Pages 1 - 41

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable William H. Orrick, Judge

DELPHINE ALLEN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

VS.) NO. C 00-04599 WHO

CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,

Defendants.

San Francisco, California Thursday, October 13, 2022

TRANSCRIPT OF REMOTE ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES VIA ZOOM:

For the Plaintiffs:

THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS

Airport Corporate Centre

7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1120

Oakland, California 94621

BY: JOHN L. BURRIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW

LAW OFFICES OF JAMES B. CHANIN

3050 Shattuck Avenue

Berkeley, California 94705

BY: JAMES B. CHANIN, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

REPORTED REMOTELY BY: Ana Dub, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR, CRG, CCG

CSR No. 7445, Official U.S. Reporter

1	APPEARANCES VIA ZOOM:	(CONTINUED)
2	For the Defendants:	OFFICE OF OAKLAND CITY ATTORNEY
3		One Frank Ogawa Plaza, Sixth Floor Oakland, California 94612
4	BY:	
5		
6	For the Intervenor:	RAINS LUCIA STERN
7		ST. PHALLE & SILVER, PC 2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Suite 500
8	BY:	Pleasant Hill, California 94523
9		
10	Also Present:	Mayor Libby Schaaf
11		Chief LeRonne Armstrong
12		Assistant Chief Darren Allison
13		Deputy Chief Clifford Wong
14		Captain Kevin Kaney
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Thursday - October 13, 2022 1 3:47 p.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 THE CLERK: A reminder to those who don't know already: 4 5 We do ask that you not stream these proceedings out live or 6 make any audio or visual recording of the proceedings, including screenshots. 7 And I believe we are set to get underway in Case 8 Number 00-4599, Allen, et al. vs. City of Oakland, et al, 9 although I don't see the judge. So let me see what is 10 11 happening. I thought I did and then I didn't. (Pause in proceedings.) 12 All right. We have decided that the easiest 13 THE CLERK: way around this is to just have the Court appear in the well at 14 15 the microphones. So, right here. 16 THE COURT: This one here? 17 THE CLERK: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, everybody. 18 19 you hear me? 20 THE CLERK: Let me get this on. 21 There. Okay. 22 THE COURT: All right. We're going to try this again. 23 Can you all hear me? 24 MR. CHANIN: Yes, we can. 25 MS. MARTIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So, my apologies to you. My criminal calendar ran late, and then we have apparently too many Zoom cameras on or not working or something. But I am glad to see you all.

So during the past several CMCs, I've tried to focus the parties on the issues of particular importance to me in the oversight of the Oakland Police Department.

Number one is reducing racial disparities in vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle stops with continued use of intelligence-led policing.

The second was implementing Vision and its associated dashboards in a technologically straightforward way so that the tools are used effectively in the risk management process.

Number three was recruiting officers who reflect the diversity, in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, and other, of the City of Oakland.

Number four was ensuring that all uses of force and instances of potential misconduct are accurately reported and rigorously investigated within set timeliness standards.

And, fifth, to ensure that disciplinary decisions and the disciplinary process are fair and equitable.

And I just want to start by saying, I'm glad that it appears to me that the Police Department is meeting the first three of those goals in a way that seems sustainable.

I'm also happy that the Police Department is meeting the

timeliness standards for uses of force and instances of potential misconduct and that most of the NSA tasks remain in compliance. The body-worn cameras issue seems to have been resolved with the cameras all being rolled out.

And it's worth noting that all of this comes at what I know has been a very challenging time for the City of Oakland, given the surge of violence and the attrition in the force.

So I just want to start there and then pivot, because the work is not done. I've been informed about the investigations that relate to two internal OPD investigations and its discipline process that the Compliance Director Monitor has called "deeply troubling."

I know that the investigations are ongoing. I'm going to withhold judgment until they're completed. But the information that I do know is concerning.

I want to underscore for the parties now how important full and timely cooperation with the requests of the outside law firm handling the investigations is. I'm very hopeful that the investigations will be completed well in advance of our next CMC, which I'm going to set for January 10th at 2:00 p.m. Actually, we'll make it January 10th at 3:30 p.m. That can't happen without very timely responses from OPD.

I've directed the Compliance Director Monitor to advise me if there's any lack of cooperation by the City or the Department with these investigations; and if there are any

roadblocks, I'm going to order that the outside law firm be answerable to the Compliance Director Monitor directly.

I also note the debate about whether Task 45 is in compliance. I will note that the Police Department has taken real steps to analyze the issues. What I'm interested in is how OPD will address the racial disparities shown in the disciplinary data, such as black officers being more likely to receive suspensions and less likely to receive counseling than their white counterparts. So I'll look forward to hearing a little bit more about that.

So before I go to the parties, I do have a few questions, as I'm wont to have, and I would like to start with the Chief.

Chief, good afternoon.

CHIEF ARMSTRONG: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's good to see you.

CHIEF ARMSTRONG: Good to see you, sir.

