To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
From: Councilmember Kriss Worthington  
Subject: Referral to the City Manager, City Attorney, and Police Review Commission for Police Accountability Reform  

RECOMMENDATION:  
1) Refer to the City Manager and City Attorney to review the Berkeley Police Review Commission’s suggestions for short-term reforms and detail the steps that may be taken.  
2) Refer to the Police Review Commission to review the Oakland Ballot Measure LL and develop a similar full-fledged ballot measure to reform police accountability.

BACKGROUND:  
In 2016, Oakland voters created a Police Review Commission that has the power to implement real change. San Francisco has also passed similar reforms. Berkeley now trails behind both cities in police accountability standards.

Berkeley’s Police Review Commission was established in 1973. Since the Commission’s creation, the relationship between the community and police organizations has changed. After the Berkeley Police Department’s response to the Black Lives Matter protests, many cities and communities realized a more pressing need to address police misconduct.

This Council item will refer to the City Manager and City Attorney to differentiate:  
1) Which suggestions for police accountability reform can be accomplished by the City Council as a policy vote.  
2) Which suggestions require a meet and confer process with the Berkeley Police Department Association.  
3) Which reforms can only be passed through a ballot measure, if the city decides to do so. This information will help the City reform the Police Review Commission as soon as possible. By referring to the Police Review Commission, the process of writing a ballot measure for the November 2018 election will begin. We request the Commission have a draft ballot measure within 6 months of the referral.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
Staff time.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY:
Consistent with Berkeley’s Environmental Sustainability Goals and no negative impact.

CONTACT PERSON:
Councilmember Kriss Worthington  510-981-7170
Intern Sahana Matthews       s.matthews@berkeley.edu

Attachment:
1. Police Review Commission short-term reforms
2. Oakland Ballot Measure LL
3. Ten Reasons Why reform is needed
June 14, 2016

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: George Perezvelez, Chair, Police Review Commission
Re: Suggestions for Ballot Measure to Amend Current Enabling Ordinance Establishing the Police Review Commission (Response to Item #52 on the Council's June 14, 2016 agenda.)

The Berkeley Police Review Commission (PRC) was created with the general purpose of providing for community participation in setting and reviewing police department policies, practices, and procedures, and to provide a means for prompt, impartial, and fair investigation of complaints brought by individuals against the Berkeley Police Department. (B.M.C. section 3.32.010.)

In the interest of creating a more robust and effective avenue for citizen oversight of the Berkeley Police Department (BPD), the members of the PRC suggest the following changes to the PRC ordinance, to be either approved by the City Council or submitted to the voters in November. We believe these proposed changes will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the PRC, and assure that we are able to fully able to provide meaningful oversight to BPD.

1) The PRC shall use the “preponderance of the evidence” as the standard of proof for all decisions.

2) The current 120-day limit on the imposition of discipline shall be extended to one year, consistent with existing California law.

3) The PRC shall have full discretion to review complaints as to alleged officer misconduct from any person with personal knowledge of the alleged misconduct. Additionally, the PRC shall have the discretion to accept complaints from anonymous sources professing first-hand knowledge of alleged police misconduct, so long as the complainant requests anonymity based upon a credible belief that the complainant will face prosecution or harassment. The determination of whether the request for anonymity is based upon a credible belief shall be made by the a 2/3 vote of the full commission, acting in closed session.

4) The Commission shall have the same access to all BPD files and records, in addition to all files and records of other City departments and agencies, as the BPD's Internal Affairs Division. The BPD and other City departments and
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agencies shall make every reasonable effort to respond to the Commissioner's requests for files and records within ten (10) days.

5) Upon a sustained finding of misconduct, the Board of Inquiry shall have the authority to suggest appropriate discipline to the Chief and/or City manager.

6) In addition to the training required of all Berkeley City Commissioners, all members of the PRC shall be required to complete training in the following areas: use of force; criminal procedure; Fourth Amendment; BPD general orders and standard operating procedures. This training shall include law, policy and best practices. The training shall be organized annually by the PRC Officer, in consultation with the City Attorney's office, the BPD, the BPA, and other community organizations.

7) Expand the jurisdiction of the PRC to include non-sworn employees of the BPD.

8) Review the Mayor's proposed budget to determine whether budgetary allocations for the Department are aligned with the Commission's approved policies, procedures, customs, and General Orders. The Commission shall conduct at least one public hearing on the Department budget per budget cycle and shall forward to the City Council any recommendations for change.

