



# **OAKLAND POLICE COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**

**July 14, 2022  
6:30 PM**

The purpose of the Oakland Police Commission is to oversee the Oakland Police Department to ensure its policies, practices, and customs conform to national standards of constitutional policing, and to oversee the Office of the Inspector General, led by the civilian Office of Inspector General for the Department, as well as the Community Police Review Agency (CPRA), led by the Executive Director of the Agency, which investigates police misconduct and recommends discipline.

**Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54953(e), members of the Police Commission, as well as the Commission's Counsel and Community Police Review Agency staff, will participate via phone/video conference, and no physical teleconference locations are required.**



# OAKLAND POLICE COMMISSION

## REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

July 14, 2022  
6:30 PM

The purpose of the Oakland Police Commission is to oversee the Oakland Police Department to ensure its policies, practices, and customs conform to national standards of constitutional policing, and to oversee the Office of the Inspector General, led by the civilian Office of Inspector General for the Department, as well as the Community Police Review Agency (CPRA), led by the Executive Director of the Agency, which investigates police misconduct and recommends discipline.

### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Oakland Police Commission encourages public participation in the online board meetings. The public may observe and/or participate in this meeting in several ways.

#### OBSERVE:

- To observe, the public may view the televised video conference by viewing KTOP channel 10 on Xfinity (Comcast) or ATT Channel 99 and locating City of Oakland KTOP – Channel 10
- To observe the meeting by video conference, please click on this link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82007817203> at the noticed meeting time. Instructions on how to join a meeting by video conference are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362193>, which is a webpage entitled “Joining a Meeting”
- To listen to the meeting by phone, please call the numbers below at the noticed meeting time: Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):  
+1 669 900 9128 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 301 715 8592  
Webinar ID: 820 0781 7203  
Passcode: 995091

After calling any of these phone numbers, if you are asked for a participant ID or code, press #. Instructions on how to join a meeting by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663>, which is a webpage entitled “Joining a Meeting By Phone.”

**PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT:** There are three ways to make public comment within the time allotted for public comment on an eligible Agenda item.

- Comment in advance. To send your comment directly to the Commission and staff BEFORE the meeting starts, please send your comment, along with your full name and agenda item number you are commenting on, to [tgilmore@oaklandca.gov](mailto:tgilmore@oaklandca.gov). Please note that e-Comment **submissions close at 4:30 pm**. All submitted public comment will be provided to the Commissioners prior to the meeting.
- By Video Conference. To comment by Zoom video conference, click the “Raise Your Hand” button to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on an eligible agenda item at the beginning of the meeting. You will then be unmuted, during your turn, and allowed to participate in public comment. After the allotted time, you will then be re-muted. Instructions on how to “Raise Your Hand” are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/205566129>, which is a webpage entitled “Raise Hand In Webinar.”
- By Phone. To comment by phone, please call on one of the above listed phone numbers. You will be prompted to “Raise Your Hand” by pressing STAR-NINE (“\*9”) to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on an eligible agenda item at the beginning of the meeting. Once it is your turn, you will be unmuted and allowed to make your comment. After the allotted time, you will be re-muted. Instructions of how to raise your hand by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663>, which is a webpage entitled “Joining a Meeting by Phone.”

If you have any questions about these protocols, please e-mail [tgilmore@oaklandca.gov](mailto:tgilmore@oaklandca.gov).



# OAKLAND POLICE COMMISSION

## REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

July 14, 2022  
6:30 PM

The purpose of the Oakland Police Commission is to oversee the Oakland Police Department to ensure its policies, practices, and customs conform to national standards of constitutional policing, and to oversee the Office of the Inspector General, led by the civilian Office of Inspector General for the Department, as well as the Community Police Review Agency (CPRA), led by the Executive Director of the Agency, which investigates police misconduct and recommends discipline.

### I. Call to Order, Welcome, Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

Chair Tyfahra Milele

*Roll Call: Chair Tyfahra Milele; Vice Chair Marsha Peterson; Commissioner Brenda Harbin-Forte; Commissioner Rudolph Howell; Commissioner Jesse Hsieh; Commissioner Regina Jackson, Commissioner David Jordan; Alternate Commissioner Angela Jackson-Castain; Alternate Commissioner Karely Ordaz*

### II. Open Forum Part 1 (2 minutes per speaker, 15 minutes total)

After ascertaining how many members of the public wish to speak, Chair Tyfahra Milele will invite Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on matters that are not on tonight's agenda but are related to the Commission's work should raise their hands and they will be called on in the order their hands were raised. Comments regarding agenda items should be held until the agenda item is called for discussion. Speakers not able to address the Commission during this Open Forum will be given priority to speak during Open Forum Part 2, at the end of the agenda.

### III. Update from Police Chief

OPD Chief Armstrong will provide an update on the Department. Topics discussed in the update may include crime statistics; an update on the Negotiated Settlement Agreement and the latest report; a preview of topics which may be placed on a future agenda; responses to community member questions sent in advance to the Police Commission Chair; and specific topics requested in advance by Commissioners. ***This is a recurring item. (Attachment 1).***

- a. Discussion
- b. Public Comment
- c. Action, if any

### IV. Update from the Office of the Inspector General (OIG)

Inspector General Michelle Phillips will report on the OIG's work. ***This is a recurring item. (Attachment 2).***

- a. Discussion
- b. Public Comment
- c. Action, if any

### V. Review and Consideration of Response to the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Memorandum

The Commission will hear from the OIG regarding a proposal for the Commission to exercise its oversight and policy powers to discontinue the practice of sharing Internal Affairs Division (IAD)

reports and investigative analysis with the Community Police Review Agency (CPRA). ***This item is new item. (Attachment 3)***

- a. Discussion
- b. Public Comment
- c. Action, if any

**VI. Presentation from Commission Counsel**

The Commission will hear a presentation on Brown Act, Government Code and Commission Rules with Respect to Quorum Requirements, Voting and Ad Hoc Committee Membership

- a. Discussion
- b. Public Comment
- c. Action, if any

**VII. Committee Reports**

Representatives from Standing and Ad Hoc Committees will provide updates on their work. ***This is a recurring item. (Attachment 4).***

**Body Worn Camera Policy**

**(Commissioners Peterson, Harbin-Forte, Hsieh)**

This Ad Hoc Committee is tasked with the review and revision of the Oakland Police Department's Body Worn Camera Policy.

**Community Outreach**

**(Commissioners Howell, Hsieh, Jordan)**

The objective of this Ad Hoc is to increase public awareness and knowledge of the Commission's work and ensure broad community voices, especially from the most marginalized, are elevated. This Ad Hoc will also oversee the community engagement and outreach of the CPRA, the IG's office and to some extent the OPD. Additionally, this Ad Hoc will work to set the guidelines for how Commission Ad Hoc's are formed and run.