THE COURT: Would you give me your current assessment of where we stand on each of those five goals that I laid out at the beginning of the CMC, where you're expecting improvement and how sustainable you think the Department's compliance is?

CHIEF ARMSTRONG: Well, Your Honor, I'd first like to say that the work of the Oakland Police Department continues to be ongoing, and I am proud that we have really focused our efforts on compliance in a way that I haven't seen before. And I say that because the things that you brought before us in our last

appearance before you, we went back and took very seriously.

When it came to the completion of policies, when it came to the issuing of a survey, those things we made a priority and got done.

I'll say that from our standpoint, I think our use of force review process has definitely improved. We have put together a review panel of commanders that actually do spot-checks and random checks to ensure that we are catching things within our use of force investigative review process.

One of the things that we've learned, Your Honor, is that we have a fairly young command staff. 50 percent of our command staff have been promoted in the last year. But that's required Assistant Chief Allison and I to really focus on developing those commanders to better understand the thorough level of review that we expect.

So we've had our Training Division begin to provide specific training for review of use of force and IAD investigations for supervisors and commanders. We've also put together an IAD review case group, essentially command staff, that also conducts spot-checks.

And so when we talk about our ability to be sustainable,

I believe that the processes that we've set in place will help
ensure that sustainability continues.

I think the effort that we partner with the Police Commission and their OIG has been helpful as well.

She's been involved in conversations with our Bureau of Risk Management about continuing to perform audits as well.

I also think, Your Honor, that the culture of the Department is rooted in compliance now. Nearly 70 percent of our officers have been here less than ten years; so all they know is compliance with these high standards that we have at the Oakland Police Department.

And I think if you look at the body-worn camera issue,
I think it's one in which we have really moved forward on.
I think today Assistant Chief Allison will present numbers that will issue around 250,000 activations. The Department takes it very seriously that these cameras are used every time they have an interaction and that they're actually activated on time. We have internal processes to better assess whether these things are done. And we've held several people accountable when these cameras haven't been activated. And so I think it's something that we take very seriously.

Our Stop Data Program continues to be one of the nationally recognized programs across the country.

Our intelligence-led policing is leading to a huge focus on gun violence. We've recovered 27 percent more firearms than we recovered at the same time last year. So our focus has been on those that are engaged in violence, and I believe that focused effort will continue.

Although we now, you know, have begun to focus more on

traffic safety, it still will be intelligence led, focused on areas, working with our Department of Transportation of giving us specific locations where we call "high-injury networks" where we want to make stops that actually make Oakland safer.

So everything that we're doing is intelligence led and focused. I think our command staff are all prepared to continue to maintain this high level of accountability, and it's actually a part of the culture of the Department.

I think one of the things that we did that I think will prove helpful in the future, in preparing future leaders in this department, is that we're putting commanders on our assessment teams so that they can personally get the experience of reviewing use of force, IAD complaints, and policy development. So those are key things that we're doing, Your Honor.

And then our Vision system is fully implemented. We are fully in use of our Vision system. Our external dashboards are working. Our internal dashboards are working. We have -- our ITD Unit, the City's ITD Unit, has a staff that is supporting the Department. That staff is actually able to now maintain those dashboards for us. Previously, we did have some issues with ensuring that these dashboards were maintained on an ongoing basis. We've now fixed that.

The only need that we have now is to secure some technical assistance from the company on how we allow supervisors and

commanders to be limited to their actual staff that they review. So I think it doesn't prevent us from doing any of the work. The systems are working.

And I'm confident with the changes that we've made to our discipline process, that we are issuing fair and equitable discipline. We've anonymized all of our discipline processes as well as our case processes. So essentially, we don't talk about race or gender in those meetings. Everything's anonymized.

And I think the analysis that, I think, Bridgid Martin will speak to at some point will speak to the work that we've done over the last several months with Dr. Grossman and her analysis of our data that shows that we haven't seen disparity in our 2020 and 2021 data.

Also during the survey, I think one of the interesting things that we learned is that some people questioned fairness, but we believe that's attributed to the fact that people don't like discipline, Your Honor. That's natural. But I think it is about the organization holding people accountable.

So one of the things that we did is that we mandated by policy that captains meet with every officer or member who's given discipline to ensure that they understand why they were sustained for a complaint and why they received a certain level of discipline. And so we hope that that makes the process much more transparent and people to be much more open to our

discipline process and at least trust the process.

And then lastly, Your Honor, I feel good about our recruiting efforts. We have been making tremendous success with the hiring of women. We've had a very diverse class over the last two classes that we have graduated. They've been some of the most diverse classes that we've seen in years, with both multicultural and multiple genders; we have women as well as -- a significant number of women, up to about 20 percent, which is good for us. So we'll continue to focus our efforts. We joined the 30 by 30 Initiative, which is the Department's commitment to hire 30 percent women by the year 2030, and we are continuing to work on that effort of our recruiting of women.