The members of the PRC voted at its June 8, 2016 meeting to send this communication to you by the following vote: Ayes – Bernstein, Lippman, Murphy (temporary appointment), Perezvelez, Roberts, Sherman, Smith, and Yampolsky; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Javier, Waldman.

cc: Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager
    Michael Meehan, Chief of Police
    Zach Cowan, City Manager
    Christian Stines, BPA
    PRC Commissioners
Measure 86333

Measure ___. Shall Oakland’s City Charter be amended to establish: (1) a Police Commission of civilian commissioners to oversee the Police Department by reviewing and proposing changes to Department policies and procedures, requiring the Mayor to appoint any new Chief of Police from a list of candidates provided by the Commission, and having the authority to terminate the Chief of Police for cause; and (2) a Community Police Review Agency to investigate complaints of police misconduct and recommend discipline?
CITY ATTORNEY’S BALLOT TITLE AND SUMMARY OF MEASURE LL

A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO OAKLAND’S CITY CHARTER
ESTABLISHING A POLICE COMMISSION TO OVERSEE
THE POLICE DEPARTMENT’S POLICIES AND PROCEDURES,
AND A COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW AGENCY
TO INVESTIGATE COMPLAINTS OF POLICE
MISCONDUCT AND RECOMMEND DISCIPLINE

Summary:

Police Commission

This measure would establish a Police Commission (“Commission”) consisting of seven regular and two alternate members.

Commission members would be Oakland residents. No member could be a current police officer, current City employee, former Oakland police officer, or current or former official, employee or representative of a union that represents police officers. The first group of Commissioners would serve two, three or four-year terms. Later members would serve three-year terms, with a two-term limit.

The Mayor would nominate three regular Commissioners and one alternate, subject to the City Council’s approval. A nine-member Selection Panel would nominate four regular Commissioners and one alternate, subject to the City Council’s approval. Each City Council member and the Mayor would make an appointment to the Selection Panel. No panel member could be a current OPD employee.

Many changes to the Oakland Police Department’s (“OPD’s”) policies and procedures would be subject to the Commission’s approval. The Commission could require the Chief to submit annual reports, and the Commission would disclose the information in the Chief’s reports to the Mayor, the City Council and the public, if permitted by law. The Mayor would appoint any new Chief from a list of four candidates identified by the Commission. The Commission could remove a Chief from office for cause.

Community Police Review Agency

The Commission would establish a Community Police Review Agency (“Agency”), which would receive and review complaints of police misconduct. The Agency would be required to investigate complaints involving use of force, in-custody deaths, profiling and public assemblies. The Commission could also direct the Agency to investigate other possible police misconduct. After completing its investigation of a complaint, the Agency would submit its findings and proposed discipline to the Commission and the Chief.
If the Chief agrees with the Agency’s findings and proposed discipline, the Chief would notify the officer who is the subject of the complaint. The officer would have an opportunity to appeal by filing a grievance.

If the Chief disagrees with the Agency’s findings and proposed discipline, the Chief would be required to prepare separate findings and proposed discipline. A three-member committee of the Commission would consider the Agency’s and the Chief’s recommendations and make a final decision, and the officer would have an opportunity to appeal by filing a grievance.

**Budget and Staffing**

The City would have to allocate enough money to the Commission and the Agency so that they can perform their required functions and duties. At a minimum, staff would consist of an Agency Director and Agency investigators. There would be at least one Agency investigator for every 100 OPD officers. The City would also be required to allocate enough money for the City Attorney to assign outside counsel to provide legal advice to the Commission and Agency. No current or former Oakland police officer or current official, employee or representative of a union that represents police officers could serve as staff for the Commission or Agency.

s/DENNIS J. HERRERA  
San Francisco City Attorney
CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE LL

Currently, the City Administrator supervises the Oakland Police Department (“OPD”). The Chief of Police (“Chief”) is responsible for the OPD’s day-to-day operations. The Chief investigates possible police misconduct, but the City Administrator must approve all suspensions of five or more days, fines, demotions or discharges. The City’s Citizens’ Police Review Board (“CPRB”) investigates citizen complaints of police misconduct.