**Chief of Staff Search**

**(Commissioners Milele, Jackson, Jordan)**

This Ad Hoc is tasked with recruiting for the open Chief of Staff position, serving the Oakland Police Commission.

**Racial Profiling**

**(Committee as a whole)**

The purpose of this Ad Hoc is to gather information and make recommendations for an updated policy to effectively reduce racial profiling.

- a. Discussion
- b. Public Comment
- c. Action, if any

**VIII. Open Forum Part 2 (2 minutes per speaker)**

Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on matters that were not on tonight's agenda but are related to the Commission's work should raise their hands and they will be called on in the order their hands were raised. ***Persons who spoke during Open Forum Part 1 will not be called upon to speak again without prior approval of the Commission's Chairperson.***

**IX. Upcoming/Future Agenda Items**

The Commission will engage in a working session to discuss and determine agenda items for the upcoming Commission meeting and to agree on a list of agenda items to be discussed on future agendas. ***This is a recurring item.*** ([Attachment 5](#)).

- a. Discussion
- b. Public Comment
- c. Action, if any

**X. Adjournment**

**NOTICE:** In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, for those requiring special assistance to access the videoconference meeting, to access written documents being discussed at the Discipline Committee meeting, or to otherwise participate at Commission meetings, please contact [tgilmore@oaklandca.gov](mailto:tgilmore@oaklandca.gov) for assistance. Notification at least 48 hours before the meeting will enable the Police Commission to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting and to provide any required accommodations, auxiliary aids or services.



# Weekly Crime Report — Citywide

## 27 Jun. – 03 Jul., 2022

<b>Part 1 Crimes</b> <i>All totals include attempts except homicides.</i>	<b>Weekly Total</b>	<b>YTD 2020</b>	<b>YTD 2021</b>	<b>YTD 2022</b>	<b>YTD % Change</b> 2021 vs. 2022	<b>3-Year YTD Average</b>	<b>YTD 2022 vs. 3-Year YTD Average</b>
<b>Violent Crime Index</b> (homicide, aggravated assault, rape, robbery)	82	2,938	3,411	3,020	-11%	3,123	-3%
<b>Homicide – 187(a)PC</b>	3	37	60	55	-8%	51	9%
<b>Homicide – All Other *</b>	-	3	6	2	-67%	4	-45%
<b>Subtotal - 187(a)PC + all other</b>	3	40	66	57	-14%	54	5%
<b>Aggravated Assault</b>	37	1,552	1,864	1,504	-19%	1,640	-8%
Assault with a firearm – 245(a)(2)PC	4	187	323	244	-24%	251	-3%
<b>Subtotal - Homicides + Firearm Assault</b>	7	227	389	301	-23%	306	-2%
Shooting occupied home or vehicle – 246PC	6	165	300	184	-39%	216	-15%
Shooting unoccupied home or vehicle – 247(b)PC	1	82	140	83	-41%	102	-18%
Non-firearm aggravated assaults	26	1,118	1,101	993	-10%	1,071	-7%
<b>Rape</b>	3	116	72	73	1%	87	-16%
<b>Robbery</b>	39	1,233	1,415	1,388	-2%	1,345	3%
Firearm	20	359	569	606	7%	511	19%
Knife	2	101	64	45	-30%	70	-36%
Strong-arm	12	551	427	375	-12%	451	-17%
Other dangerous weapon	1	36	41	40	-2%	39	3%
Residential robbery – 212.5(a)PC	-	51	47	30	-36%	43	-30%
Carjacking – 215(a) PC	4	135	267	292	9%	231	26%
<b>Burglary</b>	22	5,572	4,295	5,336	24%	5,068	5%
Auto	11	4,141	3,350	4,194	25%	3,895	8%
Residential	3	684	526	485	-8%	565	-14%
Commercial	2	612	289	497	72%	466	7%
Other (Includes boats, aircraft, and so on)	2	98	92	46	-50%	79	-42%
Unknown	4	37	38	114	200%	63	81%
<b>Motor Vehicle Theft</b>	110	4,503	4,638	4,576	-1%	4,572	0%
<b>Larceny</b>	34	3,532	2,891	3,102	7%	3,175	-2%
<b>Arson</b>	4	95	100	90	-10%	95	-5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>16,643</b>	<b>15,341</b>	<b>16,126</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>16,037</b>	<b>1%</b>

**THIS REPORT IS HIERARCHY BASED. CRIME TOTALS REFLECT ONE OFFENSE (THE MOST SEVERE) PER INCIDENT.**

These statistics are drawn from the Oakland Police Dept. database. They are unaudited and not used to figure the crime numbers reported to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. This report is run by the date the crimes occurred. Statistics can be affected by late reporting, the geocoding process, or the reclassification or unbounding of crimes. Because crime reporting and data entry can run behind, all crimes may not be recorded.

\* Justified, accidental, foetal, or manslaughter by negligence. Traffic collision fatalities are not included in this report.  
PNC = Percentage not calculated — [Percentage cannot be calculated.](#)  
All data extracted via Coplink Analytics.



# Weekly Gunfire Summary

## 27 Jun. – 03 Jul., 2022

<b>Citywide</b> <i>All totals include attempts except homicides.</i>	<b>Weekly Total</b>	<b>YTD 2020</b>	<b>YTD 2021</b>	<b>YTD 2022</b>	<b>YTD % Change</b> 2021 vs. 2022	<b>3-Year YTD Average</b>	<b>YTD 2022 vs. 3-Year YTD Average</b>
Homicide – 187(a)PC	3	37	60	55	-8%	51	9%
Homicide – All Other *	-	3	6	2	-67%	4	-45%
<b>Subtotal - 187(a)PC + all other</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>-14%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>5%</b>
Assault with a firearm – 245(a)(2)PC	4	187	323	244	-24%	251	-3%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2)</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>-23%</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>-2%</b>
Shooting occupied home or vehicle – 246PC	6	165	300	184	-39%	216	-15%
Shooting unoccupied home or vehicle – 247(b)PC	1	82	140	83	-41%	102	-18%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2) + 246 + 247(b)</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>829</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>-31%</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>-9%</b>
Negligent discharge of a firearm – 246.3PC	23	416	954	824	-14%	731	13%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>1,783</b>	<b>1,392</b>	<b>-22%</b>	<b>1,355</b>	<b>3%</b>