So, Your Honor, I feel like we are making a lot of progress. I know there's more work to do. I'm also concerned about the cases that are being reviewed. But as a result of that, we've even stricted our processes even more to ensure that we are doing better internal reviews of IAD investigations.

THE COURT: All right. Well, so that's a very positive and impressive survey of everything that's going on, Chief.

I am glad to hear you say that there is -- institutional reform requires all of those policies being in place and rigorously followed. It requires the strong leadership of people up and down the chain. And as people leave -- I'm

looking at the Mayor right now. I'm not sure that I'm going to see her at the next session that we have -- but the commitment from the top to make sure that constitutional policing and transparency and accountability and integrity, all of the things that are wrapped up in a positive culture, continue over time. And that's long after the Court and some of the players who are on this screen are gone. That's going to be the challenge for the Department.

So thank you very much for your review.

I'm interested in talking to Captain Kaney next, if I could.

CAPTAIN KANEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. So, welcome. I'm not sure that we have met before, but I understand that you're now in charge of Internal Affairs.

CAPTAIN KANEY: I am.

THE COURT: And one of the very positive things that was reported is, the timeliness in IAD investigations now seems to -- first of all, you're in compliance, which is great. How are you going to maintain that?

CAPTAIN KANEY: For timeliness, for the Task 2?

So right now, we do have some newer sergeants that are coming through. And so to give them a little more time in their review process, we have pushed out our 30-day normal timelines when a case is due to IAD and we pushed it out to

45 days. That gives us a little more of a cushion if a newer sergeant is missing something.

The other thing about the new sergeants is, next week we have an IAD training course being put on by Third Degree that is going to put -- I think we're at 35 supervisors going through this IAD training course, which should help the completeness for Task 5, as well as for our timelines, so that when a case comes into our DLI coordinators and it's complete, it makes the process a lot faster and a lot easier and we don't have to push back for more investigation. And so that is very helpful with our newer sergeants and our newer reviewers.

But the policies and the practices that we've had that have been set up for quite a while now seem to have been working, and we are continuing to push on with those timelines and with those, you know, benchmarks for our -- to make sure that our cases are completed within our 180 time frame.

THE COURT: And is it your intent that these steps will remain past the sustainability period, that this is going to be an ongoing policy and practice?

CAPTAIN KANEY: Yeah, absolutely. I think that it's been working. We have been -- with the processes we've been doing, reviewing our -- we do a 180 report every week which tells us which cases are getting close to our 180 date, and I review those with the lieutenants of Internal Affairs, and I ask about every case that's within 21 days.

And I think that these processes that have been set up and that have been working so far will continue to work and continue to keep us in timeliness for our investigations.

THE COURT: Great. Well, thank you. And thank you for your efforts in this.

CAPTAIN KANEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me go to Deputy Chief Wong.

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Afternoon. How are you?

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: Very well, sir. How are you?

THE COURT: I'm very well.

The stop data story is, obviously, as the Chief was saying, it's one of the -- it's a crown jewel, if not the crown jewel, of the reforms. And I want to just find out from you how the Department intends to ensure that the risk management meetings, which are critical to the ongoing success in this area, are going to continue once oversight is no more from the Court and transferred to the Police Commission.

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: Well, aside from the fact that we have ingrained that process into the Department or into our organizational culture, it's already in policy. I'm sure you remember DGO R-01, our risk management policy, which contains all the requirements that these meetings be held. In fact, if a meeting is not held, it has to be approved by the Chief to skip one. So that process is in place. We've been following

it.

Our Risk Analysis Unit actually keeps track of those meetings. They schedule them. Not only the area meetings, but also the Department-wide meetings. So they keep track of every single one of those. And the Office of Internal Accountability will be the body that keeps an eye on it.

Of course, all that lies under BRM. So ultimately, I or my successor will be accountable to make sure that that continues on as an ongoing process.

THE COURT: And how are you monitoring the quality as well as the quantity of those meetings?

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: The area-wide meetings that only -have the Deputy Chief involved. So if an Area 1 meeting
occurs, obviously, the captain, lieutenants, and the sergeants
will all be there. But the Deputy Chief will oversee it to
make sure that the discussion is substantial and of quality.

And when those meetings then roll into the area-wide meeting, it's, once again, reviewed with all the deputy chiefs, including the Chief and the Assistant Chief. So there's -- anything that's missed in the lower-level meetings will be covered in the bigger group setting.