This measure would establish a Police Commission (“Commission”) to oversee the Police Department’s policies and procedures, and a Community Police Review Agency (“Agency”) to investigate complaints of police misconduct and recommend discipline.

Police Commission

The Commission would review the OPD’s policies, procedures and General Orders. The Commission may also propose changes, and approve or reject the OPD’s proposed changes, to those policies, procedures and General Orders that govern use of force, profiling, and general assemblies. The Commission’s proposed changes, and any rejections of the OPD’s proposed changes, would be subject to the City Council’s review and approval. The Commission would also conduct at least one public hearing a year on OPD policies, procedures and General Orders.

The Commission would consist of seven regular and two alternate members. The Mayor would nominate three regular Commissioners and one alternate, subject to the City Council’s approval. At least one of the three appointees must be a retired judge or lawyer with trial experience in criminal law or police misconduct.

A nine-member Selection Panel would nominate four regular Commissioners and one alternate. Each member of the City Council and the Mayor would appoint one member to the Selection Panel. The Selection Panel’s nominees would become members of the Commission, unless the City Council rejects all of the panel’s nominees.

Community Police Review Agency

Currently, after investigating a complaint of police misconduct, the CPRB may recommend proposed discipline. The CPRB must submit any recommendations regarding discipline to the City Administrator, who must respond to the CPRB in writing and make the final decision.

Under the proposed measure, the Commission would establish the Agency, which would receive and review all complaints of police misconduct. The Agency would be required to investigate all complaints involving use of force, in-custody deaths, profiling and public assemblies. The Commission could also direct the Agency to investigate other possible police misconduct. After completing its investigation of a complaint, the Agency would submit its findings and proposed discipline to the Commission and the Chief.
If the Chief agrees with the Agency’s findings and proposed discipline, the Chief would notify the officer who is the subject of the complaint. If the Chief disagrees with the Agency’s findings and proposed discipline, the Chief would be required to prepare separate findings and proposed discipline. A three-member committee of the Commission would consider the Agency’s and the Chief’s recommendations and make a final decision, subject to the officer’s ability to file a grievance.

**Budget and Staffing**

The City must allocate enough money to the Commission and the Agency so that they can perform their required functions and duties.

After the City Council confirms the first group of Commissioners, the CPRB’s pending business would be transferred to the Commission and the Agency. The CPRB’s Executive Director would become the Agency’s Interim Director, and all other CPRB staff would become Agency staff.

s/DENNIS J. HERRERA  
San Francisco City Attorney
CITY AUDITOR’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE LL

This Measure is a Charter amendment which will establish a Police Commission to oversee the Oakland Police Department. This new Police Commission and Community Police Review Agency will replace the current Citizens’ Police Review Board (CPRB).

The CPRB’s Director will become the Interim Director for the new Community Police Review Agency, and the CPRB’s pending business and staff will be transferred to the new Community Police Review Agency.

Financial Impact

The 7 regular Commissioners and 2 alternate Commissioners for the new Police Commission will serve their duties without pay. The City Attorney would assign to the Commission an attorney who would not be a City employee. We estimate the annual cost at $227,800, which is equivalent to the cost of a full-time Deputy City Attorney III. Part of this outside counsel cost is already borne by the City for the CPRB.

This Measure increases the current CPRB staffing level from 11 full-time employees to a minimum of 14 full-time employees. An additional 3 employees are required if this Measure passes because the Measure requires at least one Investigator for every 100 sworn police officers. As of July 2016 there were approximately 770 sworn officers and 60 trainees.

The current Police Review Board has 5 Investigators in their budget, so that an additional 3 Investigators will be required to meet the required ratio. We estimated the additional Investigators to cost the City between $403,400 to $495,200 for salaries and benefits.

This Measure also requires specific, professional training for the 9 Commissioners. The exact cost of this training is unknown; we estimated a minimum of $9,000 annually for Commissioner training.

Passing this Measure may cost the City an additional $560,400 to $652,200 annually, as detailed below; we also estimate an additional one-time equipment cost for new employees at $6,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Component</th>
<th>City’s Current Costs (11 full-time employees)</th>
<th>Additional per Year</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Total Estimated Annual Cost (14 full-time employees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>$1,580,000</td>
<td>$403,400 to $495,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,983,400 to $2,075,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Counsel</td>
<td>$85,800</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$227,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,820,800</td>
<td>$560,400 to $652,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,381,200 to $2,473,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are three potential, financial impacts that cannot be quantified at this time, as noted below:

- Reconfiguration of workspaces for new and current employees, and the addition of private interview rooms may be necessary. The cost of any renovation cannot be determined because it is project-specific.

