds like it would likely be something akin to a public information officer. Perhaps someone in the city administrator's communication shop would have a similar

classification. I just don't know what that is, and I imagine the director might be able to find out if he does a little digging.

Dorado:

Great. Thank you very much. Any further comments or questions? I'm just going to throw something out regarding ad hocs. I'm so grateful for having the two commissioners that are on the [inaudible 02:11:45] ad hoc, Commissioner Harbin-Forte and Commissioner Shay, working with me on that issue. One of the things that I think we may consider seriously is making a commitment to having all of our ad hocs really engage the community in a laid-out way, that is a very clear way. And I think that would serve us well in terms of our responsibility to be transparent, as well as allowing us to be nimble, as our chief of staff put it. So, I think that sort of a commitment can take a number of forms, but I think that's something that the commission should look at, because I think that's a central question into our discussion, is around the question of transparency and what does that look like. So, if there's no other comments or questions, I think we're going to go to public comment regarding this item. Rania.

Rania Adwan:

[inaudible 02:13:07] thank you. Members of the public wishing to make public comment on this item, please raise your hand and I'll call on you in the order that you appeared. We have one hand up. To the phone call ending in 5802, give me just one second. All right. When you're ready, I've unmuted you. If you unmute yourself, you can begin.

Selene Bay:

Thank you. Salim Bay, 100 Black Men of the Bay Area. Where is the bay ad hoc that was disappeared "off the priority list?" Where's the promised racial profiling ad hoc which should have been a priority standing committee from the beginning of the OPC, since the NSA, Stanford, and every independent investigation has held that OPD is still racially profiling in the black community and the Instagram finding proves that OPD is still failing in racial and sexist bias? Now you are too busy for a racial profiling ad hoc/committee to address a Measure LL-mandated focus on profiling of any kind. I have no expectations of loyalty to the black community from other commissioners, but do the black commissioners think racial profiling is a priority worth your time and OPC resources? If not, please quit tonight.

Selene Bay:

OPC agenda states in contract, "Ad hoc committees have few rules. They are not subject to Brown Act requirements, so long is less than a quorum of commissioners attending in any given meeting. Local ordinances do not require compliance with any other rules for ad hoc," which means that you can create an ad hoc anytime, anywhere, and racial profiling should have been created.

Selene Bay:

Measure LL states, "The agency shall not be required to investigate each public complaint it receives beyond the initial intake procedure but shall investigate public complaints in using use of force, in-custody death, profiling based on any of the protected characteristics identified by state, federal, yada, yada, First Amendment assembly." Why is it so hard, for three years, to create this profiling committee since the press ROSS report produced independent evidence showing OPD is currently steeped in systemic black racism, implicit Muslim religious bias, and misogynistic abuses, even after the OPD serial gang rape of a minor was brushed under the rug with no follow-up. This is why missing persons and

human trafficked minors are still a known blight in Oakland's flatlands today. Why hasn't racial profiling been given any priority since Ex-Commissioner Janell Harris was cheated off the OPC?

Rania Adwan:

Excuse me. Thank you, Mr Bay. And I'm sorry to have to cut you off but your time is up. Seeing no more hands for public comment. Vice-Chair Dorado, it's back to you.

Dorado:

Okay. Thank you so much.

PART 4 OF 6 ENDS [02:16:04]

Dorado:

Thank you so much. So we'll then continue on to item five. You want to advance the slide, please?

Rania Adwan:

Yep. Vice-chair, commissioner Gage has his hand up.

Dorado:

I'm sorry. Go ahead, commissioner Gage.

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, vice-chair. I'd like to, not sure if this needs to be a motion, but I'd like to ask slash move that this matter be continued to a future agenda, pending receipt of information from staff as to the items previously discussed.

Dorado:

Thank you. Go ahead, and make that a motion. Is there a second?

Harbin-Forte:

A second, Harbin-Forte.

Dorado:

Okay. Thank you, commissioner Harbin-Forte. Let's do this quick and easy. All those in favor of the motion of holding this over for discussion at a later date, say aye. All those opposed? Any abstentions? It passed unanimously, so will be agendized for a later date. Thank you, commissioner Gage. Now we can go on to item five. Don't know quite how to deal with this. Maybe I'll just throw it out to discussion, commissioner Gage.

Henry Gage III:

Thank you, vice-chair. I have to give credit to commissioner Milele for seeing this coming and attempting to give me a heads-up. So thank you for that. Something seems a bit unseemly having you recognize yourself. As a bit of privilege, I'd like to extend my thanks to you for your service on this commission. You are one of our originals and this commission has not been an easy bit of service, it's not been

particularly fun at times. Especially over the last year it's been particularly draining. I'd like to thank you personally, for the work you've put into this commission, for the time and energy you've spent serving the people of the city.

Henry Gage III:

I know how much this work means to you, and I'm very sorry that I could not say this. Thank you and goodbye in person. I wish we had a chance to sit around the desk again before we go our separate ways, but such as the circumstance of the day, we're very grateful to have devoted and committed people, like yourself, who are willing to spend their nights, and nights, and sometimes mornings listening to public comment and talking policy and trying to make a difference. Just trying, not always succeeding, but always trying. So thank you for your service. It's much appreciated.