THE COURT: Okay. So this may be a question that I'm going to hear more from -- in fact, I'm confident I will -- from Ms. Martin. But with respect to the Department's most recent analysis on discipline, I was concerned about black

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

officers being more likely than their white counterparts to be sustained for discovered violations and, also, that they were more likely to receive suspensions and less likely to receive counseling than their white counterparts. How do you explain that, those findings, and what plans are there to address them? DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: Referring back to the 2019 DLI findings that we did some extra work on, we were not able to actually get to the root cause of the issue. You know, as with all social science type of research, you can get a good indication of what you're looking at, but you can never truly get to the root cause of it. But what we did identify were some essential areas -potential appears where -- sorry. MR. BURRIS: I'm sorry. THE COURT: I think Mr. Burris was trying to interrupt you in your answer there. (Laughter.) THE COURT: Go ahead. **DEPUTY CHIEF WONG:** My headphones are a little too loud. So, actually, what we're able to do is determine that there were some areas where we can make some improvements, such as self-identified or internally identified allegations. Right? So we know, like -- for example, profanity; how you

it.

determine what's a discovered allegation or just profanity when you're, you know, sitting by yourself in a car or if you're in front of a citizen. The way you determine if that's an allegation or not has a little bit of variability in it. So we're going to focus in on those and try to get them more consistent among our supervisors.

The hard part about the study is, we couldn't figure out, of the allegations, if they came from within or if they were made by citizens outside, because that's not something that was tracked in the older cases. So to remedy that situation, we actually added fields into Vision to track that so, going forward, we can actually see if the complaint came from within or externally; we can see if the allegation was one of the original allegations or if it was discovered by an investigator.

And if we're able to track that data, we can now tell if there's any kind of, you know, bias or disparity created from within or by the investigators or by even the, you know, DLI staff reviewing these cases.

So that's how we're going to address the issue going forward. And we're going to keep an eye on it and study it, because we don't see the numbers right now in 2020, in 2021, but we don't want to see it come back in the future either.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Thank you. I appreciate

And now Assistant Chief Allison.

ASSISTANT CHIEF ALLISON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. I'm glad I don't have to harass you about the body-worn cameras.

Tell me, how are the new cameras functioning? What issues, if any, do you have at this point?

ASSISTANT CHIEF ALLISON: So, Your Honor, the cameras are functioning well. We are a hundred percent rolled out with the body-worn -- new body-worn cameras through Axon. So every field officer has the new cameras in play. They -- there's a lot of good feedback on the quality and usability and ease and even the review process of the cameras in the system itself.

One of the challenges we encountered with the cameras is with some uniform types -- we have a wool uniform as well as our utility uniform, so a little thicker, as well as outer carrier vests that we can wear. And in some cases, the magnet that holds the camera in place can become dislodged, when it comes to thicker uniforms.

And so we are purchasing new hooks and adhesions to keep the camera in place. And for those that are experiencing trouble of holding their camera in place, you know, it getting dislodged during struggles or whatnot, we have equipment to be able to give to those officers to replace that holder, so to speak.

So from the camera systems, they are working well.

They're easier to annotate; so we can find mile markers for use 1 of force investigations or other internal audits or reviews. 2 And, again, the feedback has been positive. 3 THE COURT: Good. And what's the status of revisions to 4 5 the body-worn camera policy? 6 ASSISTANT CHIEF ALLISON: Your Honor, we have completed 7 the ad hoc development process with the ad hoc Police Commission. That will then move into the next phase, 8 which is presentation to the Commission; and then, certainly, 9 if there's any modifications or changes, we can make those. 10 11 there are no modifications and it's voted to move forward, then we can move to the stakeholder review piece of it. 12 13 THE COURT: All right. So do you think that'll be done by the next CMC? 14 15 ASSISTANT CHIEF ALLISON: I am anticipation --16 anticipating completion by the next CMC. 17 THE COURT: Great. Great. And then let me ask you. The Compliance Director Monitor 18 19 has noted some recent use of force incidents in which he 20 believed that a supervisor should have caught violations of Department policy. In three cases, those incidents were 21 22 eventually sent over to IAD. Two of the cases have now been 23 completed. There have been some sustained findings. What are you doing to ensure that first-line supervisors 24

and their commanders are more vigilant in their reviews of

25

these cases?

ASSISTANT CHIEF ALLISON: Thank you for that, Your Honor.

As I've stated before, within our organization, I see the foundational principles as being policy, training and experience, and accountability, particularly for our supervisors.

So certainly, we have our policies. One of our more recent policies when it came to use of force was K3, which was published last December and trained and rolled out in January. We also implemented a new Type 32 policy that went into effect for reporting in division around June.

So now that we have a policy foundation, we certainly need to ensure that our staff, particularly our supervisors, are commanders, are properly trained.

We recognized that there were some areas -- new areas of policy requirements when it came to use of force that we outlined in K3, Use of Force Policy, when it came to language around active and assaultive resistance; particularly, also, uses of intermediate use of force specifically around our tasers, our electronic control weapon equipment.

And so we rolled out training in the spring for staff around the use of tasers. We then rolled out training specifically around assaultive and active resistance, again, to make sure that it was crystallized on the use of intermediate force. And then we are in process of rolling out training on

how to be a good reviewer and investigator when it comes to use of force investigations.

On top of that, we recognize, with our new supervisors, that they not only needed classroom training, but they needed experiential training. And as I've reported out before, we do have our field training process. But what we are seeing is, going to singular supervisors during that process wasn't getting a far and wide exposure to that training. And so we are now rotating among supervisors so they have an opportunity to engage in investigations while supervised, to learn a little bit better.