<b>Area 1</b> <i>All totals include attempts except homicides.</i>	<b>Weekly Total</b>	<b>YTD 2020</b>	<b>YTD 2021</b>	<b>YTD 2022</b>	<b>YTD % Change</b> 2021 vs. 2022	<b>3-Year YTD Average</b>	<b>YTD 2022 vs. 3-Year YTD Average</b>
Homicide – 187(a)PC	-	4	9	13	44%	9	50%
Homicide – All Other *	-	-	-	1	PNC	0	200%
<b>Subtotal - 187(a)PC + all other</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>56%</b>
Assault with a firearm – 245(a)(2)PC	-	22	42	49	17%	38	30%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>35%</b>
Shooting occupied home or vehicle – 246PC	-	22	49	31	-37%	34	-9%
Shooting unoccupied home or vehicle – 247(b)PC	-	13	20	13	-35%	15	-15%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2) + 246 + 247(b)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>-11%</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>11%</b>
Negligent discharge of a firearm – 246.3PC	1	37	79	57	-28%	58	-1%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>-18%</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>7%</b>

**THIS REPORT IS HIERARCHY BASED. CRIME TOTALS REFLECT ONE OFFENSE (THE MOST SEVERE) PER INCIDENT.**

These statistics are drawn from the Oakland Police Dept. database. They are unaudited and not used to figure the crime numbers reported to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. This report is run by the date the crimes occurred. Statistics can be affected by late reporting, the geocoding process, or the reclassification or unbounding of crimes. Because crime reporting and data entry can run behind, all crimes may not be recorded.

\* Justified, accidental, foetal, or manslaughter by negligence. Traffic collision fatalities are not included in this report.  
PNC = Percentage not calculated — [Percentage cannot be calculated.](#)  
All data extracted via Coplink Analytics.



# Weekly Gunfire Summary

**27 Jun. – 03 Jul., 2022**

<b>Area 2</b> <i>All totals include attempts except homicides.</i>	Weekly Total	YTD 2020	YTD 2021	YTD 2022	YTD % Change 2021 vs. 2022	3-Year YTD Average	YTD 2022 vs. 3-Year YTD Average
Homicide – 187(a)PC	-	-	3	-	-100%	1	PNC
Homicide – All Other *	-	-	-	-	PNC	-	PNC
<b>Subtotal - 187(a)PC + all other</b>	-	-	3	-	-100%	1	PNC
Assault with a firearm – 245(a)(2)PC	2	10	19	18	-5%	16	15%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2)</b>	2	10	22	18	-18%	17	8%
Shooting occupied home or vehicle – 246PC	-	7	6	6	0%	6	-5%
Shooting unoccupied home or vehicle – 247(b)PC	-	2	3	2	-33%	2	-14%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2) + 246 + 247(b)</b>	2	19	31	26	-16%	25	3%
Negligent discharge of a firearm – 246.3PC	1	9	19	19	0%	16	21%
<b>Grand Total</b>	3	28	50	45	-10%	41	10%

<b>Area 3</b> <i>All totals include attempts except homicides.</i>	Weekly Total	YTD 2020	YTD 2021	YTD 2022	YTD % Change 2021 vs. 2022	3-Year YTD Average	YTD 2022 vs. 3-Year YTD Average
Homicide – 187(a)PC	2	6	11	11	0%	9	18%
Homicide – All Other *	-	-	-	-	PNC	-	PNC
<b>Subtotal - 187(a)PC + all other</b>	2	6	11	11	0%	9	18%
Assault with a firearm – 245(a)(2)PC	-	27	47	43	-9%	39	10%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2)</b>	2	33	58	54	-7%	48	12%
Shooting occupied home or vehicle – 246PC	-	16	23	17	-26%	19	-9%
Shooting unoccupied home or vehicle – 247(b)PC	-	10	18	9	-50%	12	-27%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2) + 246 + 247(b)</b>	2	59	99	80	-19%	79	1%
Negligent discharge of a firearm – 246.3PC	3	50	87	107	23%	81	32%
<b>Grand Total</b>	5	109	186	187	1%	161	16%

**THIS REPORT IS HIERARCHY BASED. CRIME TOTALS REFLECT ONE OFFENSE (THE MOST SEVERE) PER INCIDENT.**

These statistics are drawn from the Oakland Police Dept. database. They are unaudited and not used to figure the crime numbers reported to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. This report is run by the date the crimes occurred. Statistics can be affected by late reporting, the geocoding process, or the reclassification or unfounding of crimes. Because crime reporting and data entry can run behind, all crimes may not be recorded.

\* Justified, accidental, foetal, or manslaughter by negligence. Traffic collision fatalities are not included in this report.  
PNC = Percentage not calculated — [Percentage cannot be calculated.](#)  
All data extracted via Coplink Analytics.



# Weekly Gunfire Summary

## 27 Jun. – 03 Jul., 2022

<b>Area 4</b> <i>All totals include attempts except homicides.</i>	Weekly Total	YTD 2020	YTD 2021	YTD 2022	YTD % Change 2021 vs. 2022	3-Year YTD Average	YTD 2022 vs. 3-Year YTD Average
Homicide – 187(a)PC	1	9	8	15	88%	11	41%
Homicide – All Other *	-	1	-	-	PNC	0	PNC
<b>Subtotal - 187(a)PC + all other</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>36%</b>
Assault with a firearm – 245(a)(2)PC	1	22	51	29	-43%	34	-15%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>-25%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>-2%</b>
Shooting occupied home or vehicle – 246PC	2	25	38	31	-18%	31	-1%
Shooting unoccupied home or vehicle – 247(b)PC	1	10	15	17	13%	14	21%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2) + 246 + 247(b)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>-18%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>2%</b>
Negligent discharge of a firearm – 246.3PC	6	71	152	137	-10%	120	14%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>-13%</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>9%</b>

<b>Area 5</b> <i>All totals include attempts except homicides.</i>	Weekly Total	YTD 2020	YTD 2021	YTD 2022	YTD % Change 2021 vs. 2022	3-Year YTD Average	YTD 2022 vs. 3-Year YTD Average
Homicide – 187(a)PC	-	10	10	9	-10%	10	-7%
Homicide – All Other *	-	-	2	1	-50%	1	0%
<b>Subtotal - 187(a)PC + all other</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>-17%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>-6%</b>
Assault with a firearm – 245(a)(2)PC	-	43	70	46	-34%	53	-13%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>-32%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>-12%</b>
Shooting occupied home or vehicle – 246PC	2	45	101	55	-46%	67	-18%
Shooting unoccupied home or vehicle – 247(b)PC	-	22	45	22	-51%	30	-26%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2) + 246 + 247(b)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>-42%</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>-17%</b>
Negligent discharge of a firearm – 246.3PC	7	116	294	269	-9%	226	19%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>-23%</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>4%</b>

**THIS REPORT IS HIERARCHY BASED. CRIME TOTALS REFLECT ONE OFFENSE (THE MOST SEVERE) PER INCIDENT.**

These statistics are drawn from the Oakland Police Dept. database. They are unaudited and not used to figure the crime numbers reported to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. This report is run by the date the crimes occurred. Statistics can be affected by late reporting, the geocoding process, or the reclassification or unbounding of crimes. Because crime reporting and data entry can run behind, all crimes may not be recorded.