Dorado:

Thank you so much, commissioner Gage. I think our chief of staff had her hand up first?

Rania Adwan:

I do, and point of privilege or through the chair or however we do this, vice-chair derado, I have something to read out from chair Jackson for you. From chair Jackson, my apologies that I've had to miss this meeting. I'm helping to set up a sustainability Institute in Africa, but I want to take this opportunity to thank Jose for his steadfast commitment. From the inception of the Oakland police commission, as the only other four-year term, other than myself, Jose, air quotes, community policing, Derado has served faithfully, not only as vice-chair this year and has demonstrated a hard work ethic in policy making, participating in our first discipline committee, and working on the recent police chief search.

Rania Adwan:

His recommendation for the white supremacy ad hoc was visionary. Whilst the community policing work is not yet complete, he's led a unique community engagement model, which is helping us to evolve and refine our approach. It is my hope that Jose will remain engaged as his knowledge and contributions are substantial. Thank you for your service, commissioner Jose Dorado, and I echo all of that. Commissioner Derado in the short term that we've worked together, you've been incredible and I know you are not going anywhere, so not too many tears shared from me right now, but thank you so much. Thank you again from Chair Jackson.

Dorado:

Thank you so much, Ranya. Commissioner Harbin-Forte?

Harbin-Forte:

Yes. Thank you, Jose. I words really cannot express my deep appreciation to you for your commitment to the goals and the ideals of the police commission to this community, to making other changes in our community that are so desperately needed. I've seen you do very courageous things. I have seen you. I told you, you're such a class act. You are caring, you're compassionate, you are extremely fair. I just have never seen a person more hardworking than you, and just constantly, constantly considering the community and what the importance is of the community, and hearing all of the voices and being very inclusive.

Harbin-Forte:

I am privilege to work with you on the commission, on the ad hocs that we've worked on together. I have learned so much from you. I want to be like you when I grow up. So if I ever grow up, so I just really want to thank you. I'm glad you're not going anywhere. We've told you on the community policing ad hoc that you're not going anywhere. We need you there. We need your voice. You are the conscience of this commission. It's been a real privilege to have worked with you as a member of this commission. I look forward to continuing working with you in the future. Congratulations.

Dorado:

Thank you, commissioner Harbin-Forte. Commissioner Jordan?

Jordan:

Yeah, I'll try and be brief, but I know that this must be incredibly challenging for you to have to step in and facilitate your final meeting. It's the responsibility of having to take this on, under the circumstances, I know it must be a little bittersweet and a little challenging for you tonight. I just want to acknowledge that. I think that, as was said earlier, these four years, I'm sure for you, was incredibly challenging. This commission was forced to hit the ground running. It was a huge community demand that you begun, be responsive immediately with a minimal run up, unfortunately, and also minimal support a lot of the time, and in an environment where we are sometimes asked to serve the community, which is not a monolith. It is all of the individuals and all of their different perspectives.

Jordan:

You as an individual have shown up and been principal, and compassion of it and a guiding force for those of us who are, who are following in your path. I think that it's important to be mindful that you and even those of us are here now, this is still such a new endeavor, and we are working for the future. If we are setting the baseline setting, the foundation for all of the progress that comes after us, that's a thing to be proud of, your role in that, especially as one of the sort of founders. So we'll miss you, but I know that we will still hear from you. Thank you.

Dorado:

Thank you commissioner Jordan. Commissioner Milele?

Commissioner Milele:

Thank you, vice-chair. A lot has been said already that I was going to say. But I will add that I just want to show some deep appreciation for what I've seen over the past year of your commitment, or more precisely, your love for the Latinx community, and the way you stand up for your community, the way you stand up for the black community, and the way you support the residents of Oakland in general, I have seen that and I truly appreciated it. So thank you for your service.

Dorado:

Thank you so much. Commissioner Hsieh?

John Alden:

I've only been here for about four months, but I can tell that you are the guiding voice of this commission and of the community. You are my first ad hoc co-chair. I have learned a great deal from

you. I'm sorry that I've challenged you as much as I have, I'm sure I have, but it's only so that I can learn as much as I can from you in the short amount of time that we've had together, I've truly valued it. This is definitely not goodbye. Thank you.

Dorado:

Thank you. Director Alden.

John Alden:

Well, commissioner, I'm really to see you go. I echo what everyone else said before me, but in addition, for me personally, you're one of the commissioners that brought me on here, and I really appreciated and valued your confidence and support and for giving me this chance, which has been just fantastic for me. I've really enjoyed serving with you. I have a really deep appreciation for how long you have been investing in this community and how much the time that you have volunteered has really meant for you. I really have been guided by that, and I have really been honored to be here, with you in particular. So I'm going to miss you a lot [foreign language 02:27:09]. So anyway, I know I'll see you again, because we're not going to let you go here so easily, but I'm really looking forward to being you again. So thank you so much.

Dorado:

[foreign language 02:27:27] I don't see any other hands. So I'm [crosstalk 02:27:35] I'm sorry. Commissioner Peterson?

Commissioner Peterson:

I would just say as one of the newest commissioners, I do regret I will not be able to spend more time observing you and learning from you. Your reputation for good works in the community precedes you. I just wish you well. God bless your future efforts to advance the needs of the citizens of Oakland. Thank you for your service.

