Pages 1 - 44

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 Tuesday, January 23, 2024

TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEOCONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES: (via videoconference)

For Plaintiffs:

LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS 7677 Oakport Street - Suite 1120

Oakland, California 94612

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

For Defendants:

OFFICE OF OAKLAND CITY ATTORNEY

BARBARA J. PARKER

One Frank Ogawa Plaza - Sixth Floor

Oakland, California 94612

BY: BRIGID S. MARTIN, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

REPORTED BY: Marla F. Knox, CSR No. 14421, RPR, CRR, RMR

United States District Court - Official Reporter

1	APPEARANCES:	(continu	ed via videoconference)
2	For Interveno	r:	DATMO LUGIA 6 MILWINGON
3		BY:	RAINS LUCIA & WILKINSON 2300 Contra Costa Boulevard - Suite 230 Pleasant Hill, California 94523
4		DI:	ROCKNE A. LUCIA, JR., ATTORNEY AT LAW
5	Also Present:		Acting Chief Darren Allison
6 7			Deputy Chief Clifford Wong Captain Anthony Tedesco Marsha Carpenter Peterson, OPC Chair
8			Mayor Sheng Thao City Administration Jestin Johnson
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Tuesday - January 23, 2024

3:31 p.m.

2

1

PROCEEDINGS

3

---000---

4

5

THE CLERK: We will get started in case number 00-4599, Allen, et al. versus City of Oakland, et al.

6 7 Counsel, if you would please state your appearance for the record.

8

MR. BURRIS: Yeah, John Burris for the Plaintiffs.

9

for the City of Oakland. I have here with me today Mayor Sheng

MS. MARTIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Brigid Martin

10 11

Thao; City Attorney Barbara Parker; City Administrator, Jestin

Johnson; Chief of Police, Darren Allison and members of the

12

13

executive team at OPD; Inspector General, Michelle Phillips and

14

Police Commission Chair Marsha Peterson.

15

THE COURT: Excellent. Good afternoon.

16

MR. LUCIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Rockne Lucia

Great. Good afternoon to everybody.

17

for Intervenor OPOA.

18

assume Mr. Chanin will be fighting his way through Zoom and

19 20

getting -- joining us in a moment.

THE COURT:

21

22

Let me start today first by acknowledging the death of Officer Tuan Le, who was killed in the line of duty, protecting

23

and serving the public.

24

In my view being a public servant is the highest calling

25

for any human being and being a police officer is the most

difficult of those calling.

Police work provides the scaffold for the rule of law without which our republic can't function. So the loss of Officer Le is a blow to all of us.

Before getting into the work that remains, I want to start by recognizing the progress that OPD has made.

The case management statement this time didn't highlight the substantial decrease in stops over the last several years, but it did point out critically that the rate of Blacks detained in stops has fallen dramatically.

The CMC statement didn't discuss the impact of vision or the risk management meetings that occurred not only citywide but area-wide, which are critical to constitutional policing.

It did note that the policies that were recommended by the Clarence Dyer report have been published and that the Monitor has found OPD in compliance with task 5 at the moment.

OPD is also in compliance with task 2 although there is some question whether it is going to be able to stay there.

And I look forward to asking about that in a moment.

I am concerned about task 45. The City argues that it should have been found in compliance because it's promulgated appropriate policies and issued a searing report identifying real issues regarding disparate treatment of Black officers and officers of color generally in disciplinary proceedings.

And I congratulate the City for doing that because it

shows an ability to examine internal processes and expose problems that it found. That's really important.

But to be in compliance with task 45 means fixing the problem. That's what is required. And I see this issue as completely intertwined with the Clarence Dyer report, with task 5, and with the underlying racial issues that got -- resulted in the NSA in the first place.

I'm also concerned with how long it's taking to select a new chief of police.

I think Chief Allison has done an excellent job, and I thank him for his leadership over the last year and a half; but I would like to ensure that the new chief -- whoever he or she is -- is committed to constitutional policing.

I agree completely with the Police Commission statement on the importance of civilian oversight, and I look forward to the day that this Court and this monitorship comes to an end.

That's going to require excellence in the candidates recruited for the chief's job and a commitment to everybody -- from everybody to constitutional policing.

So, I have a few questions and then I'm going to be happy to hear targeted comments from the lawyers and from Mayor Thao.

I will say now the next CMC is going to be on June 4th of 2024. I know that the City had been hoping for an earlier date, but I want to see what happens regarding tasks 2, 5 and 45.

And prior to that CMC, I want the parties -- I also hope maybe the chief will be -- the new chief will have been selected by that time.

I want to see the parties in advance of that meet and discuss whether it's appropriate to end the monitorship at that time, to change its form or to retain the status -- maintain the status quo.

And in advance of that, I would like the City to update the stop data -- historic stop data as well as other meaningful metrics that show how the OPD has embraced the spirit as well as the letter of the NSA.

So -- so that's my -- those are my preliminaries. Let me add -- so I'm going to start by asking a few questions, as I have before. And is Captain Tedesco -- he is present. Can you turn on your camera, Captain Tedesco?

CAPTAIN TEDESCO: Indeed.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

CAPTAIN TEDESCO: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, the last review of task 2 puts you right on the cusp and -- of compliance, and I have raised with your predecessors how important I think it is that -- that these investigations are timely and that falling below 85 percent really does a disservice to everybody who is involved.