\* Justified, accidental, foetal, or manslaughter by negligence. Traffic collision fatalities are not included in this report.  
PNC = Percentage not calculated — [Percentage cannot be calculated.](#)  
All data extracted via Coplink Analytics.



# Weekly Gunfire Summary

## 27 Jun. – 03 Jul., 2022

<b>Area 6</b> <i>All totals include attempts except homicides.</i>	<b>Weekly Total</b>	<b>YTD 2020</b>	<b>YTD 2021</b>	<b>YTD 2022</b>	<b>YTD % Change 2021 vs. 2022</b>	<b>3-Year YTD Average</b>	<b>YTD 2022 vs. 3-Year YTD Average</b>
Homicide – 187(a)PC	-	8	19	7	-63%	11	-38%
Homicide – All Other *	-	2	4	-	-100%	2	PNC
<b>Subtotal - 187(a)PC + all other</b>	-	10	23	7	-70%	13	-48%
Assault with a firearm – 245(a)(2)PC	1	55	86	50	-42%	64	-21%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2)</b>	1	65	109	57	-48%	77	-26%
Shooting occupied home or vehicle – 246PC	2	46	82	44	-46%	57	-23%
Shooting unoccupied home or vehicle – 247(b)PC	-	24	35	19	-46%	26	-27%
<b>Subtotal - 187 + 245(a)(2) + 246 + 247(b)</b>	3	135	226	120	-47%	160	-25%
Negligent discharge of a firearm – 246.3PC	5	126	314	223	-29%	221	1%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>-36%</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>-10%</b>

**THIS REPORT IS HIERARCHY BASED. CRIME TOTALS REFLECT ONE OFFENSE (THE MOST SEVERE) PER INCIDENT.**

These statistics are drawn from the Oakland Police Dept. database. They are unaudited and not used to figure the crime numbers reported to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. This report is run by the date the crimes occurred. Statistics can be affected by late reporting, the geocoding process, or the reclassification or unfounding of crimes. Because crime reporting and data entry can run behind, all crimes may not be recorded.

\* Justified, accidental, foetal, or manslaughter by negligence. Traffic collision fatalities are not included in this report.  
PNC = Percentage not calculated — [Percentage cannot be calculated.](#)  
All data extracted via Coplink Analytics.



**2022 Year-to-Date Recovered Guns**

Recoveries through 03 Jul., 2022

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>861</b>
--------------------	------------

<b>Crime Recoveries</b>	
Felony	431
Felony - Violent	116
Homicide	18
Infraction	0
Misdemeanor	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>585</b>

<b>Crime Gun Types</b>	<b>Felony</b>	<b>Felony - Violent</b>	<b>Homicide</b>	<b>Infraction</b>	<b>Misdemeanor</b>	<b>Total</b>
Machine Gun	1					1
Other	3					3
Pistol	364	81	15		16	476
Revolver	4	9	1		2	16
Rifle	38	16	2		2	58
Sawed Off	2					2
Shotgun	7	8				15
Sub-Machinegun						0
Unknown/Unstated	12	2				14
<b>Total</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>585</b>

<b>Non-Criminal Recoveries</b>	
Death Investigation	5
Found Property	208
SafeKeeping	63
<b>Total</b>	<b>276</b>

<b>Non-Criminal Gun Types</b>	<b>Death Investigation</b>	<b>Found Property</b>	<b>SafeKeeping</b>	<b>Total</b>
Machine Gun				0
Other		4	1	5
Pistol	3	66	32	101
Revolver	2	36	7	45
Rifle		58	17	75
Sawed Off		2		2
Shotgun		28	4	32
Sub-Machinegun		3		3
Unknown/Unstated		11	2	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>276</b>



### 2022 vs. 2021 — Year-to-Date Recovered Guns

Recoveries through 03 Jul.

Gun Recoveries	2021	2022	Difference	YTD % Change 2021 vs. 2022
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>42%</b>

Crime Recoveries	2021	2022	Difference	YTD % Change 2021 vs. 2022
Felony	309	431	122	39%
Felony - Violent	119	116	-3	-3%
Homicide	16	18	2	13%
Infraction	0	0	0	PNC
Misdemeanor	19	20	1	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>585</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>26%</b>

Non-Criminal Recoveries	2021	2022	Difference	YTD % Change 2021 vs. 2022
Death Investigation	14	5	-9	-64%
Found Property	57	208	151	265%
SafeKeeping	74	63	-11	-15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>90%</b>

PNC = Percentage not calculated  
[Percentage cannot be calculated.](#)

(No subject)

OPD Media <opdmedia@oaklandca.gov>

Wed 6/29/2022 8:39 AM

To:

- OPD Media <opdmedia@oaklandca.gov>

## Located:

Thank you to our community and media partners, Zoe Hunt is no longer a #Missing Person.

## Background:



For Immediate Release June 16, 2022

OPD NEWS:

## Missing Person Zoe Hunt: At Risk

The Oakland Police Department is requesting assistance from our community and media partners in locating Missing Person, Zoe Hunt, who is **at risk**.



## Missing Person Zoe Hunt

She was last seen on June 14, 2022, around 8:00 PM in the 3800 block of Market Street. Hunt was wearing a brown bonnet, brown zip-up sweater, blue t-shirt, gray pajama pants and black Vans shoes.

Hunt is described as an 18-year-old, black female. She stands 5'8" and weighs 125 pounds with black hair and brown eyes.

If you have any knowledge or information regarding the whereabouts of Hunt, please notify the **Oakland Police Department's Missing Persons Unit at 510-238-3641**.

Visit [Nixle.com](https://www.nixle.com) to receive Oakland Police Department alerts, advisories, and community messages, or follow OPD on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram @oaklandpoliceca.



CITY OF OAKLAND

Oakland Police Commission

Office of the Inspector General

## AGENDA REPORT

**TO:** Tyfahra Milele  
Chair, Oakland Police Commission

**FROM:** Michelle Phillips  
Inspector General

**SUBJECT:** Office of the Inspector General (OIG)  
Progress Report

**DATE:** July 14, 2022

### PURPOSE

The Inspector General reports to the Police Commission and members of the public as requested by the Police Commission. This report outlines updates from the OIG since the Inspector General reported to the Police Commission on June 9, 2022. The information compromised in this report is also intended to answer OIG specific questions raised at Police Commission meetings since the last OIG report. The OIG is committed to accountability, transparency, and impartiality as it conducts its work.

### NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT (NSA, MEASURE S1 MANDATE)

The OIG has finalized its scope for the first audit/review of Oakland Police Department (OPD) mandated task 42. As of this report, the OPD has been given the letter of engagement that outlines the scope and objectives of the audit/review. The letter also lists documents requested for OIG review. The Chief of Police has acknowledged receipt of the document and has his staff working on fulfilling the document request.