Dorado:

Thank you so much. Thank you so much. All of you for your kind words. Yeah, I'm not going to-

Harbin-Forte:

Excuse me, I don't mean to interrupt, but Connor Kennedy has his hand up. Council has his hand up. I'm sorry.

Connor Kennedy:

Vice-chair. I did want to add my voice to this chorus. I really just want to say that you're a fantastic public servant, a visionary leader, and also a really great person. So for our firm, having gotten to know you over these past few years, it's really been one of the highlights of this work. Thank you so much for your leadership and thank you for everything, because we'll miss you very much too.

Dorado:

Well, we'll have that beer, Connor.

Connor Kennedy:

Yes, we will.

Dorado:

Well, I'm so appreciative of your kind words and I'm not going to BS you and tell you I'm happy about this. I really do feel it's a failure of the selection committee. I have to say that there's been three attempts by commissioners to be reappointed and all three have been rejected, and all three have either been a Latino or someone who's half-Latino. I don't consider that to be a consequence and something I won't forget. So I just want to lay that out. So Latino representation throughout the city is far below what it should be. We're a third of the city now, probably more. Our representation on the various boards and commissions, and the council and the OPD and staffing in the city has to reflect that. That's one of the things I'll be working on. So that said, the gentleman that's taking my place, Rudy, will be an asset to this commission?

Dorado:

I reached out to him. We actually went out and met, and grabbed something to eat, some Mexican food, in fact. I can tell you he's a great guy. I took to him right away and I told him, I'm at your service, whatever you need, I will work as hard as I can to get it to you, whatever you need, because this isn't a popularity contest. This is about the work. Certainly my comments about the selection committee, selection panel have nothing to do with him as a candidate or any of the other candidates. I'm going to help him as much as I can. I made that clear to him as well as my displeasure, but again, the work is primary and so that's what I'm going to concentrate on. That includes the 15-01 community policing ad hoc.

Dorado:

I'm not going anywhere. So to the extent that I can help the ad hoc or the commission in any way. That's, that's my that's going to be my goal going forward. So count on that in any way that I can that I can be of service. So let me just leave it at that. Commissioner Peterson, did you have your hand up? I just want to make sure I didn't skip over you again. Did you have another comment, commissioner Peterson?

Commissioner Peterson:

No, I do not.

Dorado:

Thank you. Then we will go to public comment.

Rania Adwan:

I've got you. Thank you so much. Members of the public wishing to make a public comment on this, please raise your hands and I'll call on you in the order that you have appeared. I see two hands up. Rashidah Grinage, give me just one moment. I will get your timer going. Ms. Grinage, when you're ready, I've unmuted you on my end.

Rashidah Grinage:

Thank you. Well, I just wanted to give a little bit of a historical footnote to everything that's been said by others, and that historical footnote, is that a good deal of the work that was done to craft Measure LL

was actually done at the office of Jose Dorado. He very graciously and generously allowed us to use his office to meet and to work on drafting and research and figuring out what should be in Measure LL and allowed us to use his office to store our campaign materials. So he was a huge asset to us and in the whole creation of Measure LL, which of course created the commission. So you can think of him as the Godfather of the police commission. Thank you so much, Jose. Thank you.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms. Grinage. Calling on phone number ending in five- eight. I've unmuted you. When you are ready, please go ahead.

Selene Bay:

[inaudible 02:33:23] The CPA alliance is clear, now. I'm here to express the profound disappointment that the black and Muslim community circles on in has, and it is indescribable in its depth of disappointment in Mr. Dorado's political mishandling and sabotage of black justice related to black murders. You leave knowing the proven incomplete Bay complaint, 13-10 62 is being suppressed. That my brother's cases have not been investigated to by OPD to this date. I'll never stop saying this. Everywhere I go, I make sure no black person I respect is ignorant to the damage that you, Mr. Dorado has inflicted on our black community's justice. Your name will go down as a blight on the historic Oakland black and brown unity that was cemented by the Black Panthers and the Brown Beret Unity, in cause against corrupt OPD that you now shield. Why do I say this harsh stuff?

Selene Bay:

Because Mr. Dorado promised me personally, based on evidence that he had seen, that he wouldn't quit until every violated and outdated OPD policy related to these black and Muslim community murders have been addressed and completed, with the attention to detail with quote, his quote, "An FAA plane crash investigation." Since this no longer applies, we are here to expose Mr. Dorado as a fraud and no friend to the black community based on his lack of action on evidence of racial and religious profile, and [inaudible 02:34:45] black community that we've shared with him before the approval of the Ross independent investigation.

Selene Bay:

Mr. Dorado has revealed himself in slow walking and interfering the Ross investigation independence in racial and religious profiling in the black community until this fake send-off. Mr. Dorado's interference is not in the Latinx community where his negative involvement will be between him and himself and his people, but he dared to sabotage black justice by suppressing and sabotaging said Ross investigation by ignoring SB 1421, and failing to fight for lawful California voter demanded OPD misconduct transparency in IED 13-10 62 by siding with the city and mayor who repeatedly lied-

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Mr. Bay. Sorry to have to cut you off, but you have exceeded your time. Mariana Contrares. Let me restart the clock when you are ready. I have unmuted you. Please go ahead.