So I'm interested in how you are holding your employees,

your supervisees, investigators accountable for meeting the deadlines and whether any changes are going to be necessary to remain in compliance.

CAPTAIN TEDESCO: Thank you, Your Honor. A couple of points on that, if you will bear with me, I think the -- my assignment in June, I have been learning quickly on the job.

I'm very process oriented from my previous assignments.

And I immediately took the opportunity to learn and assess everything that we were doing in order to look for opportunities for improvement.

One of the things I want to say right away is that the department for Q3 maintained its 85 percent compliance despite the cyber attack, which provided us with very significant challenges that were seen a little bit in quarter 2, more so in Q3 and moved forward into Q4 as well.

I'm not expecting to see those same challenges moving into the first quarter of this year as well as I think we have resolved them all.

So looking at resiliency through that, I don't know that we imagined a cyber attack, the design of the 85 percent standard, but we were still able to maintain it despite that significant challenge.

But with that, there was opportunities for building resiliency within a number of our systems so such a thing couldn't happen to us again, and that went forward in storing

our data in a number of different sources of third-party evidence.com in order to make sure that if something happened again, we would have multiple backups so we wouldn't lose data in the same fashion again.

And also, it gave us opportunity then to look at our intake process, our assignment to investigations process, our division level process for inefficiencies because really we can do the investigations and I believe that we can commit to quality investigations but the 180-day timeline really means that we need every available moment in order to get them done properly.

And so we looked very hard at a number of our processes, and one of the major things that we have undertaken since I have transferred over is the switch away from paper processes to all digital processes.

And what that's done is it's allowed us to save weeks on the front end of most investigation in accumulating all of the evidentiary material and distributing it to the investigator that needs that material and then being able to easily share through that the process with review without having to transport physical files from place to place.

So we are saving a lot of time there, and we expect that to continue on forward; and it's been already a bit of a game changer for us in terms of our timeline pieces of it.

Really I'm hoping with that -- because I agree with the

report, there is definitely a nexus between task 2 and
task 5 -- that the additional time saved with us going forward
will give us opportunity to continue with quality
investigations and make sure that we are getting that right;
that we are getting to the truth of the matter in each of these

THE COURT: That's great. That's very encouraging and I'm delighted that you have taken the bull by the horns. So I will look forward to continued compliance then going down the road. Thank you very much again.

And so, Deputy Chief Wong.

investigations.

(Pause in proceedings.)

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. How are you?

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: Very well, sir.

THE COURT: Good. So you sit in a pivotal place for achieving the ends of the NSA and I am interested in -- first of all, I assume that you were going to tell me that the risk management meetings continue apace throughout the district and throughout the area commands; is that true?

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: Yes, Your Honor. The risk management meetings still continue at the area levels as well as at the department level, and we still have them separated by field operations and investigative sections and traffic so as to not make the meetings so long, but we have thorough coverage

for them.

THE COURT: So could you give me a specific example or two of how the information that you have learned through the risk management meetings has actually modified officer behavior?

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: That's a very wide range of topics that are covered at risk management meetings.

THE COURT: And I could've given you a heads-up on that, but I didn't. I'm interested in what you can provide for me.

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: Okay. Well, starting from something as simple as, let's say, training. Vehicle collisions, we noticed that those were going up a while back, and they were low speed collisions and we simply referred that over to the training section; and they were able to adjust the training regimen.

And normally, they would be involved in a lot of high-speed pursuit driving, but we realize that's not where the accidents were occurring. They were occurring when the officers were trying to get gas or just turning short corners.

So they changed the training to adjust to that small -the small or slow speed maneuvers. So that's a broader
example.

A more narrow example would be they had an officer that was -- their attendance records weren't quite normal. You

would notice they were calling in sick or having a lot of issues. And then when they looked at that individual officer, put them on supervisory monitoring as a result of the risk management meeting, and that monitor later discovered that the officer was having personal issues in her life; and they were able to correct that via a non-punitive method.

And that all stemmed from data that just came up on a slide at a risk management meeting.

THE COURT: So that's -- that is excellent. Can you assure me that when I am no longer asking you questions on Zoom, that risk management meetings are now fully embraced within the department and that -- that this is something that's -- that will survive long after people have forgotten what the NSA is?

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: Well, first of all, it is documented policy in our one, so the whole risk management meeting process is in policy and required.

Second, it is part of the way we do business now. It is in our processes. It is in the way that -- that's how we speak to, I guess, our subordinate levels of supervision to determine what's going on in their areas, what's going on in their units.

These risk management meetings are a way of taking the information based on individual level or on squad levels or even department levels and drilling up and down.

And then we have -- we have gotten used to basically

talking about issues in these meetings because this is the perfect format to cover several layers of supervision as well as a wide range of topics, and we have gotten to the point where we started adjusting the topics that we talk about.

If we realize, you know, these collisions are no longer an issue, we kind of take that off and put it on the back burner.

If we realize that stops are becoming an issue, that becomes the bigger topic and we spend more time on those. And it is just engrained in the way we do things now.

THE COURT: I'm delighted to hear that. I really expect that that will continue. I went -- as you know, I went to a couple of the earlier risk management meetings. And to have this now engrained throughout the department is -- is a tremendous step forward. So, thank you for that.

DEPUTY CHIEF WONG: You are welcome.