Further, the OIG continues to observe OPD meetings, to include Risk Management, Force Review Boards, and Internal Affairs. The OIG also attends virtual site visits conducted by the Independent Monitoring Team. There will be continued conversations and workgroups with OPD as the City moves through the sustainability period.

### THE BEY MATTERS

The OIG continues to work diligently on the Bey Matters. Since the OIG's last report, there have been several document requests submitted to various City agencies, including the Community Police Review Agency and the OPD. All information requested is germane to the review. The review is active and ongoing therefore the OIG will not be able to provide any lessons learned or recommendations until its completion. There are several layers to this complete review and the OIG is working through the best way to present that information.

Police Commission Meeting  
July 14, 2022

**CITY COUNCIL AUDIT**

Prior to the appointment of the current Inspector General, the City Council requested an audit of OPD’s calls for service. On Thursday, June 23, 2022, the OIG met with the City Council President’s staff to discuss audit scope and timelines. There will need to be additional meetings and conversations, to identify a clear scope and objective for the requested audit.

**OIG STAFF UPDATE**

The City Council approved the mid-cycle budget requests submitted by the City Administrator on behalf of the OIG. On Thursday, June 16, 2022, the OIG attended the Civil Service Board meeting regarding the Inspector General Program and Performance Auditor Manager position.<sup>1</sup> While this job classification continues through the approval process, the OIG elected to move forward with recruiting for an exempt limited duration employee (ELDE). The OIG identified a skilled individual with police oversight, audit and management experience and extended an offer of employment for this temporary role. The individual is currently completing the hiring process and has an anticipated start date of July 23, 2022.

The OIG is pleased to report that on June 25, 2022, Ms. Marubeth Sanchez was hired as the Executive Assistant to the Inspector General, in an ELDE role. Ms. Sanchez has office management and executive assistant experience working in an Inspectors General office in another jurisdiction. Ms. Sanchez is bilingual in Spanish and English and skilled in the administration of confidential tasks, report formatting and release, scheduling, graphic design, and website/social media communications. Ms. Sanchez is scheduled for training with the Citywide Communications department on Friday July 8, 2022.

Lastly, the OIG is developing job specifications for the position of Deputy Inspector General (DIG) as funding for this position was awarded during the mid-year budget cycle. Once the job specifications completed and approved, the OIG will dissolve the Chief of Staff position as there will no longer be funding for that role. The Chief of Staff position may be revisited at a later date if the OIG expands and there is a need for the role.

**LIMITED SCOPE PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

In early February 2022, the OIG initiated a preliminary review of IAD and CPRA’s practice of sharing draft reports of investigations, prior to the conclusion of each agency’s independent investigation. This practice posed a concern regarding the perception and practice of investigations being conducted in a manner that was not independent in nature. This review was initiated and completed during the former CPRA Director’s tenure. The practice referenced in the review has discontinued, per the Police Commission’s directive. The OIG strives to be as transparent as possible as a result, the OIG previously reported on this review verbally but has attached the final written report and Police Commission’s response for members of the public to view (Attachment 1).

<sup>1</sup> The agenda for the Civil Service Board can be located at this website: <https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Civil-Service-Board-Regular-Meeting-Agenda-Packet-June-16-2022.pdf>

**OIG COMMUNITY MEETINGS AND OUTREACH**

During the month of June 2022, the OIG participated in community clean ups, attended the City of Oakland’s Town Hall Series, Juneteenth forums, and Oakland Pride events. During these events the OIG was able to inform and educate the community about the roles and responsibilities of the OIG. These types of engagement activities have helped the OIG establish a presence in the Oakland community. We will continue to participate, engage, and expand these efforts as the OIG grows. The OIG has been invited to engage with several organizations in July to include the Coalition for Police Accountability. Ms. Sanchez is working on the OIG social media presence and website. The OIG currently has Facebook and LinkedIn pages that are being developed.

For questions regarding this report, please contact Michelle Phillips, Inspector General, at OIG@oaklandca.gov.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Michelle N. Phillips  
Inspector General  
Office of the Inspector General

Attachments

- 1. OIG Public Synopsis for Limited Scope Preliminary Review: Report of Investigation

**Public Synopsis**  
**Limited Scope Preliminary Review:**  
**Reports of Investigation**

# OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL



CITY OF OAKLAND

**Oakland Police Commission**

**Office of the Inspector General**

---

## **Public Synopsis**

Limited Scope Preliminary Review:

Reports of Investigation

Released: July 8, 2022

*Michelle N. Phillips, Inspector General*



Office of the Inspector General  
Michelle N. Phillips, Inspector General  
250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza  
Oakland, California 94612



Attachment 2

July 8, 2022

Dear Residents of the City of Oakland,

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) is responsible for monitoring the Oakland Police Department's (OPD) compliance with policies, procedures, and laws intended to further strengthen the City's ability to decrease instances of police misconduct. This oversight also includes but is not limited to auditing and reviewing the Community Police Review Agency's (the Agency) complaint and investigative process, compliant with the City Charter<sup>1</sup> and enabling ordinances. The OIG provides reports and recommendations to the Police Commission as the action holder for implementation. The OIG's primary charge is overseeing the city's compliance with the negotiated settlement agreement.

### **Background**

In 2016, residents of the City of Oakland voted to approve Measure LL. This measure established the Oakland Police Commission, which is charged with overseeing the OPD policies and procedures as they relate to constitutional policing, procedural justice, equity, and accountability. Measure LL also established the Agency, which is tasked with investigating complaints of police misconduct. The intent of Measure LL as it relates to the Agency was to establish an independent civilian oversight body dedicated to the investigation of officer misconduct.

In 2020, Measure S1 was passed to amend Measure LL and strengthen Oakland's police reform efforts. Measure S1 established an independent OIG that reports to the Police Commission and oversees OPD's compliance with policies, procedures, and laws through the negotiated settlement agreement. The OIG's jurisdiction includes examining the Agency's investigative actions and providing reports and recommendations to the Police Commission for substantive improvement and change.

The Oakland Police Commission appointed the Inspector General in January 2022. Shortly after the appointment, the OIG observed the practice of OPD's Internal Affairs Division (IAD) sending draft Reports of Investigations (ROI) to the Agency prior to the Agency's completion of their independent and parallel investigation.

### **Preliminary Review and Methodology**

The OIG conducted a preliminary review into the practice of IAD giving ROIs to the Agency prior to the Agency concluding their independent investigations. The preliminary review included discussions with OPD and the Agency, legal guidance from the Oakland City Attorney's Office, as well as an analysis of the following documents:

---

<sup>1</sup> Also referred to Oakland Municipal Code

- *Delphine Allen et al. v. City of Oakland*
  - Negotiated Settlement Agreement
- Measure LL
- Measure S1
- IAD investigative policies

The OIG also requested the Agency's standard operating procedures (SOPs) to determine how investigations are to be conducted. However, the OIG was informed that the Agency was working on SOPs, and that the document had not yet been completed. To navigate the relative absence of SOPs, the Agency has a series of expectations that are conveyed via emails, team meetings, and standard forms, and checklists. It is to be noted that this guidance is not provided in a comprehensive policy manual for Agency employees. The Agency's lack of completed SOPs outlined in a comprehensive document posed a limitation to this OIG review.