- Specialized, professional training for the Commissioners may be higher than the minimum amount estimated.

- Staff salaries and benefit rates may increase over time due to cost of living adjustments and future union negotiations, which will increase the cost to the City.

/s/BRENDA D. ROBERTS
City Auditor
Oakland Police Commission Ballot Measure LL-Pro Argument

Oakland residents want effective community-oriented policing, less violent crime in our neighborhoods, and a police force that we trust. That is why we have come together to support the creation of a civilian Police Commission for Oakland.

Serious police misconduct impedes effective policing. We need improved oversight and effective discipline in order to better focus our police force on the things we want our officers doing: community policing in our neighborhoods, responding to 911 calls and investigating serious crimes.

OPD has been under federal oversight way too long our city needs to get its house in order. While we know that most of our officers are good people doing a very difficult job, that’s not good enough. We’ve seen unacceptable scandals and inadequate consequences. It’s time for Oakland to have effective civilian oversight!

Our city needs a strong police oversight commission to help build greater trust with the community, improve police response, and ensure constitutional policing. And we need this now.

Measure LL establishes a civilian Police Commission with authority to set policy, hold the police chief accountable for the effectiveness of OPD, and impose discipline when serious misconduct occurs. And it incorporates appropriate checks and balances to ensure we can hold our local elected leaders accountable as well.

Voting YES on Measure LL also will re-create a Community Police Review Agency, but this time with beefed up investigatory resources and real authority to not only investigate allegations of misconduct but also propose meaningful discipline.

For improvements and accountability and OPD, join us in voting YES on Measure LL.

Louise Rothman-Reimer
President, League of Women Voters of Oakland

Reverend Dr. George Cummings
Chair, Oakland Community Organizations (OCO)

Noel Galo
Oakland City Councilmember

David Muhammad
Criminal Justice & Youth Violence Prevention expert

Dan Kalb
Oakland City Councilmember
No Argument Against was submitted
Section 1. Amendment to the Charter of the City of Oakland.

SECTION 604 – POLICE COMMISSION

(a) Creation and Role.

1. There hereby is established the Oakland Police Commission (hereinafter, Commission), which shall oversee the Oakland Police Department (hereinafter, Department) in order to ensure that its policies, practices, and customs conform to national standards of constitutional policing. The Commission shall have the functions and duties enumerated in this Section, as well as those assigned to the Commission by Ordinance.

2. There hereby is established a Community Police Review Agency (hereinafter, Agency), which shall have the functions and duties enumerated in this Section, as well as those assigned to the Agency by Ordinance.

3. Nothing herein shall prohibit the Chief of Police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a Department sworn employee under his or her command, nor shall anything herein prohibit the Chief of Police from taking disciplinary or corrective action with respect to complaints investigated solely by the Department.

4. No later than two (2) years after the City Council has confirmed the first set of Commissioners and alternates, the City Auditor shall conduct a performance audit and a financial audit of the Commission and the Agency. Nothing herein shall limit the City Auditor’s authority to conduct future performance and financial audits of the Commission and the Agency.

(b) Powers and Duties.

The powers and duties of the Commission are as follows:

1. Organize, reorganize and oversee the Agency.
2. Conduct public hearings at least once a year on Department policies, rules, practices, customs, and General Orders. The Commission shall determine which Department policies, rules, practices, customs, or General Orders shall be the subject of the hearing.

3. Consistent with state law and in accordance with Section 1207 of the City Charter, entitled “Oaths and Subpoenas,” issue subpoenas to compel the production of books, papers and documents and take testimony on any matter pending before it. If any person subpoenaed fails or refuses to appear or to produce required documents or to testify, the majority of the members of the Commission may find him in contempt, and shall have power to take proceedings in that behalf provided by the general law of the State.

4. Propose changes, including modifications to the Department’s proposed changes, to any policy, procedure, custom, or General Order of the Department which governs use of force, use of force review boards, profiling based on any of the protected characteristics identified by federal, state, or local law, or First Amendment assemblies, or which contains elements expressly listed in federal court orders or federal court settlements which pertain to the Department and are in effect at the time this Charter Section 604 takes effect for so long as such federal court orders and settlements remain in effect. All such proposed changes and modifications shall be submitted to the City Council for approval or rejection. If the City Council does not approve, modify and approve, or reject the Commission's proposed changes or modifications within one hundred and twenty (120) days of the Commission's vote on the proposed changes, the changes or modifications will become final.