THE COURT: Chief Allison, let me ask you a question. It's good to see you.

CHIEF ALLISON: Good to see you too, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So I'm interested in sort of a similar question that I asked of Chief Deputy Wong. How are you ensuring -- going to ensure that when you are no longer sitting in that seat and the -- and I'm no longer sitting in this seat that the -- the progress that OPD has made over time and will make over the next few months to get into full compliance is going to be permanent?

CHIEF ALLISON: Thank you for that question, Your Honor. And I also want to take an opportunity just to begin to thank you for the recognition of Officer Le and the tragedy that was faced a few weeks ago. I do appreciate that, and that means a lot to the organization and to the family.

To the question at hand, you know, having the opportunity to have been with this thing now for almost -- well, over 29 years -- I have seen this department change, grow, become self reflective over time; and I have seen it exponentially become more self reflective in adjustments in the last several months, several years of my career.

And I think, you know, fundamentally when it comes down to sustainability and organizational culture, it is creating a value system that is not only linked to the community but linked to the noble cause and the honorable position of a police officer to engage in public service that we get at the very beginning of our careers.

And I truly believe that that value system exists. It's checked on and reinforced by oversight bodies throughout the City to -- including our government, City government or City leadership, our commissions, our standards in OIG.

And I think that value system has been infused and engrained in our policies and our hiring practices and our training and development and our job in this organization is to develop not only a leadership cadre at the top but a leadership

cadre throughout the entire organization to reinforce -- to have a succession plan, a sustainability plan in that area.

And so I think we have developed the practices and the infrastructure that we didn't have, you know, 29, 30 years ago in the organization to act as a fundamental foundational principle to uphold those values.

Our policies, as was discussed a little bit about some of the outcomes of our risk management meetings, policies that we saw grow out of that were handcuffing policies or search policies, things that are integral in how we treat the public. Those have been infused and grounded in those principles.

So that along with training and accountability. And accountability comes in many different forms. It is not just discipline, but it could be mentorship, development, training, retraining but also rewarding and recognizing those principles that we find important to succeed as an organization, those fundamental, foundational principles along with our value system in how we hire and how we promote has been infused in the organization.

And, you know, obviously as individuals come in to the chair to the role of chief and leaders come and go, there's always a concern that somebody could come in and modify those policies or move the ship a different direction, so to speak.

And I think that the City has done well in creating external oversight to be able to regulate that and bring us

back to the North Star, so to speak, when -- if we were to drift down our course.

We have our Inspector General's Office that's separated from the police department that engages in audits and reviews. They have certainly shown the ability to do some recent audits and reviews.

We have our independent complaint investigative body with the CPRA that can do independent and separate internal affairs complaints.

And, of course, any policies that are fundamental to how we engage with the community and ensure public trust have Police Commission engagement and oversight. That can't just be arbitrarily changed into a different direction.

So I think we have created that value system, the policies, the structures and the protocols to reinforce that value system, and what I would consider a safety net if someone were to come in and up root those fundamental practices to get us back to center.

THE COURT: Okay. That's a good answer and I am -- I appreciate your efforts and particularly over the last year and a half -- this has not been an easy time -- and I very much appreciate the work that you have done.

CHIEF ALLISON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Well, let's go to lawyers, Mr. Chanin and Mr. Burris.

Mr. Chanin, why don't we start with you.

MR. CHANIN: Thank you, Your Honor. And I'm sorry. I don't know what happened when I couldn't sign in. I was there at 3:15 but I'm sorry.

THE COURT: This is what happens on Zoom. There's always somebody -- very rarely it's me but I have grown not to get mad at anybody else who doesn't show up. So, please go ahead.

MR. CHANIN: I was there, though.

All right. I would like to join Chief Allison in thanking the Court in postponing the case management conference because of the tragic death of Oakland Police Officer Tuan Le.

I appreciate you giving the OPD time to grieve and arrest suspects in that senseless act. I'm very sorry for his loss and everyone who feels pain because of his loss.

The disparities noted in OPD's own report attached as Exhibit 1 to our joint CMC statement are not acceptable.

In my view the disparities listed on the charts on page 7 and 8 of the Plaintiff's statement warrant further Court oversight.

What the OPD is doing to its own officers recalls the reason why John and I filed the Riders case originally.

And the fact that one officer did a significant portion of the disparate treatment and it was -- recalls the unrecognized disparate treatment over many years done by Officer Valerga when while on duty he was allowed to molest at least 100 Asian women before he was arrested and pled guilty to some of his many crimes. OPD never punished Valerga's supervisor because they could not identify who supervised him.

Now, almost 20 years later no one will tell us who, if anyone, supervised the officer who did many of these FTARC issues.

He blatantly discriminated against African-American officers over and over again, yet he was un -- not caught by OPD for too long.

As I have said many times before that the person who should have been disciplined is not just the subject officer who did the wrongdoing, it should be his supervisor or her supervisor -- in this case him, I believe. Only then will there be real accountability at the OPD.

Despite all of this, the fact that this behavior was disclosed by an Oakland police officer in a detailed report shows how far the OPD has come since negotiated settlement agreement was made an order of the Court by Judge Thelton Henderson.

And it is true that OPD has promulgated a number of policies to remedy the situation. The extension you have just granted will allow the Monitor and the Plaintiffs' attorneys time to see if these FTRAC reforms work or if we have the same problem with disparate treatment when we come back in June.