During discussions with the Agency and the IAD, it was determined that IAD sends the draft ROIs to the Agency because the Agency requests the documents. The Agency contends the practice was inherited from past management.<sup>2</sup> The OIG confirmed the practice was in place during the time of the Civilian Police Review Board and subsequently after the change to the Agency.<sup>3</sup>

### **City Charter Analysis**

According to Measure S1 604(f) § 1, the Agency shall not be required to investigate each public complaint it receives, beyond the initial intake procedure, but shall investigate public complaints involving uses of force, in-custody deaths, profiling based on any of the protected characteristics identified by federal, state, or local law, untruthfulness, and First Amendment assemblies. The Agency shall also investigate any other possible misconduct or failure to act of a Department sworn employee, whether or not the subject of a public complaint, as directed by the Commission.<sup>4</sup>

It is important to note that Measure S1 604(g), § 3 states in part that the Chief of Police prepares his or her own findings, proposes discipline and provides that information to the Agency before the Agency's investigation is initiated or completed. The Agency may close its investigation or may choose not to conduct its own investigation in order to allow final discipline to proceed as proposed by the Chief, except that in investigations of Level 1 uses of force, sexual misconduct or untruthfulness, the Commission must approve the Agency's decision by a majority vote. Further, in accordance with the negotiated settlement agreement under Task 8, IAD is required to investigate Class I uses of force. Unless otherwise directed by the Chief of Police or acceptable designee (i.e., Acting Chief, Assistant Chief, or Deputy Chief), Class I offenses shall be investigated by IAD investigators.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Civilian Police Review Board (CPRB) was renamed to the Community Police Review Agency in December 2017; staff and leadership remained in place at that time.

<sup>3</sup> OIG has continued practiced from 2017 through stop of practice at direction of the Commission

<sup>4</sup> Measure LL and Measure S1 can be reviewed at <https://www.oaklandca.gov/resources/learn-more-about-measure-ll>

<sup>5</sup> The Negotiated Settlement Agreement in its entirety can be reviewed at <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/oakca1/groups/police/documents/report/dowd006410.pdf>.

The OIG is unable to find any language that states IAD or OPD is required to submit a draft or completed ROI to either investigative entity prior to the completion of their mandated independent investigations. However, the OIG must note that there is language in Measure S1 604 (f) § 2 that states in part, subject to applicable law and provisions of this Charter § 604, the Commission, OIG, and Agency shall have the same access to all Department files and records, including IAD files and records, related to sworn employees of the Department, in addition to all files and records of other City departments and agencies related to sworn employees of the Department, as IAD, including but not limited to the same access to electronic data bases as IAD as permitted by law.

The OIG also reviewed the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) Code of Ethics and the Association of Inspectors General (AIG) Principles and Standards. NACOLE states civilian oversight practitioners have a unique role as public servants overseeing law enforcement agencies. The community, government, and law enforcement have entrusted them to conduct their work in a professional, fair, and impartial manner. They earn this trust through a firm commitment to the public good, the mission of their agency, and to the ethical and professional standards described herein. The Code of Ethics states in part that civilian oversight practitioners should be independent and thorough and conduct oversight activities with transparency and confidentiality in mind.<sup>6</sup> AIG recommends in part that investigative assignments must be free from personal or external impairments to independence and should constantly maintain an independent attitude and appearance.<sup>7</sup>

### **Findings and Recommendations**

The OIG has determined that the Agency and IAD are required to conduct parallel or simultaneous investigations of Class I misconduct violations. The example ROI noted in this document contained an allegation of a Class 1 offense, use of excessive force. Therefore, both the Agency and IAD would have been required to investigate the complaint.

Allowing, the Agency to receive any variation of the IAD ROI or vice versa, prior to the completion of both investigations, calls into question the independence of each process and the ultimate decision on discipline. The Agency has stated that they do not have the resources that IAD has and therefore IAD is able to complete their investigations faster.

To preserve the independence and integrity of the Agency's investigations and pursuant to NACOLE and AIG best practices, the OIG recommends to the Police Commission that the Agency discontinue the practice of reviewing IAD reports or being made privy to any of the investigative analysis of IAD prior to the completion of their own investigative process. Since it is noted that the Agency does not have any SOPs, it is also recommended that the Police Commission seek to understand why complaint and investigative processes and procedures have not been established to govern the processes within the Agency and mandate the Agency establish SOPs in accordance with the enabling ordinance.

---

<sup>6</sup> Information is derived from National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement [https://www.nacole.org/nacole\\_code\\_of\\_ethics\\_2](https://www.nacole.org/nacole_code_of_ethics_2)

<sup>7</sup> Information is derived from the Association of Inspectors General website. <http://inspectorsgeneral.org/files/2014/11/AIG-Principles-and-Standards-May-2014-Revision-2.pdf>. Although, CPRA is not the OIG, the principles of independent investigative oversight should apply regardless of the name of the agency as a best practice.

The OIG will continue to conduct reviews, audits, evaluations, and inspections of OPD and CPRA practices, policies, and procedures per its Charter mandate.

Respectfully,



Michelle N. Phillips,  
Inspector General

Cc: Honorable Mayor Libby Schaaf  
Honorable City Administrator Ed Reiskin  
Honorable Members of the City Council  
Honorable Members of the Police Commission

# Oakland Police Commission Response



## CITY OF OAKLAND

## POLICE COMMISSION

250 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA, SUITE 6302 • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612

June 30, 2022

Ms. Michelle Phillips  
Office of the Inspector General  
150 Frank Ogawa Plaza  
Suite 4313  
Oakland, California 94612

Re: CPRA Draft Report Sharing and Standard Operating Procedures

Dear IG Phillips,

The Oakland Police Commission (“Commission”) thanks the Inspector General (“IG”) for the detailed report proposing the Commission exercise its oversight and policy powers to discontinue the practice of sharing Internal Affairs Division (“IAD”) reports and investigative analysis with the Community Police Review Agency (“CPRA”), or vice versa, prior to both agencies’ respective completions of their own investigative processes. I share your stated interest in better ensuring the City of Oakland’s investigations reflect the utmost integrity and independence, both as to findings and as to levels of discipline.

You also memorialized in your report that after numerous requests, the CPRA provided you with no official, codified standard operating procedures (“SOPs”), and you recommended that we direct the CPRA Director to establish SOPs, in accordance with best practices and the Commission’s authority under the Charter and the Oakland Municipal Code. Like your recommendation about report sharing, this point is well taken and deserves the Commission’s immediate attention.