5. Approve or reject the Department’s proposed changes to all policies, procedures, customs, and General Orders of the Department which govern use of force, use of force review boards, profiling based on any of the protected characteristics identified by federal, state, or local law, or First Amendment assemblies, or which contains elements expressly listed in federal court orders or federal court settlements which pertain to the Department and are in effect at the time this Charter Section 604 takes effect for so long as such federal court orders and settlement remain in effect. If the Commission does not approve or reject the Department’s proposed changes within one hundred and twenty (120) days of the Department’s submission of the proposed changes to the Commission, the Department’s
proposed changes will become final. If the Commission rejects the Department’s proposed changes, notice of the Commission’s rejection, together with the Department’s proposed changes, shall be submitted to the City Council for review. If the City Council does not approve or reject the Commission’s decision within one hundred and twenty (120) days of the Commission's vote on the Department’s proposed changes, the Commission’s decision will become final.

6. Review and comment, at its discretion, on all other policies, procedures, customs, and General Orders of the Department. All such comments shall be submitted to the Chief of Police who shall provide a written response to the Commission upon request.

7. Review the Mayor's proposed budget to determine whether budgetary allocations for the Department are aligned with the Department’s policies, procedures, customs, and General Orders. The Commission shall conduct at least one public hearing on the Department budget per budget cycle and shall forward to the City Council any recommendations for change.

8. Require the Chief of Police to submit an annual report to the Commission regarding such matters as the Commission shall require.

9. Report at least once a year to the Mayor, the City Council, and to the public to the extent permissible by law, the information contained in the Chief's report in addition to such other matters as are relevant to the functions and duties of the Commission.

10. Acting separately or jointly with the Mayor, remove the Chief of Police by a vote of not less than five affirmative votes. If acting separately, the Commission may remove the Chief of Police only after adopting a finding or findings of cause, which shall be defined by City ordinance. The Commission must make its finding of just cause by no less than five affirmative votes. Upon removal, by the Commission, by the Mayor, or by the Mayor and the Commission acting jointly, or upon the notice of vacancy of the position of Chief of Police, the Mayor, in consultation with the Chair of the Commission, shall immediately appoint an Interim Chief of Police. Such appointment shall not exceed six (6) months in duration unless approved by a majority vote of the Commission. The Commission, with the assistance of the City Administrator, shall prepare and distribute a job announcement, and prepare a list of at least four candidates and transmit the
names and relevant background materials to the Mayor. The Mayor shall
appoint one person from this list, or reject the list in its entirety and request a
new list from the Commission. This provision shall not apply to any
recruitment for the position of Chief of Police that is pending at the time of
the Commission’s first meeting.

11. Send the Chairperson of the Commission or another Commissioner
appointed by the Chairperson to serve as a non-voting member of any level
one Oakland Police Force Review Board.

12. Perform such other functions and duties as may be prescribed by this Charter
or by City ordinance.

(c) **Appointment, Terms, Vacancies, Removal.**

1. The Commission shall consist of seven (7) regular members and two (2)
alternate members, all of whom shall be Oakland residents of at least
eighteen (18) years of age. To the extent practicable, appointments shall be
broadly representative of Oakland’s diversity and shall include members
with knowledge and/or experience in the fields of human resources
practices, management, policy development, auditing, law, investigations,
law enforcement, youth representation, civil rights and civil liberties, as well
as representation from communities experiencing the most frequent contact
with the Department. Background checks shall be required for all
Commission members and alternates. Such background checks shall not be
performed by the Department. The following shall not be eligible to serve
as a Commissioner:

   a. current sworn police officer;
   b. current City employee;
   c. former Department sworn employee; or
   d. current or former employee, official or representative of an employee
      association representing sworn police officers.