And at the same time, for our commander training, not only did they roll out the review training that's in process; we are incorporating them into our inspection teams, which not only helps us look from an auditing perspective, but gets them exposure to what we see as deficient investigations that need improvement, as well as quality investigations that can be sustained through the organization so they could go back to their divisions, back to their commands and look for those areas in real-time chain of reviews.

And then certainly, we do have ongoing command-level training through the FBI National Academy, the Senior Management Institute for Police Executives, to develop our commanders in the future, again, not only to be good leaders, but to be good reviewers, to know the best practices that are

not only in policy, but constitutional practices throughout the organization.

THE COURT: Great. You will not have the backup eventually, and I'm not saying it's going to be immediate, but you won't have the backup of the Independent Monitoring Team to do this really fundamental and important work. So I'm glad to hear all of those things, and continued focus on it will be great.

Thank you.

ASSISTANT CHIEF ALLISON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So let me go now to Mr. Chanin and Mr. Burris for their comments on where things stand.

MR. CHANIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

The Monitor has moved Task 5 from "In Compliance" to "Deferred Compliance."

We have no real knowledge as to what this case is about, and we feel obligated to protect the due process rights of all involved until this matter is resolved.

The Monitor has found that the information developed in the OPD's internal investigation and discipline process is, as you say, Your Honor, deeply troubling. Accordingly, we also are concerned about this matter.

The defendants have stated that Task 5 should not have been deferred on the basis that these two cases have not been investigated yet; in other words, the Monitor should just

ignore these two cases and we should move on to the sustainability period and perhaps even finish it and dismiss this case with this matter hanging out here -- out there.

We choose to wait for these findings to be made and to discuss them at an appropriate time. We remind the City of Oakland that we are in the sustainability period, which is scheduled to end in eight months. We simply must have time to evaluate this problem and see how it impacts the sustainability period.

Accordingly, we must agree with the Monitor's decision to defer Task 5. And as we have stated in our brief, we reserve the right to ask the Court to modify the sustainability period or, if necessary, to ask that it be revoked, depending on what the finding is.

Now, moving on to Task 45, OPD believes it is in compliance with that task as well. The Monitor has determined that it should be in partial compliance. We agree with the Monitor's assessment.

The OPD has gone into detail on how it can discover and monitor Task 45 problems on its own. And it is totally true that they have come a long way on this issue. In fact, I believe if they follow their own recommendations in the report they just published and set up a plan to implement the recommendations that they have, in fact, recommended themselves, that we may be able to attain compliance by the

next case management conference.

Of course, the Monitoring team and the plaintiffs' attorneys will have to examine this document and approve it, as will the Court. But the OPD has Dr. Grossman, Dr. Monin, and Dr. Eberhardt to assist them. And I think if they use these people, particularly the Stanford team that has specifically reached out to OPD, they can do a satisfactory report and attain compliance.

Some of the problems identified in the OPD Office of
Internal Accountability, Discipline, Equity, and Internal
Procedural Justice Report, which had no plan of action or
correction, include: The report does not deal with their own
finding that African Americans and Latinos were overcharged.
The report admits that black officers are more likely to have
one allegation sustained than any other race. The City has
made no real response to this, both in its report and
subsequently. The report did not deal with the fact that five
out of six officers in OPD feel the disciplinary process is not
fair and based on more who you know and your rank than any
other ethical standard.

Now, the Chief has just said, in effect, that this is sour grapes; and he may, in fact, be right. But there's no point in making this finding if you're not going to do anything about it or say what you think about it. That's not okay, at least in my opinion.

In short, the recent report did identify real problems in the OPD. But that is not the problem. The problem is that there was no action or proposed action on many of the most important issues that were identified.

And, Your Honor, in closing, I'd like to say that I was recently on a ride-along. I am very impressed with the job, the very difficult job, that the police have, especially in East Oakland where I was. They performed it with compassion and humanity, and I was impressed. It's certainly a long way from the point they were when I started. And I just want to throw that in there as a compliment to the Oakland Police Department.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Chanin.

Mr. Burris?

MR. BURRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

I only have a couple of points to follow up on, a couple of issues that I traditionally follow up on. And this goes to the non-dispatch stops, given that I'm seeing some changes in the percentages.

But two things. I'm noting that the number is fairly consistently high for African Americans in terms of the highest number of stops, which is troubling inasmuch as the African American population in the city is reducing significantly, almost daily, but the numbers for non-dispatch stops don't seem

to be dropping, seems to me, a proportionate rate. I also see where the non-dispatch stops are increasing for the Hispanic population.

So I'm wondering if there's any kind of drill-down on that by the Department and the Risk Management Committee, to see if you can attribute any particular events or conduct to any particular officer on either one of these, because I do think that, you know, it's troubling to me that the non-dispatch rates for African Americans are still pretty significant. And that question is: What kind of stops are those, aside from, I assume, traffic violations?