Please be advised that the Commission plans to agendaize both of these matters for its next regular meeting, on July 14, 2022

Sincerely,

Tyfahra Milele  
Chair, Oakland Police Commission

<b>From:</b>	Michelle N. Phillips Inspector General <i>MNP</i>	CITY OF OAKLAND  <b>MEMO</b>	Attachment 3  CITY OF OAKLAND Oakland Police Commission Office of the Inspector General
<b>Agency Name &amp; Address</b>	Office of the Inspector General 150 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Suite 4313 Oakland, California 94612		
<b>To:</b>	Tyfahra Milele, Oakland Police Commission Chair		
<b>Subject:</b>	Preliminary Review-Past Practices of Draft Report Sharing		

**Date: June 6, 2022**

## **Background**

In 2016, residents of the City of Oakland voted to approve Measure LL. This measure established the Oakland Police Commission, with overseeing the Oakland Police Department’s (OPD) policies and procedures as they relate to constitutional policing, procedural justice, equity, and accountability. Measure LL also established the Community Police Review Agency (Agency), which is tasked with investigating complaints of police misconduct. The intent of Measure LL as it relates to the Agency was to establish an independent oversight body dedicated to the investigation of officer misconduct.

In 2020, Measure S1 was passed to amend Measure LL and strengthen Oakland’s police reform efforts. Measure S1 created an independent Office of Inspector General (OIG) to monitor OPD’s compliance with policies, procedures, and laws intended to further strengthen the City’s ability to decrease cases of police misconduct. These reviews include examining the Agency’s investigative actions and providing reports and recommendations to the Police Commission. The OIG is also tasked with overseeing the city’s compliance with requirements of the negotiated settlement agreement.

The Oakland Police Commission appointed the Inspector General in January 2022. Shortly after the appointment, the OIG observed the practice of OPD’s internal affairs division (IAD) sending draft reports of investigations (ROI) to the Agency prior to the Agency’s completion of their independent, parallel investigation.

## **Preliminary Review and Methodology**

The OIG conducted a preliminary review into the practice of IAD giving ROIs to the Agency prior to the Agency concluding their independent investigations. The preliminary review included discussions with OPD and the Agency, legal guidance from the Oakland City’s Attorney’s Office, as well as an analysis of the following documents:

- *Delphine Allen et al. v. City of Oakland*
  - Negotiated Settlement Agreement
- Measure LL
- Measure S1
- IAD investigative policies

The OIG also requested the Agency’s standard operating procedures (SOPs) to determine how investigations are to be conducted. However, the OIG was informed that the Agency had been working on SOPs, but for a host of reasons the document had not yet been completed. To navigate the relative

absence of SOPs, the Agency has a series of expectations that are conveyed via emails, team meetings, and standard forms, and checklists. It is to be noted that this guidance is not provided in a comprehensive policy manual for Agency employees. The Agency's lack of completed SOPs outlined in a comprehensive document posed a limitation to this OIG review.

During discussions with the Agency and the IAD, it was determined that IAD sends the draft ROIs to the Agency because the Agency requests the documents. The Agency contends the practices was inherited from past management.<sup>1</sup> The OIG confirmed the practice was in place during the time of the Civilian Police Review Board and subsequently after the change to the Agency.

### **City Charter Analysis**

According to Measure S1 604(f) § 1, the Agency shall not be required to investigate each public complaint it receives, beyond the initial intake procedure, but shall investigate public complaints involving uses of force, in-custody deaths, profiling based on any of the protected characteristics identified by federal, state, or local law, untruthfulness, and First Amendment assemblies. The Agency shall also investigate any other possible misconduct or failure to act of a Department sworn employee, whether or not the subject of a public complaint, as directed by the Commission.<sup>2</sup>

It must be noted that in Measure S1 604(g), § 3 states in part that the Chief of Police prepares his or her own findings and proposed discipline and provides it to the Agency before the Agency's investigation is initiated or completed, the Agency may close its investigation or may choose not to conduct its own investigation in order to allow final discipline to proceed as proposed by the Chief, except that in investigations of Level 1 uses of force, sexual misconduct or untruthfulness, the Commission must approve the Agency's decision by a majority vote. Further, in accordance with the negotiated settlement agreement under Task 8, IAD is required to investigate class I uses of force. Unless otherwise directed by the Chief of Police or acceptable designee (i.e., Acting Chief, Assistant Chief, or Deputy Chief), Class I offenses shall be investigated by IAD investigators.<sup>3</sup>

The OIG is unable to find any language that states IAD or OPD is required to submit a draft or completed ROI to either investigative entity prior to the competition of their independent investigations. However, the OIG must note that there is language in Measure S1 604 (f) § 2 that states in part subject to applicable law and provisions of this Charter § 604, the Commission, OIG, and Agency shall have the same access to all Department files and records, including IAD files and records, related to sworn employees of the Department, in addition to all files and records of other City departments and agencies related to sworn employees of the Department, as IAD, including but not limited to the same access to electronic data bases as IAD as permitted by law.

The OIG also reviewed the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) Code of Ethics and the Association of Inspectors General (AIG) Principles and Standards. NACOLE states civilian oversight practitioners have a unique role as public servants overseeing law enforcement agencies.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Civilian Police Review Board (CPRB) was renamed to the Community Police Review Agency in December 2017. The staff and leadership stayed in place at that time.

<sup>2</sup> Measure LL and Measure S1 can be reviewed at <https://www.oaklandca.gov/resources/learn-more-about-measure-ll>

<sup>3</sup> The Negotiated Settlement Agreement in its entirety can be reviewed at <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/oakca1/groups/police/documents/report/dowd006410.pdf>.

The community, government, and law enforcement have entrusted them to conduct their work in a professional, fair and impartial manner. They earn this trust through a firm commitment to the public good, the mission of their agency, and to the ethical and professional standards described herein. The Code of Ethics states in part that civilian oversight practitioners should be independent and thorough and conduct oversight activities with transparency and confidentiality in mind.<sup>4</sup> AIG recommends in part that investigative assignments must be free from personal or external impairments to independence and should constantly maintain an independent attitude and appearance.<sup>5</sup>

### **Findings and Recommendations**

The OIG has determined that the Agency and IAD are required to conduct parallel or simultaneous class 1 use of force investigations. The example ROI noted in this document contained an allegation of a class 1 offense, use of excessive force. Therefore, the Agency and IAD would have been required to investigate the complaint.

Allowing, the Agency to receive any variation of the IAD ROI or vice versa, prior to the completion of both investigations calls into question the independence of each process and the ultimate decision on discipline. The Agency has stated that they do not have the resources that IAD has and therefore IAD is able to complete their investigations more quickly.