And that's going to be a big issue for me, speaking only for myself.

The disparities in FTARC speak only not to -- speak not only to task 45. If investigations result in disparities, task 5 is still a concern because you cannot have a discipline system that is unfair for any reason most of all given the disparities that led to this case if it is racially disparate.

Far worse than the task 5 explanation that the City gives is its position that it has achieved substantial compliance with task 45.

First, the City admitted that the OPD's own report pointed out the problem with FTARC. As I said previously, this is one of the many reasons why I am willing to consider having the NSA end this year because it shows that the Department has finally achieved the capacity to discover its own shortcomings.

However laudable this is, the report shows that there is still work to be done. I cannot support an exit from the NSA just because the OPD has discovered the problem.

We need to see that the problem has been solved with the same ingenuity and hard work that went into writing Exhibit 1. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Burris, do you have anything to add?

MR. BURRIS: Some, Your Honor, not much.

First off, glad to be back with everyone. You know, I

want to just say that I have continued to take cases outside of Oakland if anyone might know -- it's not surprising -- but what I have noted is that many of the conduct -- much of the conduct that we have addressed in Oakland really is still occurring in other places, and I am seeing racial profiling cases -- people being stopped -- even today -- just unnecessary reasons, tinted windows, racial profilings, people's cars being searched, chasings that we have had a lot of work on, which I think that we have done a really good job in controlling chasings where people don't get shot or killed at the end.

So I'm very, very pleased about a lot of the work that has taken place. I also feel that the work that needs to be done has to be done, and I liken it I think to completing the job to having a hole in a leaky ship.

If you have it, you haven't completed the job. You still have the problem with the ship sinking at some later point.

And to me the issue that's most concerning -- and we all have our own particular -- the racial profiling issues that existed in task 34 and the racial issues that existed in task 45 still are issues, for sustainability purposes, must be dealt with before we move on.

And certainly there has been much progress on task 34. We have not tested in a while. I hope that there will be some testing.

But that is a test, an area for sustainability purposes,

as we move onto the next generation of lawyers and next generation of people -- including my kids and all the grandkids -- that this issue of task 34 will not be an issue.

But I am concerned that we could regress in this area.

And, of course, we have always had this concern about police officers within the Department although one might not think that that was the big issue with me but it is in terms of racial discrimination because I also know this depends upon the future employment, opportunities for people within the Department.

And a racially -- African-American officers who are receiving racial bias and disparate treatment at early stages in their careers, we know that's a step behind, a step delay, and the promotional opportunities will be less and it will be less competitive.

So it's important to get this right, and I commend efforts have been made to redo the policies; but for whatever reasons, that still has not got to the essence. And it may just be human error, human judgment. And if that's the case, then there has to be checks and balances on that, so that one person can't control the impact on another person -- other people's careers for whatever reasons.

And whatever the numbers show, they show; that the disparity exists. So, you know, a lot of the good work has been done. I'm real pleased with the efforts of the

Department. There is unfinished business that has to take place.

And I don't want it to be colored and given any other kinds of names. The fact is we have to be concerned about the disparities that exist within the Department, and we have to be concerned about the disparities that might exist in terms of how people are treated on the streets.

And, of course, we want to make sure that what takes place in the Department is candidly performed.

I think a lot of good efforts is being made, and I'm hopeful that we will get it done. I don't want to leave until we know that the issues of disparities have been controlled and that everybody has a fair opportunity in the Department and that people on the street are not going to be stopped just because of their race.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Lucia.

MR. LUCIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I also just want to acknowledge your comments about Officer Le, and Chief Allison put it very appropriately. He made the ultimate sacrifice for the citizens of Oakland, and a lot of us felt this year has been traumatized by the events; but they pushed through and they push on. So I want to acknowledge that.

I also, as you know, mentioned in our CMC statement that there has been a change in leadership at the OPOA. I will tell you as their counsel for over 25 years, that officer --

Sergeant Nguyen, who is the new president, will carry through as Barry Donelan did, the tradition of being collaborative within the Department.

I will tell you over the last couple of months, a few policies hit my desk that require meet and confer; and we worked -- we put those on a fast track, and I think we came up with some solutions that accommodated the City, the union members and I think ultimately (inaudible).

So I don't really have anything else to offer, but I do want to suggest that if between now and June you'd like to meet with Sergeant Nguyen because he wasn't able to appear today -- he is somewhere out there in the ether watching us -- but if you would like to meet with him, I think he is available and would be willing to do that.

And if you don't have anything else that you would like to ask me, I think I will end it there.

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

Ms. Peterson, you are here -- I think a first time caller -- and I don't know whether you had anything that you wanted to add to the discussion.

MS. PETERSON: Well, I'm happy to be here. Thank you, Your Honor. And we too at the Oakland Police Commission mourn the death in the line of duty of Officer Le and had a moment of silence and constantly monitoring through Interim Chief Allison the health and welfare of the officers in the Oakland Police

Department as a result of that death.

With respect to the Oakland Police Commission, I'm happy that we were allowed to submit our addendum to the City's statement. I think it speaks for itself.

I won't belabor all the points, but I will say that civilian oversight is an important progressive step in the City of Oakland; and the civilian oversight will enforce the police accountability that we are all looking for here and will drive the cultural changes that we are also looking for. And effective civilian oversight, we believe, must be centered, resourced and collaborative.