But that's an area that I have some concern about, even though, on balance, we're a long ways from where we were, and I'm really pleased about that. A lot of good work has taken place, particularly when I've seen drill-down and talking about intelligent-led policing.

But non-dispatch stops is an important area because that's where people are being stopped, and an officer has arbitrariness or great discretion to make those stops. So I'd like to see, before we finish, whether or not there's some consistency in terms of a reduction in the non-dispatch stops.

Then, next, if you go to consistency of discipline, I certainly have been troubled, okay, by the -- and the Court has made reference to it earlier, in terms of the abilities and discoverabilities -- discovering of new complaints after

starting and the impact that it's had on the African Americans at a different rate than it has on other ethnic groups.

That is significant, although I do and have heard what the City, the defendants, have said about it. And it may be that they're at a point where you can only reconcile and narrow it down, in one sense, but not really necessarily find a consistent path in cause and effect of it. That may be.

I have certainly been impressed by the efforts that have been made by the committees to try to address itself to this. And it may be, futuristically, that this issue may have been curtailed and, certainly, the clear direction for the future had been set forth. I surely hope so, because I really have a strong belief -- and everyone should recognize that -- that when -- that the punishment, the discipline that one receives in part of their careers can affect how they progress through the Department, and that affects all kind of efforts on their part.

So for me, it looks like a real effort is being made.

We're a long ways from where we started out when this issue

first came forward three or four years ago. And I think we're

close, but I hope that by the next hearing, the issues that we

were concerned about in 2019 have been put to bed and that

those issues will not be forward -- not something that we'll

have to worry about in the future, particularly, as we said,

after we're gone. We'd like to know that it's being done now

and corrected and put on the right path. So that's just my feeling.

So otherwise, I think that a lot of progress is being made. I'm very happy about some of the programs that have developed. One which caught my attention was the management-level liaison committee. It's one of the first things we talked about at the very, very beginning. I think Rocky and people will -- Jim will remember this. And to see that it's still functioning and the public defenders and the D.A. and the court system are working together, at least working together in a sense that they're identifying misconduct when it occurs, is a very positive statement.

And that's the kind of long-term sustainability that I think we're looking to have here.

So, thank you.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you, Mr. Burris.

And, Deputy Chief Wong, I'll look forward to your response to Mr. Burris on the non-dispatch stops stats in January. That would be an interesting response.

So, Ms. Martin, I don't know how you want to organize the presentation, whether you want Mayor Schaaf to go or you. But obviously, one of the issues that I think you're going to be addressing is the second issue that Mr. Burris raised.

MS. MARTIN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. I think it would make sense for me to go first while we're discussing the

disparity study work and some of the findings so that I can address that now, and then go to Mayor Schaaf.

THE COURT: Great.

MS. MARTIN: So to address Your Honor's questions first about the disparity study work, I just think we ought to get clear and be on the same page, starting, that the only place that we have found statistically significant disparities thus far, meaningful differences in the data, were in those 2019 DLI investigations.

And so when Mr. Chanin is also talking about black officers being more likely to have more than one sustained case, that was in the 2019 DLIs. It's on page 16 of the report.

And the reason that we drilled down on that and found these other differences is because we were trying to find out if there were correlating factors that maybe rose to the level of contributing enough that we could call them causal factors. We couldn't, but these were correlating factors.

So we did find things like black officers had more than one sustained case in the 2019 DLIs. We also correlated the sustained findings in DLIs with discovered violations. So that was our most significant finding, is that black officers, in those 2019 DLIs, they were much more likely to have a discovered violation added to their initial allegations. And it's common sense and supported by our follow-up work that,

actually, discovered violations are more often sustained. And that's because if it's first seen by an investigator, it's likely that what they're seeing is likely misconduct. So it would make sense that if you have more discovered violations, you also have more sustained violations there.

And this is something that the correlation is what we're going to pick up and run with moving forward and looking in places where, even if we haven't seen statistically significant differences and racial disparities, which we haven't yet, if we do see that or even if we don't, we will also be looking at the discovered violations and seeing if there are differences there. And so while that might not be creating a disparity, that's an area that we can look to, to see if there's a way to remove some of the discretion.

And removing discretion in a lot of these bias studies that have been done, finding where discretion is and removing discretion, if possible and appropriate, is sometimes the only way to really have an effective impact on, particularly, unconscious bias.

So that's -- I just wanted to be clear about what we found in 2019 and what we're not finding necessarily now.

And then in light of Your Honor's statements and some of the things we've heard from plaintiffs' counsel, I think it also makes sense for me to focus on what we are looking at, now and going forward, and what the Court and the parties might expect from the City as we move forward.

So I have one specific item that addresses Task 45 that I think will be topical here, and then another more general item.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. MARTIN: But first, so, likely the most significant step that we have moving forward involving Task 45 is going to be the Department's development of what's now called, in the Office of Internal Accountability documents, as the "working methodology."