Mr. Contrares:

Thank you, commissioner Dorado. After that, you still want to serve on the commission. Commissioner Dorado, I'll also I want to give a little bit of a history. You were the first and only unanimous select from

the select panel in the initial selection of the first commissioners. There was a reason for that your hard work, your dedication to community policing. So that demonstrated that support from the select panel. I have to tell you that you, of all the initial commissioners, have been probably the hardest to lobby and to sit and have some discussions around different policies or approach of the commission.

Mr. Contrares:

You and I have done work in the community and personally, we have not always had an agreement or seen eye to eye, but the one thing that we do agree on is that the work has to get done. So commissioner Dorado, you have been a friend, but more importantly, you've been a political friend. So I don't bid you farewell from the commission, because I suspect that you, along with commissioner Janelle Harris have been put on the reserve list from the select panel. So as they say, where I'm from, [foreign language 02:37:23] we might see you again. Thank you so much for your work.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Mr. Contrares. Vice-chair, seeing no other hands, it is back to you.

Dorado:

Again, thank you all for your kind words, heartfelt appreciation. Let's move on then to committee reports, starting with the Inspector General search ad hoc.

Commissioner Milele:

Thank you, vice-chair. Just need one second to pull up notes. So for the inspector general-

Mr. Contrares:

[inaudible 02:38:07] 1, 1, 1 9, that two, this is bottom of the nine.

Commissioner Milele:

You need to ... thank you. Let me go back to that. We are so pleased that we have landed on three stellar finalists. We have Michelle Phillips, deputy inspector general for the city of Baltimore. We have Mac Muir, supervising investigator at New York's civilian complaint review board, and Rebecca Johnson, acting supervisor at the department's office of inspector general from right here in Oakland. We're even more excited to introduce the candidates to Oakland by having their final interview held in public at a virtual forum, which we're holding on Wednesday, October 27th, starting at 5:00 PM.

Commissioner Milele:

The Zoom details are available on the police commission webpage. We're not only inviting people to join us by tuning in and watching the event, we're also, we want to hear from you and invite you to suggest interview questions. You can do that by taking a short survey, also posted on the website, or you can e-mail us or the commission staff directly. The survey will be open until Monday, October 25th. After that, the ad hoc commissioners will review what we've received and decide what to include. It's a very big moment in Oakland's story. Another huge step toward creating a stronger, fairer and more just public safety landscape for Oakland. That concludes my report.

Dorado:

Thank you so much. Let's move on then to the missing person's ad hoc.

Jordan:

I guess that's me.

Dorado:

That's you.

Jordan:

So we continue to engage in a very granular, line-by-line review of the policy language. The nature of that work is that periodically you run into the points of contention. We had some contentious conversation at the last meeting, but it's the process. We are working our way through it. We also had one of our community members who's been attending, to come with a few very specific questions. So we took out some time to look at those questions individually and determine some of them were about things that maybe additions that needed to be included or some language that was imprecise, potentially. So I guess that is all to say that we just continue to engage in the process of policy development though, that said, we are filling, we are closing in on the final product. We have set a date for the public hearing for this policy, and that is going to be going up on the website imminently. We are looking to put together a flyer for recruitment or just outreach for people to attend.

Jordan:

We are also in the process of recruiting SMEs to fill out the panel that we'd like to include. We're looking to have a spectrum of SMEs, not just department members, but people who work in parallel process and missing persons investigations and people affected by family members' victim, and that, as you may suspect is challenging because we want to avoid the risk of re-traumatizing people. So we're trying to be very careful with that process. So that's essentially where we are. We are going to be meeting this upcoming Tuesday, and we should be finalizing that list of SMEs ideally before then and putting out that flyer at that point. That's it.

Dorado:

Thank you, Mr. Jordan. Next up is the community policing ad hoc of which I'm so happy with. We had a great, we've been meeting every two weeks since July 31st, I believe. We are really now getting down to the nitty-gritty, such that we actually are going to take a break and we're going to postpone our next meeting until the following month, the sixth of November, actually. In the meantime, we're going to be working. Specifically, we're going to be working on two tasks. One is the vision and purpose and principles of community policing, which is potentially the beginning of the document, and certainly the beginning of the draft policy as we see it right now. The second will be a ... did I miss the other one?

Dorado:

The second will be on the, if I remember correctly, on the duties of the CROs, the community resource officers, the CRTs, the crime reduction teams, and there's one other I'll think of in a second, but that's in two parts. So the introduction, the foundation being the values, the purpose and the principles of community policing, and the second is the actual responsibilities and duties of the CROs and the CRTs. So those are the two tasks we're going to be working on in the interim, leading up to our meeting again on the 6th of November. But if you haven't seen our website and again, we're so blessed to have somebody like Ronny Rodwan that did this work. You really have to look at it. It not only lays out what our basis is of our work, but also the ways you can get involved.

Dorado:

That includes the entire policy where you can just click on it and you can put in your comments and your edits right on the policy. Of course, that comes back to the ad hoc. We have a survey of questions that we are asking the people to take. The survey is in three languages. It's in English, Spanish and Chinese. So we're asking, have you ever called the police, and rate your experience? How well do you think OPD works with the Oakland neighborhoods? Do you know what a neighborhood crime prevention council is, or a community resource officer or a neighbor services coordinator? So there's a number of questions there that we really are getting some real solid feedback on. We're so happy that we were able to have, we're so happy with [inaudible 02:46:15], that she was get able to put this together and put it up.