The Oakland Police Commission, Community Police Review

Agency and the Office of Inspector General are up to the task

of civilian oversight.

With respect -- and I assume you want to hear about the police chief search -- yes, we are in a second phase now of that search. The ad hoc, which I am the chair and our Vice Chair Commissioner Ordaz and our Chair Emeritus Regina Jackson are also on the ad hoc.

We meet every Wednesday. We meet with the consultants.

We are wanting to expand the announcement of the -- of the chief search to expand it. We have met with several chief -- chief -- former chiefs of police and other prominent members and thought leaders in this space to understand better what kind of questions we should be asking, what kind of candidate

we are looking for. We certainly want someone progressive and isn't afraid of -- at being brave in this space of accountability.

We have asked for a rolling list of candidates and access to their resumes and applications so we can do this process as speedy as is reasonably possible.

The list, as we all know, that we were given when I took over in October, early November, was not as robust as we all would have liked; and we chose the three that we thought were best.

And, yes, the list was rejected. And we have developed a new schedule. January 1st through January 31st is the open recruitment. February 1st through the 29th we will evaluate, meaning we will vet and interview candidates and narrow it down to the minimum of three. Of course, we can send more and we will send more as we see they are qualified. And the final names on our schedule to be given to the Mayor March 1st. It could be sooner if we get through the vetting and evaluation process quicker.

So it is our goal to work collaboratively with the Mayor to choose the next police chief. It is our mandate to do that as a commission, and we are working diligently towards that.

THE COURT: Great. Well, thank you for that report and how it's going and I -- I can't emphasize enough what you already know, which is your -- this job just requires -- the

City of Oakland deserves the very best, most excellent chief that is out there. And so I -- keep working at it.

MS. PETERSON: We are.

THE COURT: I'm delighted to hear that.

MS. PETERSON: I'm born and raised in Oakland. I'm committed to doing this work, and I want to see us have the best chief; and I want to see it done, not through a circular firing squad of who didn't do or who isn't doing but to work collaboratively. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. So, Ms. Martin, I
think I will come to you next unless -- I will let you and the
Mayor decide who goes next, but I assume that you wanted to lay
the groundwork but --

MS. MARTIN: Yes, Your Honor. I'm happy to go next.

And I also know that our City Administrator Jestin Johnson is also with us today. And if Your Honor would like, he would be happy to introduce himself as well at some point. This is his first hearing before Your Honor as the City Administrator.

But I will reference first Your Honor's questions about task 45. Disparities are unacceptable, full stop. The City is in a hundred percent agreement with everyone on that.

Now, there are a few things that I do need to correct.

Mr. Chanin referenced one of the investigators being responsible for the disparity that we saw with failure to accept and refer complaints. And that was not accurate.

Although there was one investigator who was responsible for adding more of those types of allegations to investigations, ultimately there was not disparity in the findings of that officer's investigations. So I just wanted to correct that.

The Department has made its very best efforts in conjunction with Stanford University with researchers from the monitoring team to try to figure out what was causing the failure to accept and refer complaints disparity that we saw because ultimately the best way to fix the problem is to find what's causing it or to find what's likely to be causing it.

So the Department spent a lot of time -- well-spent time trying to get to the bottom of that as best as it could, and the Department in doing so found a number of what we will call process points where it would be more likely that the disparity was seeping in.

Because, as I mentioned, it wasn't the -- the result of one officer's cases or one investigator's cases, and it wasn't something that had a direct and obvious cause.

So we are looking for places where we might see bias creep into the process and working on changing those and making it less likely that bias will influence the outcomes at those process points.

So the Department changed policy. It has a new complaint policy and a new standard for failure to accept or refer

complaints.

There has been extensive training both with officers so they understand what is required of them under that policy and of investigators and supervisors who may determine if there's a violation of that policy.

The point here is to make sure that the Department is consistently interpreting the rule and applying the misconduct rules here.

The Department also added requirements for review. If you are going to add an allegation for failure to accept or refer a complaint unintentional, it now has to be approved by the Capital of Internal Affairs.

So there have been a number of things that the Department has done that are targeted -- specifically targeted, not just throwing things at the wall but targeted at really fixing this problem.

Now, I'm hopeful that the 2023 discipline outcomes and findings and misconduct findings, I'm hopeful that that report will show that there is no disparity either with failure to accept or refer complaints or with anything else.

Frankly, if there is, we are prepared to address that head on. We have a process in place. We know we can do it, and we have the partners that we can call on to help us find the cause or the most likely cause if there are disparities.

And it's -- it's, I think, reasonable for us to believe

that in the future we may see a disparity again. We are not perfect. Our -- nothing is perfect. And so if we -- we don't expect necessarily that everything will always move forward and we will never find a disparity again.

I think the central issue here is whether we can address it, we do address it, and it does get fixed.

So, I'm hopeful that our 2023 data report will show no further disparities; but at some point, Your Honor, I mean, we could theoretically continue to see disparities and have to address them.

And I think maybe once we have shown that we can fix it -and we believe that we have shown that with what we have done
and hopefully in the next few months we will see a report that
shows that there are no further disparities.

THE COURT: That's what I would love to see. That would be great.