And that's going to be, as stated in those reports, maneuvered into a more concise, final either flow chart or recipe-type document so that anyone who wants to do a disparity study on OPD's data, including OPD, because the Department is required by policy now to be doing this on an ongoing basis, can follow that recipe and do that analysis, not only to identify if there are statistically significant disparities but address those disparities.

Now, the Department has discussed the importance of doing this with both the Monitoring Team and the Stanford researchers, and the two use different terms to describe it.

Dr. Klofas, on the Monitoring Team, will call it a methodology.

Dr. Monin, from Stanford, will refer to it as a playbook. But in any event, we all agree that this is a significant item that needs to be completed moving forward.

And at this point, there isn't really a debate that the Department has a solid, written, recipe-style methodology that it now uses to pull reliable data sets and assess the data to identify meaningful or statistically significant disparities. We have that down to a science.

And we're able to get there by working, last year, with the Stanford team to pull the reliable data sets. That's around the time that we -- when we tried to replicate the 2019 Hillard-Heintze study, we learned that the data was not pulled reliably. So we figured out how to make sure we could always do that moving forward.

And moving forward from that, we need to now add to that solid identification methodology a second piece, and that's: What do we do if we see a statistically significant disparity? So we need to join those together.

And once we have that, then we will have sort of the working playbook, working final methodology going forward so that we can not only identify solidly and with trust whether there is a disparity, a meaningful disparity, but then what steps are we going to take to address that and eradicate it and impact it effectively.

Another thing just to reference is, when we're talking about meaningful differences, I did note that when we talk about differences in discipline, particularly more black officers receiving suspensions, that is something that

the Department has acknowledged and is continuing to look into. But at this point, there hasn't been any findings that that's statistically significant, or meaningful differences in that data. But we did see it; we do acknowledge it; we've reported it. We want to be transparent about it. But at this point, those data sets are very small. So it is something that we're keeping our eye on moving forward.

And it is certainly my sincere hope that once we have this sort of down to a specific science, not only the identification piece, but the next steps to address if we do find disparities, that no one will disagree that we're not in substantial compliance with Task 45.

It's also --

THE COURT: So let me -- may I stop you there for just a sec?

MS. MARTIN: Of course, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I assume that those looking-forward, going-forward steps that you're describing are ones which you're discussing with Dr. Monin or Dr. -- whoever you're discussing them with at Stanford, and also Dr. Klofas; that those are -- your goal is to have everybody on that same page as to what needs to happen, what the recipe needs to be, and how this is going to work on a going-forward basis. Is that right?

MS. MARTIN: Yes, Your Honor. That's exactly what we did

with the identification of disparities back about a year, year and a half ago, in pulling the data. We worked with Stanford to get that down cleanly. And so this is the next step.

And we're waiting to finish the 2019 DLI investigation, which we have completed that now, in order to figure out which additional data we are going to hard code, if any, so that we could pull that data as well as part of -- so we'd have that as part of the recipe or protocol, if you will, so we could use that.

Both Dr. Monin and Dr. Klofas have talked about the importance of having such a sort of recipe going forward and what we're going to do to address disparities. That is something that we'll work on. We have not yet worked on the actual content of that yet.

So we've got our working methodology. And then the next step is now to work with outside folks to get that down to kind of the same recipe style that we have for identifying disparities.

THE COURT: Great. Okay. Now, I interrupted you. What else did you have to say?

MS. MARTIN: One other thing that I wanted to follow up that was mentioned today, it's something that Your Honor said about the Court ultimately transferring the oversight reins, because it is important to note that when court oversight ends at some point down the line, OPD will not simply be left,

you know, on its own to ensure that all of its progress on the 51 tasks remain.

As a starting point, the Department, as AC Allison talked about earlier, does have measures in place to monitor and self-correct on its own, not only to sustain the progress it has made, but to continue to advance its procedural justice priorities in the community and inside the Department.

The oversight bodies to ensure sustainability and continued advancement of constitutional policing principles are what the City has enabled over the past several years, and the City is not going to have to do this alone. We have the Police Commission, the Commission's independent Inspector General, and the Community Police Review Agency, who all have express authority over areas, including Department policy, auditing NSA tasks, and investigations and discipline.

The oversight bodies are in addition to City Council, which includes a Council Public Safety Committee, the Mayor, the City Administrator, and the City Attorney, all who regularly and closely engage with the Department on accountability measures.

So who watches the watchman or who polices the police, well, in the City of Oakland, the answer to that is at least three direct oversight bodies and four additional city offices.

And the City is prepared to take the reins on oversight.

And as it edges closer to that eventuality, it's important to

acknowledge this is a Department and a City that are extraordinarily different, not only from the Department and the City at the start of this case in 2000, but even the Department and the City of six years ago.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mayor Schaaf.

MAYOR SCHAAF: Thank you, Your Honor.

This will be my last time addressing you. So it's been an honor to be on this journey for our community and for a sense of justice together.