2. Within two hundred and ten (210) days of the enactment of this Section, the
Mayor shall appoint three (3) Oakland residents as Commissioners, at least
one of whom shall be a retired judge or lawyer with trial experience in
criminal law or police misconduct, and one (1) Oakland resident as an
alternate, and submit the names of these appointees to the Council for
confirmation. The Council shall have sixty (60) days after the completion of
the background checks and from the date of receipt of the Mayor’s submission to accept or reject each of the Mayor’s appointees as Commissioners. The Mayor shall appoint an Oakland resident to fill any Commission vacancies that were previously filled by a Mayor’s appointee. If the City Council does not accept or reject the Mayor’s appointee within sixty (60) days after the completion of the background check and receipt of the Mayor’s submission, the appointee shall be deemed appointed.

3. All other Commissioners and the other alternate shall be appointed as follows:

a. There is hereby established a nine (9) member Selection Panel. Within ninety (90) days of the enactment of this Section, each City Council member shall appoint one (1) person, and the Mayor shall appoint one (1) person, to the Selection Panel. No current Department employee is eligible to be a member of the Selection Panel. The Selection Panel, with the assistance of the City Administrator, will solicit applications from those willing to serve on the Commission. The Selection Panel will review the applications, and interview applicants to serve as members of the Commission.

b. Within one hundred and twenty days (120) of its formation, the Selection Panel, by a two-thirds vote, shall submit a slate of four (4) regular members and one (1) alternate member to the City Council. The City Council may require the nominees to appear before the Council or a Committee of the Council. If the City Council does not accept or reject the slate in its entirety within sixty (60) days after the completion of the background checks and submission by the Selection Panel, the four (4) regular members and one (1) alternate member shall be deemed appointed.

c. Each year the Selection Panel shall re-convene, as needed, to designate replacements for the five (5) Commissioner (four (4) regular members and one (1) alternate) vacancies initially filled by the Selection Panel and shall submit a slate of names of such designated persons to the City Council for acceptance or rejection. If the City Council does not accept or reject the entire slate within sixty (60) days after the completion of the background checks and submission by the Selection Panel, all designated replacements shall be deemed appointed.
d. Each year the Mayor and each Councilmember may replace her or his assigned person on the Selection Panel. Selection Panel members may serve up to five (5) years.

4. With the exception of the first group of Commissioners which shall serve staggered terms, the term for each Commissioner shall be three (3) years.

5. Commission members are limited to no more than two (2) consecutive terms, except that a Commissioner serving a term of no more than one (1) year shall be allowed to serve two (2) additional consecutive terms.

6. To effect a staggering of terms among the Commissioners, the duration of the first group of Commissioners shall be determined by the Selection Panel as follows: Three (3) regular members, including one (1) of the mayoral appointees, shall have an initial term of three (3) years; two (2) regular members, including one (1) of the mayoral appointees, shall have an initial term of two (2) years; two (2) regular members, including one (1) of the mayoral appointees, shall have an initial term of four (4) years. The alternate member appointed by the Selection Panel shall have an initial term of two (2) years and the alternate member appointed by the Mayor shall have an initial term of three (3) years.

7. A vacancy on the Commission shall exist whenever a member dies, resigns, ceases to be a resident of the City, is convicted of a felony, or is removed.

8. For vacancies occurring for reasons other than the expiration of a regular member’s term, the Commission shall select one of the alternates to replace the regular member for that regular member’s remaining term of office. If the alternate chosen to replace the regular member was appointed by the Selection Panel, the Selection Panel shall appoint another alternate. If the alternate chosen to replace the regular member was appointed by the Mayor, the Mayor shall appoint another alternate.

9. All Commission members shall receive orientation regarding Department operations, policies and procedures, including but not limited to discipline procedures for police officer misconduct and failure to act. All Commission members shall receive training regarding Procedural Justice, conflict resolution, national standards of constitutional policing, best practices for conducting investigations, and other subject matter areas which are specified by City ordinance.
10. The City Council may remove members of the Commission for cause as provided in Section 601 of the Charter, or members of the Commission may be removed by a majority vote of the Commission only for conviction of a felony, conviction of a misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, a material act of dishonesty, fraud, or other act of moral turpitude, substantial neglect of duty, gross misconduct in office, inability to discharge the powers and duties of office, absence from three consecutive regular Commission meetings or five regular meetings in a calendar year except on account of illness or when absent by permission.

(d) Meetings, Rules and Procedures

1. The Commission shall meet at least twice each month unless it determines that one meeting is sufficient in a particular month. The Commission shall notify the public of the time and place of the meeting and provide time for public comment at each meeting. The Commission shall meet at least twice each year in locations other than City Hall.