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. And, Your Honor, one other thing that I wanted to mention is the question that keeps coming back, that we keep coming back to here that doesn't involve technical aspects of task compliance but more the big picture of has the Department's culture changed enough? Has the Department transformed enough? Has the Department evolved enough so that we have confidence that it's evolution will continue after the Court oversight ends?

And there's no doubt that the Department is transformed

from what it was when the NSA was implemented 20 years ago, but there still remains a need for further transformation even after 20 years.

And that's actually not surprising particularly when you think about policing culture in America. It had nearly 200 years to develop.

Boston's police department started in 1838; New York's somewhere around 1844. And Oakland itself was founded in 1853.

So the Department's cultural evolution -- though it's steady and already somewhat significant -- will likely continue for decades to come.

Because when we talk about cultural change at OPD, we also have to consider the culture of the institution of policing.

OPD's culture does not exist in a vacuum. It didn't develop in a vacuum, and its transformation isn't occurring in a vacuum.

Its members work very closely with police in neighboring and overlapping jurisdictions at the local, state and federal levels; and they are members of state and national policing organizations.

So the question at this point shouldn't be has the

Department -- or in June maybe, not at this point -- whether

the Department has completed its transformation but has it

changed enough; has it hit that critical tipping point where we

can trust that the changes it has made will hold and its

evolution will continue?

And I think we know that complete cultural change can't be the standard because last April when we were here in court, Mr. Burris told us that he had asked the Monitor whether the Monitor had ever seen a department's culture fundamentally change under oversight. And the Monitor's answer was no.

So the question must be: Has the Department's culture changed enough? Do we have the momentum once we have complied with the NSA to continue our cultural evolution absent Court oversight?

And I think that there are three things that I can think of here today that demonstrate that we should have confidence in the Department's ability to do that and that we have that momentum.

Number one is the national conversation about race in policing. Communities across the country are expressing a strong desire for their agencies to adopt policies and procedures that Oakland already has. And as a result, law enforcement agencies are adapting constitutional policing models.

This is important because, as I mentioned a moment ago, OPD's culture doesn't exist in a vacuum.

Number two, the Department has been afforded what is really a rigorous and demanding education from the court monitors and compliance directors, an education where there have been no, quote-unquote, easy As.

The lessons learned have seeped into this Department's bones, and that is no more apparent than in the risk management process and meetings that Deputy Chief Wong just talked about a few minutes ago.

Number three, the Department has demonstrated and the City -- the City has demonstrated that it believes so deeply in what are essentially 51 promises about policing that the City made to this community in the NSA, that it has put mechanisms in place in the City charter to enforce compliance with all NSA tasks and ensure transparency about that enforcement even after the settlement terms have been fulfilled as part of this court proceeding.

And these are the reasons that I believe we can be confident that the Department's evolution will continue when Court oversight ends.

And the City asks that the Court consider whether it might be appropriate to end oversight this summer assuming that we are all in agreement that the Department is in compliance.

Thank you.

THE COURT: So, thank you, Ms. Martin. And that is the -- what I'm asking everybody to talk about in advance of the June meeting.

I will say, the monitorship is not going to continue after the City has met the terms of the NSA. The City has not met the terms of the NSA and that's why we are where we are.

There may come a time that everybody says, well, we are -you know, this is going to be a forever project; and it's not
necessary for the Court to stay in on a forever project. I
will listen to that.

There is a race issue that needs to be dealt with, and it is -- it has been a through line and what the Court has been interested in from day one. It is the reason why the Court got in it at day one, and that is the thing that is -- will be driving the review in June.

And, as I think I said earlier, I'm -- nothing would make me happier than saying goodbye to everybody who is on this call because that would mean that the -- that the OPD has achieved and the City has achieved everything that it promised to do.

And I -- I don't want to undercut in any way the progress that has been made. I think there was progress made when Judge Henderson was sitting in this chair, and I think there has been a lot of progress since. And now, we just have to complete the task so...

MR. BURRIS: Your Honor, may I be heard?

Sure.

THE COURT:

MR. BURRIS: Listening to Brigid's comments -- and although I agree that much effort has been done, I have looked at a lot of departments under the country who have been under consent decrees and Oakland has probably done better than mostly all of them in terms of being in compliance with the

Go ahead.

overall objective.

However, I don't agree with the notion that because we are centered on other departments around us and we can be affected by some of them, that somehow can have -- that we can lower our standards in some ways because we have other departments who are not doing what we are doing and that we can be affected that way.

I just don't want that to be the case. I mean, I think we have to -- we have to have our own high standards here; meet those standards. And if other departments don't do it, that's on them; but we have to maybe bring them along. Maybe other lawsuits will be required for that to occur in those areas.

But I don't think we should in any way lower our standards of trying to get to the sustainability that we think is constitutional policing regardless of what other people are doing.

And I know Brigid is not suggesting that, but I want to be very clear that I don't think that other departments or whatever they are doing means anything to us and what it should mean to us in terms of what our standards ought to be and what we are trying to accomplish here. They are not under the consent decree or NSA. We are. And so we have an opportunity to set the standards for everyone else, and we are doing that in many ways. Thank you.

THE COURT: So, I agree with you completely. I think

Ms. Martin agrees with you completely, and I didn't hear her saying anything different.

And I do think that Oakland is in a leadership position in terms of not only having the policies that are sort of state of the art but the substance in any number of ways that is -- that sort of proves the benefit of the hard work that's been done.