To preserve the independence and integrity of the Agency's investigations pursuant to NACOLE and AIG best practices, the OIG recommends to the Police Commission that the Agency discontinue the practice of being reviewing IAD reports or being made privy to any of the investigative analysis of IAD prior to the completion of their own investigative process. Since it is noted that the Agency does not have any SOPs, it is also recommended that the Police Commission seek to understand why investigative processes and procedures have not been established to govern the complaint and investigative process within in the Agency and mandate the Agency establish SOPs in accordance with the enabling ordinance.

As the appropriate management official for the Agency and in this instance the OPD, the OIG is requesting a written response from the Oakland Police Commission to what action you may take if any regarding this review and recommendation. The OIG respectfully requests the Oakland Commissions' official response be sent to Michelle Phillips, Inspector General at [mphillips@oaklandca.gov](mailto:mphillips@oaklandca.gov) by **June 30, 2022**. Please feel free to contact the Inspector General should you have any questions.

---

<sup>4</sup> Information is derived from National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement [https://www.nacole.org/nacole\\_code\\_of\\_ethics\\_2](https://www.nacole.org/nacole_code_of_ethics_2)

<sup>5</sup> Information is derived from the Association of Inspectors General website. <http://inspectorsgeneral.org/files/2014/11/AIG-Principles-and-Standards-May-2014-Revision-2.pdf>. Although, CPRA is not the OIG, the principles of independent investigative oversight should apply regardless of the name of the agency as a best practice.



**CITY OF OAKLAND | POLICE COMMISSION**  
250 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA, SUITE 6302 • OAKLAND, CA 94612

### Current Committees

Standing Committee	Commissioners
Personnel	Jackson

Ad Hoc Committee	Commissioners
Budget	Milele, Peterson
Body Worn Cameras Policy	Peterson, Harbin-Forte, Hsieh
Chief of Staff Search	Milele, Jackson, Jordan
Community Outreach	Howell, Hsieh, Jordan
Community Policing (15-01)	Harbin-Forte, Howell, Hsieh
CPRA Director + IG Performance Evaluation	Milele, Peterson
IG Policies	Peterson, Harbin-Forte, Jackson
Militarized Equipment Policy	Hsieh, Jordan
OBOA Allegations Investigation	Harbin-Forte, Jackson
Racial Profiling Policy	Milele, Jackson, Jordan
Rules of Procedure	Harbin-Forte

### Recently Completed/Paused/Dormant

Ad Hoc Committee	Commissioners
Annual Report	Milele, Jackson
Antidiscrimination Policy	Harbin-Forte, Hsieh, Jackson
Electronic Communication Devices	Howell, Harbin-Forte, Peterson
Police Chief Goals and Evaluation	Milele, Peterson, Jackson
Risk Management Policy	Peterson, Harbin-Forte, Howell
Social Media Policy	Milele, Hsieh, Jackson
White Supremacists and Other Extremist Groups	Harbin-Forte, Jackson

For a roster of current Commissioners and their emails, visit:  
<https://www.oaklandca.gov/teams/police-commission>

Police Commission Pending Agenda Matters List

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Agenda Matter	Duties/Deliverables	Additional Information/Details	Timeline for 2022	Measure LL ("Charter") and Enabling Ordinance ("Ord.") Sections
	Performance Reviews of CPRA Director and OPD Chief	Conduct performance reviews of the Agency Director and the Chief	The Commission shall determine the performance criteria for evaluating the Chief and the Agency Director, and communicate those criteria to the Chief and the Agency Director one full year before conducting the evaluation.		Ord. Section 2.45.070(G)
2	Provide Policy Guidelines to CPRA Director re Case Prioritization				Ord. § 2.45.070(I)
3	Advise OIG of Priorities, Functions, & Duties				Ord § 2.45.120
4	Solicit/Consider Public Input re Quality of Interactions with CPRA and Commission				Ord. § 2.45.070(Q)
5	Review and Comment on Proposed Budget for Education and Training re: Job-related stress, PTSD Signs and Symptoms, and Other Job-related Mental Health/Emotional Issues				Charter § 604(d)(1) and Ord § 2.45.090
6	Propose a Budget for Education and Training re: Job-related stress, PTSD Signs and Symptoms, and Other Job-related Mental Health/Emotional Issues				Ord. § 2.45.070(C) & (D) (C) Review and comment on the education and training the Department provides its sworn employees regarding the management of job-related stress, and regarding the signs and symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder, drug and alcohol abuse, and other job-related mental and emotional health issues. The Commission shall provide any recommendations for more or different education and training to the Chief who shall respond in writing consistent with section 604(b)(6) of the Oakland City Charter.  (D) Prepare and deliver to the Mayor, the City Administrator and the Chief by April 15 of each year, or such other date as set by the Mayor, a proposed budget for providing the education and training identified in subsection C, above.
7	Two meetings per year outside City Hall - "Community Roundtables"	Agendized ten days in advance	Commission shall consider inviting to each roundtable individuals and groups familiar with the issues involved in building and maintaining trust between the Department and the community, including but not limited to representatives from the Department, members of faith-based groups, youth groups, advocacy groups, residents of neighborhoods that experience the most frequent contact with the Department and formerly incarcerated members of the community		Charter § 604(d)(1) and Ord. § 2.45.090
8	Establish Rules/Procedures re Mediation/Resolution of Complaints of Misconduct				Ord. § 2.45.070(N)
9	Review And Comment On Department's Practices/Policies Re: Reporting And Publishing Data On Its Activities				Ord. § 2.45.070(P)
10					

## Police Commission Pending Agenda Matters List

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Agenda Matter	Duties/Deliverables	Additional Information/Details	Timeline for 2022	Measure 11 ("Charter") and Enabling Ordinance ("Ord.") Sections
	Public Hearing on OPD Policies	Commission may shall determine which Department policies are subject of the hearing			Charter Section 604(b)(2)
11	Public Hearing on OPD Budget	Purpose of hearing is to "determine whether budgetary allocations for the Department are aligned with the Department's policies"	Tentative release date of Mayor's proposed budget is May 1st of each year.		Charter Section 604(b)(7)
12					
13	Revisit OPD's Grooming & Presentation policy		Requested by Comm. Gage (1.13)		
14	Ad Hoc to review and learn about OPD's Tow policy		Requested by Comm. Harbin-Forte (4.14)		
	For the Chief:				
15	- Report on claims regarding bail and increase in crime		Requested by Comm. Harbin-Forte (4.14)		
16	Report from Chief Armstrong regarding OPD's homelessness policy		Requested by Comm. Harbin-Forte (2.10)		
17	Presentation from the Department of Violence Prevention		Requested by Comm. Jackson (2.24)		
18	Presentation from OPD's Risk Management team on traffic stops, towing and use of force		Requested by Comm. Hsieh (3.10)		