2. The Commission shall establish rules and procedures for the conduct and operations of its business. Such rules shall be made available to the public.

3. Five (5) members shall constitute a quorum. If a quorum is not established by the regular members in attendance, the Chairperson of the Commission may designate one or more alternate members to establish a quorum and cast votes. Motions on all matters may be approved by a majority of those Commission members present.

(e) Budget and Staffing

1. The City shall allocate a sufficient budget for the Commission, including the Agency, to perform its functions and duties as set forth in this section, including budgeting at least one full-time-equivalent non-City Attorney legal advisor that is specifically charged with providing legal services to the Agency related to investigations and recommended discipline. The one full-time-equivalent non-City Attorney legal advisor shall be assigned by the City Attorney after consultation with the Chair of the Commission. The non-City Attorney legal advisor shall not in the regular course of his or her
2. legal practice defend law enforcement officers and shall not participate in, nor serve as counsel to the City or any of its Council members or employees in defense of any lawsuit arising from any incident involving an Oakland police officer.

3. Within sixty (60) days of the City Council’s confirmation of the first group of Commissioners and alternates, the Oakland Citizens’ Police Review Board (hereinafter Board) shall be disbanded and its pending business transferred to the Commission and to the Agency. The Executive Director of the Board shall become the Interim Director of the Agency, and all other staff will be transferred to the Agency.

4. After the effective date of this Charter section, the Commission may identify special qualifications and experience that candidates for Agency staff positions must have. Candidates for future vacancies may be selectively certified in accordance with the Civil Service Personnel Manual, as may be amended from time to time; said selective certification shall be subject to discretionary approval by the City Administrator or his or her designee.

5. The staff of the Agency shall consist of no fewer than one line investigator for every one hundred (100) sworn officers in the Department, rounded up or down to the nearest one hundred (100). The number of investigators shall be determined at the beginning of each budget cycle based on the number of sworn officers employed by the Department the previous June 1. At least one investigator shall be a licensed attorney. The budget set-aside for such minimum staffing may be suspended for a fiscal year or two-year budget cycle upon a finding in the budget resolution that the City is facing an extreme fiscal necessity, as defined by City Council resolution.

6. The City Administrator shall assign a staff member to act as liaison to the Commission and to provide administrative support to the Commission.

7. Upon a vacancy, the Director of the Agency shall be hired by the City Administrator from among two (2) or three (3) candidates submitted by the Commission. By an affirmative vote of at least five (5) members, or by an affirmative vote of four (4) members with the approval of the City
8. Administrator, the Commission may terminate the Director of the Agency. The Commission shall periodically conduct a performance review of the Agency Director. The Agency Director shall be classified as a Department head, and shall have the authority to hire and fire Agency staff, in consultation with the City Administrator.

9. Agency and Commission staff, with the exception of the Agency Director, shall be civil service employees in accordance with Article IX of the City Charter. Background checks shall be required for all Agency investigator applicants before they are hired by the Agency. Such background checks shall not be performed by the Department. Staff of the Board who are transferred to the Agency as discussed in section (e)(2) above shall not be subject to background checks.

10. No current or former sworn employee of the Department, or current official, employee or representative of an employee association representing sworn police officers, is eligible for any staff position in the Agency or the Commission.

(f) Investigations

1. Beginning sixty (60) days after the City Council’s confirmation of the first group of Commissioners and alternates, the Agency shall receive, review and prioritize all public complaints concerning the alleged misconduct or failure to act of all Department sworn employees, including complaints from Department non-sworn employees. 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, 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. The Agency shall forward a copy of each complaint received to the Internal Affairs Division of the Oakland Police Department within one business day of receipt.

2. Subject to applicable law, the Agency shall have the same access to all Department files and records, with the exception of personnel records, in addition to all files and records of other City departments and agencies, as
the Department’s Internal Affairs Division (IAD). Access to personnel records shall be limited to the Agency Director who shall maintain confidentiality as required by law. The Department and other City departments and agencies shall make every reasonable effort to respond to the Agency’s requests for files and records within ten (10) days.

3. The Agency shall make every reasonable effort to complete its investigations within one hundred and eighty (180) days of the filing of the complaint with the Agency. Within thirty (30) days of completion of the investigation, the Director of the Agency shall issue written findings and proposed discipline regarding the allegations stated in the complaint to the Commission and the Chief of Police. The City Administrator shall not have the authority to reject or modify the Agency’s findings and proposed discipline.