Dorado:

In fact, the survey was done by Mariana Contrares one of our, I guess you could say participants, that's the formal term, but we're so blessed to have Maria Contrares, Kathy Leonard, Candace Elder, Pastor Jackie, from Allen Temple, Craton Davis, from the CPAB, Reginald Lyles, from the Allen Temple, Joe Degrees. We also have two from OPD, lieutenant [inaudible 02:46:56] and lieutenant Turner, that all of us together, are putting this together. So we're so blessed to have all those different perspectives, and that's the idea. So we come out with something that we really can present to the commission for their review.

Dorado:

Again, I'm so fortunate to have two of the commissioners to work with, commissioner Harbin-Forte and commissioner Hsieh, so I just wanted to put that out, but please take a minute and check out the website of the 15-01 committee policing ad hoc. I think you'll be impressed. So we're going to continue on, and this may take several months, but I guarantee you that when we're done, we'll have a real product that not just, we will be proud of, but also the entire commission. So I'll leave it at that. Commissioner Harbin-Forte and commissioner Hsieh, you have anything to add?

John Alden:

Nothing to add, thank you.

Harbin-Forte:

Nothing to add, but thank you.

Dorado:

Thank you. With that being the case, let's move to the community outreach committee.

Jordan:

Commissioner Hsieh, why don't you go ahead and take this?

John Alden:

Thank you. So we have had some initial meetings to determine what our plan goals are going to be, what our measure of community participation is going to be frequency of meetings. Some of our priorities, I'll say, for the next round of outreach committee meetings and projects, I think that we will probably start meeting soon on it. Outreach committee is no longer going to be inactive. I think it'll be

pretty active, regularly active, and I hope everyone will stay tuned. Am I missing anything, commissioner Dorado, commissioner Jordan?

Dorado:

No, I think that that pretty much sums it up.

Jordan:

Yeah, that sounds about right to me.

John Alden:

Thank you.

Dorado:

Let's move on then to the public comment, Ranya?

Rania Adwan:

Great. Thank you so much members of the public wishing to make a comment about this item, please raise your hand and I'll call on you in the order that you appeared. Let's get the clock going. One hand. Give me just a moment. Number ending in five-eight-zero-two. Mr. Bay, I believe that's you. Give me-

PART 5 OF 6 ENDS [02:50:04]

Rania Adwan:

Number ending in 5802 Mr. Bey, I believe that's you give me just a second I will get the timer going. I have unmuted you 5802, when you're ready. I think that's you, Mr. Bey.

Selene Bay:

Good evening. Saleem Bey. I would encourage any commissioner that was hurt by my description of Mr. Dorado's mishandling of our family members cases, to do their research and go back before Ginale Harris was kicked off the OPC and see that the OPC's priority list had the Bey case investigation as a priority. Why is it missing now? Why has it been missing ever since Regina Jackson became the Chair? This shows that Mr. Dorado will continue to focus on community policing, but completely ignore the Bey cases that he said he was committed to. Why am I harsh? I'm harsh because my brother was murdered by somebody that evidence shows was receiving aid from corrupt OPD cops being suppressed by Mr. Dorado and this current OPC.

Selene Bay:

I'm harsh because my brother John, who calls in to this OPC and survived an attempted murder by persons being murdered by OPC. The evidence is there and we will never, ever, ever, ever, ever quit until we have justice. So if you're tired of hearing me say the Bey case Justice Ross Independent Investigation, like I know that you are, do something about it. If you're not going to do something about it, then I will definitely bend your ears, and I cannot wait until this commission comes back in person so you can't hit mute when I'm saying this. And I can look you in the face while you're sitting up there on that dias and selling out the community. But not investigating the Bey cases that have shown that independently they need to be investigated.

Selene Bay:

They've never been investigated by OPD, they're being ignored by the local press, you've never heard any reporting on this, but you've heard it on the Instagram, the rape scandals on all these different things. But the white local press will never say anything about this. This has been on the city council's agenda once a month, since the beginning of the year, January. And the last time it came up, Mr. Dorado failed to show up. He came back with some excuse when it was a two hour...

Dorado:

Is that the only speaker, Rania?

Rania Adwan:

My bad, I'm so sorry I was on mute. Mr. Bey, I'm so sorry to cut you off. That was your time. Vice chair Dorado you're correct, no more hands up so it's back to you.

Dorado:

Okay. Thank you. Let's go to the next slide.

Rania Adwan:

The next slide is actually open forum, part two.

Dorado:

Back to you Rania.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you so much. Members of the public wishing to make public comment on this item that did not make public comment on the first open forum. Please raise your hand and I will call you in the order that I see them. Let's start with Ms. Assata Olugbala, give me just one second. I will get your timer going. Ms. Olugbala, when you're ready I've unmuted you.

Assata Olugbala:

I can't believe that Mr. Bey has addressed his case repeatedly tonight and not one individual on this commission has said, we need to bring that case forward to see where we are because that's an investigation that we took part in and do something. But you remain completely silent. When this gentleman says, the case is not getting the attention, it's not getting the response, you are not doing your diligence to work to make sure that those police officers involved in murders can be held accountable.