I get asked, about a hundred times a day, what am I doing next, and my answer is I am 1000 percent focused on being the Mayor of Oakland to my very last day, which will be January 2nd at 9:59 a.m. And so you have my continued commitment to stay laser focused on this work.

I will not stop holding this department accountable not for compliance. Everybody in this organization knows I bristle at that word because this is about continual improvement. It is work that will never end, and it is the work that we must be committed to.

And I promise, as well, that when my successor is known, which should be in about four weeks, that I will also work to transition them and to clearly impart to them the importance of staying personally and deeply engaged in this work. That is my

commitment to you and to the people of Oakland.

I do want to acknowledge our challenges, particularly the huge increase in homicides and the sense of frustration from our public that there is a rising lawlessness.

But I do want to acknowledge that our problems with attrition, for example, have improved. We are starting to see that slow down.

And our success in recruiting the right kind of new officers, who have raised their hand for public service for all the right reasons and are here to be the guardians of our community, not lawyers, we are very pleased to see the results of recruitment and training.

I do want to address head-on the two related disciplinary matters that were raised in the Monitor's recent report. City Administrator Reiskin and I are fully versed on the matters. We take them extremely seriously. We took swift action to hire external expert investigators as soon as there was any question about the sufficiency of OPD's internal investigations. And we will continue to stay vigilant to instances where the nature of certain matters clearly will warrant independent review. And as always, we look forward to finding the truth in these matters and addressing any issues that are uncovered, both in terms of personal accountability of officers as well as improving OPD's processes.

My departing thoughts for you is just to express my deep,

deep gratitude to the Court and, of course, to the plaintiffs' counsel who have been incredible partners in this work. And because of you, our city is safer; it has more dignity; it has more justice. So thank you for that.

And I also want to say that we are going to continue to embrace -- it's who Oakland is -- the opportunities to make our public safety system stronger and involve community organizations, community members, both the formal and informal organizations and structures that Oakland is so well-known for, who will continue to insist that we reimagine public safety, that we strengthen civilian oversight. And that will, of course, include the continuing and very important and effective role of the Office of the Inspector General that is independent and under our Police Commission.

I guess I want to just to end with one parting observation. You've seen in these reports that there is clear evidence of cultural change in the Department. You see it in the statistics around racial disparities. Not to say that the work is ever done, but we see it. But I want you to know that I also have felt it.

Every new class of police recruits -- and it's actually captured in the documentary *The Force*. My very first day as the Mayor of Oakland eight years ago, I walk up and down the line, while they are still in their training, before graduation day, and I asked each one individually: Why have you chosen to

come work for the Oakland Police Department?

And I want you to know that the quality and the nature of those answers has changed during my time as Mayor. And every graduation, when I address that class, I ask them to remember their "why" and to hold it deeply in their hearts as they do this incredibly difficult work.

I hear those answers so differently now, so many more officers who have grown up in Oakland, that want to ensure that their communities, that often don't have a voice, have someone they can trust within government that they feel will be fair and hear their particular concerns. And that is what I'm hearing more and more, and that is what I am feeling.

And so, Your Honor, again, I thank you for your incredible contribution to Oakland's safety and justice. And I want to just say it has been a pleasure. It has been hard, but this work is the most important work that any leader can do.

And I thank you for everything that you have done for Oakland.

THE COURT: Well, thank you.

MAYOR SCHAAF: And, of course, I welcome your questions.

THE COURT: Thank you. I don't have any questions for you.

I want to send thanks back to you, particularly in the last few years, which is not to denigrate anything before, but in the last few years, your personal engagement and commitment

to accountability and integrity as part of this process of
constitutional policing. It's not that you shouldn't have been
doing that anyway. It is the job of the mayor. The buck does
always stop with you. But you have been particularly engaged
in this process, and the City has been very well-served by
that, as has the OPD.

And it is my hope that you will be able to pass that

And it is my hope that you will be able to pass that commitment along to the next mayor who, if anything, will need to do it more than you have.

So I thank you very much for your service, and I look forward to reading about what you end up doing in life. So thank you.

MAYOR SCHAAF: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lucia.

MR. LUCIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. LUCIA: I really don't have much to offer in terms of the substantive issues that have been discussed; so I'll leave it at that.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that's very wise. It's hard to -- you don't want to step on the last act.

So with that, I will tell you that we are going to meet again on January 10th. We are in the sustainability period, and it is my firm expectation that everyone on this call will keep their eyes firmly on the prize and make sure that all of

the things that the Chief described earlier maintain their 1 state of sustainability and improvement and all of the things 2 that are necessary for OPD. 3 So I will look forward to seeing you on January 10th. 4 5 Thank you all very much. 6 MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor. 7 ALL: THE CLERK: Thank you all. 8 (Proceedings adjourned at 4:54 p.m.) 9 ---000---10 11 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 12 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 13 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 14 15 Friday, October 21, 2022 16 DATE: 17 18 19 20 Ana Dub, CSR No. 7445, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR, CRG, CCG Official United States Reporter 21 22 23 24 25