4. To the extent allowed by law and after consultation with the Commission, the Agency shall forward information to other enforcement agencies, including but not limited to the Alameda County District Attorney, when such information establishes a reasonable basis for believing that a crime may have been committed by a sworn Department employee.

(g) Adjudication

1. If the Chief of Police agrees with the Agency’s findings and proposed discipline, he or she shall send to the subject officer notification of findings and intent to impose discipline. The Chief of Police may send such notification to the subject officer before IAD has begun or completed its investigation.

2. If the Chief of Police disagrees with the Agency’s findings and/or proposed discipline, the Chief of Police shall prepare his or her own findings and/or proposed discipline which shall be submitted to a Discipline Committee comprised of three Commissioners. The City Administrator shall not have authority to reject or modify the Chief of Police’s findings and proposed discipline. The Agency’s findings and proposed discipline shall also be submitted to the Discipline Committee which shall review both submissions and resolve any dispute between the Agency and the Chief of Police. Based solely on the record presented by the Agency and the Chief of Police, the Discipline Committee shall submit its final decision regarding the appropriate findings and proposed discipline to the Chief of Police who shall
notify the subject officer. The City Administrator shall not have the authority to reject or modify the Discipline Committee’s final decision regarding the appropriate findings and level of discipline. The Discipline Committee shall not have the authority to conduct its own investigation.

3. If 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 if the Agency is required to conduct an investigation by subsection (f) above, the Commission must approve the Agency’s decision by a majority vote. If the Agency chooses not to close its investigation, imposition of final discipline shall be delayed until the Agency’s investigation is completed and the Agency makes its findings and recommendations for discipline. The Agency shall notify the Chief of its final decision regarding how it will proceed within five (5) business days of the Chief’s notice of completion of his or her investigation.

4. All employees are afforded their due process and statutory rights including Skelly rights. After the findings and imposition of discipline have become final, the subject officer shall have the right to grieve/appeal the findings and imposition of discipline if such rights are prescribed in a collective bargaining agreement.

(h) **Enabling Legislation**

The Commission may make recommendations to the City Council for enacting legislation or regulations that will further the goals and purposes of this section 604. The City Council may, on its own initiative, enact legislation or regulations that will further the goals and purposes of this section 604. Once the Commission is seated, subsequent legislation or regulations shall be submitted to the Commission for review and comment. The Commission shall have forty-five (45) days to submit its comments to the City Council, such time to be extended only by agreement of the City Council.
Section 2. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Measure is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the Measure. The voters hereby declare that they would have passed this Measure and each section, subsection, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that one or more other sections, subsections, clauses or phrases may be declared invalid or unconstitutional.
The top ten reasons why Berkeley needs police accountability reform: by Kriss Worthington

1. The system is so fatally flawed that Civil Rights and Civil Liberties attorneys tell clients it’s not worth it to file complaint cases with the Police Review Commission.

2. Complainants report that restrictive rules leave them feeling violated and disrespected when they pursue their complaints.

3. Unfortunately, racial profiling is alive and well in Berkeley. The statistics generated by the Fair and Impartial Policing Policy provide substantial documentation that ethnic minorities appear to be disproportionally stopped by Police.

4. The media, students, and the General Public across all ethnicities report excessive use of force against both protestors and bystanders during the December Black Lives Matter protests. The police were seen beating and using CS on the crowd.

5. The media reports that other jurisdictions respond to Public Record Act requests about police accountability with far more details.

6. Blindfolded by restrictions on their access to documents such as tapes and video recordings, PRC commissioners cannot make fully informed decisions.

7. Berkeley trails behind other Bay Area jurisdictions, such as Alameda County, BART, San Francisco and Oakland, who have been adopting reforms to hold police accountable.

8. Many qualified PRC commissioners are frustrated to find the system full of severe rules and practices that prevent full review of facts. Commissioners who have promoted reform have seen them delayed many months and years.

9. In the 1970’s Bell Bottoms were fashionable and the Berkeley Police Review Commission structure was forward thinking. But in the 21st century, the US Department of Justice’s recommendations, and regional best practices have evolved from decades of experiences with new technologies and a multicultural society.

10. The PRC system is 43 years old. Isn’t it time for a change?