Assata Olugbala:

You sit there and say absolutely nothing. Nothing. And I sat here all night waiting to see who is going to respond to Mr. Bey. Mr. Bey, as a commissioner, I can guarantee you this commission will work to bring justice if there is any injustice that happened with you, and the murder of your family. We will intervene to make sure that happens. But what happened? Silence. Silence. And that's been going on the whole while that this case has been brought to the commission for years. You have no credibility. You did the same thing with Ginale Harris. You did the same thing with Omar Former. And I will sit in these meetings

and bring this to your attention, the Bey case. And I do this at city council because they have to do something too. The Bey case involves murders that officers were involved in. Do something.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms. Olugbala. I have Maria Arroyo, let's try you. Hopefully we can hear you this time. Ms. Arroyo, when you're ready, I've unmuted you my end, please unmute yourself and start talking. I'll get your timer going.

Maria Arroyo:

Hello?

Rania Adwan:

Yes.

Maria Arroyo:

Okay, good. You can hear me. Great. Okay. Good evening, my name is Maria Arroyo. And I have a concern involving Argus and the way officers are operating it. Patrick Gonzalez to be exact. Not too long after I moved to my house in mid July 2020, I noticed this helicopter constantly flying really low all over my house. Particularly while I was in my yard, working out, landscaping, or working on one of my cars. It became bothersome so I reported it. My complaint was closed, so he began to do it more. But then he literally began to follow me around Oakland as though we were going somewhere together, but in different vehicles. By May 2021, I began to see the helicopter just about every day. He also began circling my house several times a day. Yesterday he came to my house three different times to come circle my house.

Maria Arroyo:

Tuesday, he flew to my house, stopped, then dropped altitude to a dangerously low 222 feet above the ground, then he flew away. I felt like he was trying to scare me and he was quite successful. Internal affairs denied ownership of this helicopter on two different occasions. And any other time I spoke to them, they tried to attempt to convince me that this was not happening. Regardless of me having over 1000 flight records and videos as proof. I have no desire to create non-existent problems in my life. This is getting worse by the day and me and my son are living our lives in fear. I am working with CPRA, but apparently this is not exactly a mandated investigation, but in some ways it is. Other complaints from other people exist as well. I want to thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns about this situation.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms. Arroyo.

Maria Arroyo:

Thank you.

Rania Adwan:

Vice chair, seeing no more hands. Oh, I do see 5802. Mr. Bey. I believe you gave public comment at the first public forum. Number ending in 5802 I'm trying to unmute you, Mr. Bey. Okay.

Selene Bay:

Yes, Good evening. Saleem Bey. I'm addressing something, that's not on the commission thing, and after listening all night and finding that it's not on, this is why I'm saying. At the September council meeting, no one from the Oakland Police Commission showed up to report on the Bey case. That was agendized by the boss of the Oakland Police Commission, the city council. How many times have you seen a case on the council agenda every month, January, February, March, all the way through September of the year with no answer, never reported by the local media, right.

Selene Bay:

The same week September rules committee agenda is a report on the Ross Independent Investigation for the public safety committee for November 9th, 2021. I am asking that anybody on the commission that cares about this case, somebody should show up and be prepared to report on the findings of this investigation that have been cleared by Senate bill 1421.

Selene Bay:

If nobody on that dias is writing down SB 1421 and Googling it, then you're derelict in your duty. The Bey case will be on public safety. And it's a report that they're demanding from the Oakland Police Commission. If you don't know anything about that, then you are again, derelict in your duty. I will keep saying Bey case, I will keep saying independent investigation that you paid for. You paid \$50,000 for the Ross Independent investigation and poof, it magically disappeared. When will we get any type of justice or resolution for this? We fought extra hard for an independent investigation. Independent investigation is in, and it has been reported, we want the results to be made public. We know what's in it. It's racial profiling, systemic racism that's being covered up for the benefit of the current administration, the current city attorney, and all the sycophants that upholds that sick system that upholds a corrupt OPD that's not been in compliance since 2003 NSA. That's a failure. It's a black community.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Mr. Bey. Vice-chair Dorado. No more hands up, back to you.

Dorado:

Okay. Thank you so much. Let's move on to item eight review and adoption of meeting minutes. We have August 12th and the minutes of September 16th. Let's take them one at a time. August 12th, are there any additions, deletions, or corrections to what we have in August 12th? Commissioner Harbin-Forte.

Harbin-Forte:

I'm sorry. Did I have my hand up? I didn't intend to. There may be... no.

Dorado:

Corrections already. I'll entertain a motion if there're no addition deletions or corrections motion to approve the minutes of August 12th as written.

Harbin-Forte:

I am sorry, commissioner. There was just one minor typo that I brought up. A Minor typo in the August 12 minutes related to the spelling of Ms. Olugbala's name. So that is not substantive. I think it was spelled as [inaudible 03:02:15] but that's the only correction.

Dorado:

Okay. Well, we'll make sure that that's spelled correctly. I believe it's O-L-U-G-B-A-L-A.

Harbin-Forte:

Yeah. It's spelled correctly in other places and in the September minutes. So, that was the only one.