Now, we just have to finish that.

MR. BURRIS: Stay the course.

THE COURT: So, let me -- move onto Mayor Thao. And sorry that you are sick and please what -- tell me what you would like to tell me.

MAYOR THAO: Absolutely. Good afternoon, Your Honor, and thank you for the flexibility in allowing us to be on Zoom. I definitely don't want to give what I have to everyone.

MR. BURRIS: Yeah, it wouldn't help the cause. Thank you.

MAYOR THAO: I double down on exactly what John Burris just stated. You know, we need to be the leaders in the nation in regards to constitutional policing, and I truly believe that, you know, even today if we were to look at our force, I would argue that we have the best trained officers.

Is there more work to be done? Absolutely. And that's why we are here today. But -- and then before I say anything else, I also want to say thank you, Your Honor, for the moment for Officer Le.

It was a very difficult time for our whole Oakland family. You know, going through that process, it was very hard for me personally. You know, it truly is losing a family member, and I want to acknowledge here as well too for OPOA for really stepping up to host a memorial so that the community can, you know, really celebrate the life of Officer Le and have a moment as well too. And so thank you to the OPOA for stepping up to organize that in such a short period of time.

In my remarks today, Judge, it's going to be even shorter than usual because I am having a hard time breathing, to be honest.

But, you know, our City Administrator is here. His name is Jestin Johnson. If you would like to hear from Mr. Johnson, I do believe he is in the container.

And as the Court might imagine, this year -- my first year as being the 51st Mayor of the City of Oakland -- I have been able to really reflect deeply on what it means for someone to be a good leader, and I wanted to share some of the insights that my experiences as Oakland's mayor have really driven home for me in this past year.

You know, for more than two decades, I truly see that no city outside of Oakland has invested in to cultivate policy that promote the constitutional policing and accountability.

Is it enough? We have much more to grow. And I do also see that, you know, no police department out there has cheered

louder for the culture of integrity and transparency. And again, we will continue to strengthen those, right, and continue to do that hard work.

And yet despite our written and our spoken commitments that we hear and you hear every quarter or what have you, we have dealt with some serious setbacks, and we have to acknowledge that over the many years.

The details, whether they are different when you hear them, no matter what, these are serious problems. You know, full stop. They are serious problems. And they usually involve a failure of some sort of leadership at some level.

And the solutions have involved other leaders stepping up to make changes so that we can grow from the mistakes that have been -- that have been made.

And in any organization a policy is only as good as the people uplifting it. And if a leader fails to even recognize the problem behavior when they see it, the policy work can't be done; right. It will just be a watered down version for people to stand by to make the same mistakes.

And if a leader minimizes or hides the behavior to protect themselves or the people they favor, the policy just can't work either.

And, you know, if an organization's leader don't model the behavior that they want to see, if they don't really embrace and personify a culture that they want to see, then the rest of

the team picks up on that and even the most inspirational mission statement won't have a real meaning.

You know, I think of it as I'm a single mother. I have always lived by my words and my actions because I know that our kids -- my kid, my son, my nieces and nephews are always watching, right, and it's just the same thing.

When Oaklanders elected me as their mayor, I was honored and continued to be humbled by the trust they put in me. I always will be. I'm thankful for the many leaders in Oakland.

You know, in the City of Oakland, we are so activated, whether it be politically or engaging with our neighbors including OPD, who actually walked the walk.

But I also recognize that I have a uniquely critical role as Mayor of the City. And in my first six weeks in office I had to begin addressing some of those serious incidents and cultural problems.

We were all there together, all of us in this room. And I had to make some very difficult decisions. As I stand here today, I can't say that I modeled that behavior I want to see at OPD and throughout City Government.

We recognized the unacceptable behavior for what it was, and I refused to look the other way even though it was very difficult, you know, as a person myself.

But I refused to down-play it. And when I had to make tough decisions, I did that, you know, without playing

favorites, without playing politics. I did just that. I didn't want to take any shortcuts. I put Oakland first and its constituents first, its residents and businesses first, by what I knew was right. And I always will to be quite honest.

And as much as I wish we could put something in place that would just prevent us from ever covering another serious problem -- whether it be at OPD or other departments or what have you -- that's something we can control -- that we cannot control because problems happen, you know.

What I can control is how leaders in Oakland respond to problems. You know, leading is a responsibility -- a high responsibility.

To your point, Judge, you know, I take public service -you know, it is the highest level of calling, I believe, and I
take it very seriously.

And so I have hired a wonderful City Administrator,

Mr. Jestin Johnson, who has promised me that he will embody the

type of integrity that we want to see at OPD, and I will hold

him to it.

Soon we will hire a police chief, and I will hold them to the same promise. And to that point this is why I think it is so critical that Oakland deserves nothing but the best.

We are at a pivotal moment. We do not and I refuse to allow for all the great work that we have done together, you know, whether because of this process or not -- you know, all

the progress that we have created, I refuse to allow that to go by the wayside. I only want to build upon it to continue to be the leading city in the whole nation on all these progressive efforts.

And at the end of the day, I believe that's what the NSA is fundamentally about. The NSA is obviously a legal document, but the core of the NSA is a promise. It is a commitment that the City of Oakland made to the people of Oakland, present and future. It is a promise to change, you know, the DNA of how we police in the City of Oakland.