Dorado:

Okay. So we'll make sure it comes out correctly in August 12th. Again, I'll entertain a motion to approve the August 12th minutes. Anybody-

Speaker 9:

So moved.

Dorado:

A second.

Dorado:

(silence)

Dorado:

There are second to the motion to approve?

Commissioner:

Second.

Dorado:

Second is Commissioner Jordan. Let's do this voice vote, all those in favor of approving the minutes of August 12th, say aye.

Dorado:

[crosstalk 03:03:11].

Dorado:

All those opposed say nay. Any abstentions? It's unanimous. The minutes of August 12th were approved. Moving on to September 16th. Any additions, deletions, or corrections to the minutes as written? If not, I'll entertain a motion to approve the minutes of September 16th.

Speaker 9:

So moved.

Dorado:

Okay. A second?

Commissioner Milele:

I'll second.

Dorado:

Was that Commissioner Milele?

Commissioner Milele:

Yes.

Dorado:

Okay. Thank you. Voice vote. All those in favor of approving the minutes of September 16th as written, say aye. [crosstalk 03:04:07].

Dorado:

All those opposed? Nay. Any abstentions? It's unanimous? The September 16th minutes are approved as written. Let's move on to item nine; agenda setting and prioritization of upcoming agenda items. Certainly we've got one and that has to do with ad hocs-

Rania Adwan:

Vice Chair. Vice chair respectfully, do you need public comment for the last one?

Dorado:

Oh, I'm sorry. Yes.

Rania Adwan:

Okay. Members of the public wishing to make a comment about that item on a minute's approval, please raise your hand and I'll call on you in the order that they've appeared. Just give it a few seconds. Mr. Bey, give me just a second. Mr. Bey, this is public comment for adoption of the minutes. I've unmuted you when you're ready?

Selene Bay:

Yes. Saleem Bey. I would just like to say that the minutes never reflect the lack of based investigation on there. And I also would just like to say that Mr. Dorado's opening statement, where he says there's only one issue or items that he actually cares about. If he doesn't say Bey behind that item, I rest my case. Thank you.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Mr. Bey. Sorry. I didn't get to start your timer. Ms. Olugbala, you're up next. I've unmuted you, if you can unmute yourself and start.

Assata Olugbala:

Yes. I want to ditto what Mr. Bey has said. If the minutes does not reflect every meeting, the number of times that the request has been made for this body to bring forth information on the Bey case. The Bey case investigation that you paid \$50,000 for. The minutes have to reflect that because we are going to continue to talk about it, as well as Ginale Harris. How do the minutes reflect that the community continues to say Ginale Harris was forced out, pushed out, of her position.

Assata Olugbala:

And since Ms. Harris has left, nobody, as the minutes reflect, nobody has said anything. The minutes should reflect also that there has been no attempt to deal with that investigation of the crime reduction team. That is a part of community engagement that you want to have. All of those people involved with that were members of the crime reduction team. And you want to act like that's a non-issue, that's a serious issue. So I don't know what your minutes read, but they definitely have to read that the community repeatedly has been asking for the Bey case to be brought to a public setting at these meetings and it's not happening.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms. Olugbala. Seeing no more hands. Vice chair Dorado, back to you.

Dorado:

Yes. Thank you. Rania. Now we can move on to item nine agenda setting and prioritization of upcoming agenda items. Discussion as to the subject, certainly we've already determined that the discussion round ad hocs and standing committees is something that will be agendized at a later date. So certainly that seems to be the top of the list for the next meeting. Any other subjects that should be agendized as well. Ms. Milele.

Speaker 9:

Yes. Thank you, Vice chair. I'm wondering if we can agendize a discussion on what's reportable about the Bey case?

Dorado:

Okay. I have that written down and as well as the ad hoc standing committees, any other items that should be agendized? Certainly the other there'll be... Commissioner Peterson.

Commissioner Peterson:

Did we have something on there? A update on the IG selection and the town hall. We're having a public forum on the 27th of October.

Dorado:

Okay. I have that written down and I'll be passing of course, this all on to our chair, Regina Jackson. Any other items that should appear on our next commission agenda? Okay. If there are none and certainly everybody has an opportunity to make suggestions to the chair or any other items that come up that they think should be on the agenda. If there's nothing else, let's go to public comment.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you. Members of the public wishing to make a public comment on this item, please raise your hand and I will call on you in the order that they appear. Vice chair, I see two. Ms. Olugbala, when you're ready.

Assata Olugbala:

You haven't unmuted me.

Rania Adwan:

You're speaking. I can hear you.

Assata Olugbala:

Okay. I didn't unmute myself. I don't know how you did that. It should not be what's reportable on the Bey case. The Bey case can be reported to you. Even if you have to go in closed session for whatever reason, but that shouldn't be the issue it should be publicly reported. But the issue should not be what is reportable? You want the report of the investigation. You mean you paid \$50,000 for a report, and now somebody's going to say you can't get the information? The coverup is obvious. And if they have anybody that has a sense of decency. Did you hear Mr. Bey say his brother was killed?

Assata Olugbala:

He's dedicating years and years of his life for justice, for his brother and other individuals who have been victimized by the police. And you going to sit there and ignore this man over and over again. And people have made commitments to him and lied in his face and told them that they would uplift this issue with no respect for this man and what he's been through. And the loss of his family member. You're not going to do this. You're not going to do this. Mr. Bey is going to get justice and the same thing's going to happen at that city council. He's going to get justice and we don't care how long it takes. The Bey case will be dealt with by this commission. And then, you know what it is at this point, you're being forced to do it. You're being forced to do it.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms. Olugbala. Mr. Bey, when you're ready. I've unmuted you, if you can unmute yourself and start. Mr. Bey?

Selene Bay:

All right, thank you. Mr. Bey. First of all, thank you, Commissioner Milele for actually seeing the injustice and actually happen to speak to it again, it's proof that if Mr. Dorado actually really did care about this or really was forceful about making sure this justice came about, he wouldn't be talking about there was only one issue that he saw after this whole meeting of listening to the dissatisfaction of the handling of this. That that should be brought to light, that that should be agendized, that the Bey case, the incomplete nature of IED 13, 10 62, the fact that these investigations have never been investigated, I'll never rest until we get justice.

Selene Bay:

And I'll never quit calling people out. I have a bunch of people up there. I can call by name, who has never done anything, but Mr. Dorado, since you're going out, I just want you to know that we know that you haven't done anything, that you haven't lived up to the expectations of the community that put

their trust in you. That you lied directly to my face, that you lied directly to Ginale's face when you're talking about justice for my brother who was murdered, right? And the murderer of that brother was getting direct police aid. That's the evidence in the independent investigation, there would be no shooting murders of Chauncey Bailey, Odell Roberson, Michael Wills, as collateral damage in the black community forming illegal weapons.

Selene Bay:

If the Oakland Police Department wasn't giving aid to shooters, known shooters with known access to illegal weapons. Then come back and say, we need more cops because there's violence on the street. If you don't deal with this, this will continue to haunt this commission and this city until we deal with it. OPD is a blight, a scourge, a non reformed scoffed law that will never do right by themselves. Unless this Oakland Police Commission that was empowered by a super majority of the Oakland voters does something to oversee this.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Mr. Bey and I'm sorry to cut you off. Your time is up. Ms. Grinage, when you're ready, I have unmuted you my end.

Rashidah Grinage:

Thank you. I think, given the number of people who called earlier about the Instagram issue and the more important underlying issues that the Instagram posts revealed that once again, it appears that the commission is not seeing this as a priority. Is not identifying this as a core element of your job, which is to oversee the police department and hold them accountable. And if there was ever a time to hold them accountable for this behavior, this would be the time. And I think that at the very least, you need to ask director Alden to provide some information about the investigations that CIPRA did, what the outcomes were.

Rashidah Grinage:

Obviously you can't violate 832.7, but you can at least receive some indications about the nature of the discipline that was imposed and what level of discipline it was and why, with respect to the matrix. So I would certainly hope that based on the number of people who've expressed this concern in the community and not to mention the city council, that the commission would see this as a priority. And I certainly hope that you will do. Thank you.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms. Grinage.

Rania Adwan:

Jennifer Findley, when you're ready, I've unmuted you my end.

Jennifer Findlay:

Good evening. I'd like to support Mr. Bey and getting that information and actually doing something with it. I've been appalled with the wall of silence tonight, and I'd also like to echo Ms. Grinage and say that we need to get the Instagram situation actually looked at and addressed, I'm going to read to you from the report. The failure of anyone at OPD to flag these memes, or to recognize the extent to which

they undermined years of efforts to comply with the NSA, suggest that the views expressed by the memes remain alarmingly widespread.

Jennifer Findlay:

The investigation revealed that OPD as a department took much too long to recognize the bigoted and corrosive nature of the crime reduction team page. At best this failure signals an absence of processes within the department to ensure a safe and discrimination free workplace, committed to court, ordered reforms. At worst, it speaks a culture so hostile to women and minorities, and so wedded to a discredited model of policing that it can not identify discriminatory and anti-reform messaging, but it sees it.

Jennifer Findlay:

I am disturbed that no one at the commission pushed further on this. I'm concerned that Mr. Armstrong didn't answer questions. And we're talking about academy's and recruiting. I would like to know maybe how have they been addressing that in their recruiting? I think this is something you need to be looking at more. What are we doing to actually make sure that this is happening and it's not just lip service? So I hope you'll address that a little bit further next time. Thanks.

Rania Adwan:

Thank you, Ms. Findley. Vice chair Dorado, seeing no more hands up. The floor is back to you.

Dorado:

Thank you so much. That being the last item of action, the only thing meaning is our adjournment. So I would entertain a motion to adjourn our meeting of all of October 14th, 2021. Nobody wants to go home?

Speaker 9:

So moved.

Dorado:

A second?

Dorado:

(silence)

Dorado:

A second of the motion to adjourn?

Commissioner:

Second.

Dorado:

Second, Commissioner Jordan. Thanks again everybody. We'll be seeing you soon. All those in favor of the motion to adjourn, say aye.

This transcript was exported on Oct 19, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

Dorado:

[crosstalk 03:19:42]

Dorado:

Oppose, nay? Any abstentions. I don't believe so. Everybody stay safe. [foreign language 03:19:51]. Talk to you soon.

PART 6 OF 6 ENDS [03:20:15]