You know, to what Mr. Burris spoke about, those are real allegations -- not allegations but we have seen that they have been implemented throughout the City. Yes, it is probably happening, you know, in other departments too; but what we have today is we have leaders of the City of Oakland, so that's what we are going to talk about.

It is not a guarantee that OPD will ever be problem free, but it is a promise that their leaders will root out problems, deal with them honorably and really put Oakland's interest at the forefront.

No, the public doesn't hear about all the nuances or even know the full story behind what decisions are made, but I can tell you that if we can put Oakland's interests at the forefront, its constituency -- whether it be residents, businesses or what have you -- that we can as leaders of the

City altogether really hold our Department to the same 1 threshold. 2 And I have been holding us to that promise, and I will 3 continue to hold us to that promise as long as I'm in this 4 5 position. So I just want to say thank you, and I'm happy to answer 6 any questions that you may have. 7 THE COURT: Thank you, Mayor Thao. I appreciate your 8 commitment to the NSA, which you have shown, and there's more 9 10 work to be done. So, thank you. 11 Ms. Davis, could you let Mr. Johnson in? I can take a hint if two people tell me that I ought to put him on the 12 I would like to just say hello. 13 screen. MR. BURRIS: It is a hint, hint, hint; right? 14 15 (Pause in proceedings.) 16 MR. LUCIA: Your Honor, may I be heard? 17 THE COURT: Sure, Mr. Lucia. MR. LUCIA: Just a question, while Mr. Johnson is 18 19 plugging in. You mentioned earlier that you want the parties 20 to meet before June to discuss the future of the NSA. And literally speaking "parties," we are not a party. 21 are the intervenor. So can you provide some clarification to 22 23 OPOA -- most of the board members are watching -- what role you want them/us to play in that process going forward. 24

Well, so I think I have said a few times

25

THE COURT:

in these meetings how important I think the members of your organization are to make sure that the NSA is embodied in the spirit of OPD.

So, I'm going to in June hear from everybody and I would like to know -- it's not going to be a majority rule, but I want everybody's perspective on -- on how -- what should happen at this point, whether -- whether the work has been done, whether task 45 is now in a place where it is in compliance and looks like it would be forever -- not forever but for a reasonable period of time.

And I recognize so completely that we are not living in a perfect world, and we are all humans and every -- there are always going to be problems.

So that I get. We just have to get over this last -these last hurdles without running into some full-fledged other
crisis the way that we have over the last several years.

So there he is. Mr. Johnson, good afternoon.

MR. JOHNSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Thank you for the opportunity.

THE COURT: Well, you have been identified a couple of times. So how are you enjoying your job?

MR. JOHNSON: It's been a phenomenal experience. I started on June 5th. I relocated -- well, located to the Bay Area from the City of Atlanta where I had the pleasure of serving as the Deputy Chief Operating Officer overseeing a

public safety portfolio which also included the Atlanta Police Department.

So this has certainly been quite an experience. I've enjoyed every minute of it. I'm a junkie for this public administrative work, so it has certainly been a great experience thus far and having the pleasure of serving Mayor Thao and working very closely with Chief Allison.

I couldn't agree with you more. Chief Allison has done a phenomenal job from day one. He has certainly set a standard that we are certainly looking to replicate going forward.

So it has been a pleasure supporting him, his leadership team. And one of the things that he really put forth the first time I met him -- just talking about the work that we are doing with respect to the NSA -- but he certainly put his money where his mouth is. And so I couldn't agree with you more.

And the only thing I will just add is I'm absolutely committed to supporting this work, specifically supporting the efforts with compliance and constitutional policing.

And so our Inspector General, who I have had the opportunity to work with -- and I'm certainly learning quite a bit as it relates to her role in all of this as well -- I want to publicly thank her as well.

But you have my word that I will absolutely commit that the role I play in this is certainly one that we lead with integrity and so not just on the police department side but

also the role that the departments that support the Oakland Police Department, we are leading in that way as well.

There are certainly roles for all of us to play with respect to our public safety agency, the Oakland Police Department.

I want to say thank you for this opportunity. I'm very grateful to have this moment, but also I certainly look forward to continuing this discussion in June where I'm hoping for a favorable outcome going forward. Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Well, there are always favorable outcomes no matter what the outcome is. You have got to keep moving forward.

And I just -- I want to say one of the things that I have learned sitting in this chair in the monitorship is that everybody who is on this screen is integral to the success of the NSA; the Mayor, the City Administrator, the Chief, the Commission now, the OPOA, and the leadership within the police department right down the ranks, it just matters.

And when one of those people isn't stepping up, the entire system has a problem. So I'm delighted that you are -- that you are in the role that you are; that you have the commitment that you have. And I will look forward to seeing you in June.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir, thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Everybody, I will look forward to seeing you in June. If there's something that you think I

```
should be aware of in the meantime, let me know.
 1
                                                         And,
     otherwise, I wish you all well. Thank you.
 2
              MS. MARTIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
              MR. BURRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
 4
 5
              MR. LUCIA: Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE CLERK: That concludes our conference. Thank you
 6
 7
     all.
                   (Proceedings adjourned at 4:37 p.m.)
 8
                                 ---000---
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: February 28, 2024 Marla Krox Marla F. Knox, CSR No. 14421, RPR, CRR, RMR United States District Court - Official Reporter