### CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE 1 U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS 2 ---000---3 In Re: POLICE PRACTICES AND POLICE-COMMUNITY 5 RELATIONS IN SONOMA COUNTY 6 **CERTIFIED** COPY REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10 11 Justice Joseph A. Rattigan State Building 12 50 D Street Conference Room 410 13 Santa Rosa, California 14 Friday, February 20, 1998 15 16 Hon. FERNANDO HERNANDEZ, Ph.D., Chairperson 19 20 21 22 Reported by: LUEL J. SIMSON, CSR No. 4720

MAES & SIMSON, INC.

923 College Avenue ~ Santa Rosa, CA 95404 (707) 546-8436  $\sim$  (800) 564-4277

CCR 3 Meet. 291

4

7

8

9

17

18

23

24

25

26

ALM STE

#### APPEARANCES

#### U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Hon. CRUZ REYNOSO Vice-Chairperson

YVONNE LEE Member

#### California Advisory Committee

Hon. FERNANDO HERNANDEZ, Ph.D. Chairperson

LUZ BUITRAGAO
MICHAEL CARNEY
EDWARD J. ERLER, Ph.D.
KEVIN D. FRANKLIN, Ph.D.
ROSE BOON FUA
DEBORAH HESSE
ANDREA PATTERSON
MITCHELL POMERANTZ
DENA SPANOS-HAWKEY

## TABLE OF CONTENTS -- PANELISTS

2		PAGE
3	OVERVIEW:	
4	ELISABETH ANDERSON; Executive Director, Sonoma County Center for Peace & Justice	15
5	LARRY HAJIME SHINAGAWA, Ph.D.; Associate Professor, Sonoma State University;	22
6	Chair, American Multi-Cultural Studies Department; Coordinator, Asian-American	
7	Studies  JUDITH VOLKART; Chairperson, Sonoma County	31
8	American Civil Liberties Union	-
9	COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS:	
10		
11	TANYA BRANNAN; Purple Berets STEVEN CAMPBELL; Sonoma County Homeless	58 67
12	Coalition  KAREN SAARI; October 22 Coalition Against  Police Brutality	71
13	Police Brucality	
14	LAW ENFORCEMENT I: POLICIES, PRACTICES, PROCEDURES:	
15	JIM PICCININI; Sheriff, County of Sonoma MICHAEL A. DUNBAUGH; Chief of Police,	95 103
16	City of Santa Rosa	
17	PATRICK ROONEY; Chief of Police, City of Rohnert Park	112
18	LAW ENFORCEMENT II: EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING, DISCIPLINE:	
19		
20	J. MICHAEL MULLINS, Esq.; District Attorney, County of Sonoma	158
21.	JERRY SCHOENSTEIN; Director, Basic Academy Santa Rosa Training Center, Santa Rosa	163
22	Junior College	
23	COMPLAINT REVIEW:	
24	DONALD CASIMERE; Investigative and Appeals	196
25	Officer, City of Richmond PENNY HARRINGTON; Director, National Center	211
26	for Women in Policing  JOHN PARKER; Executive Director, San Diego  County Police Review Board	223

## INDEX OF SPEAKERS--OPEN SESSION

2		PAGE
3	Rabbi Michael Robinson	256
4	James Carlson	258
5	Jaime Gutierrez	258
6	Eric Goldschlag	260
7	Mary Moore	263
8	Ken Davenport	265
9	Anthony Ferrari	267
10	Todd Mendoza	268
11	William P. Adams	269
12	Darlene Grainger	270
13	Earl Her, M.D.	274
14	Rudy Kham	275
15	Duane DeWitt	276
16	Pia Jensen	277
17	Andre Lance Dews	278
18	Robert Dan McCarter	280
19	Phyllis Rosenfield	286
20	Isabel Huie	289
21	Claudia Turner	291
22	John Husseyn	294
23	Virginia Steele	296
24	Bill Stirnus & Cindy Pilar	298
25	Daniel Loyal Garcia	301
26	Louis Beary	301

# INDEX OF SPEAKERS--OPEN SESSION--(Cont'd.)

2		PAGE
3	Vicki Vidak-Martinez	305
4	Cornelius Hall	307
5	Kit Mariah	309
6	Nancy Wang	312
7	John Gurney	315
8	Charla Greene	317
9	Estelle Townsend	318
10	Cathy Harvey	319
11	Sean Jones	321
12	Wayne Griffith	323
13	Ralph O'Connell	325
14	Sherryl Nives	326
15	Barbara Londerville	328
16	R. D. Wishard	330
17	Toni Mac Donald	332
18	Russell Jorgensen	333
19	Irene Hoener	335
20	Virginia McCullough	338
21	Carol Mardeusz	342
22.	Claudia Rickman	. 346
23	Thomas Twiddy	349
24	Janice Karman	352
25	Kalia Mussetter	356

#### PROCEEDINGS

9:00 a.m.

3

4

1

2

---000---

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

MR. HERNANDEZ: Good morning. This meeting of the California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights will now come to order.

I am Fernando Hernandez, Chairperson of the California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is an independent, bipartisan fact-finding agency first established under the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

The Commission on Civil Rights is an independent agency of the United States government established by Congress in 1957 and directed to:

Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap or national origin or by reason of fraudulent practices;

Two: Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin or in the administration of justice;

Three: Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws;

Four: Serve as a national clearinghouse for information about discrimination and;

Five: Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and Congress.

Advisory Committees were established in each state and the District of Columbia, in accordance with enabling legislation and the Federal Advisory Committee Act, to advise the Commission on matters pertaining to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap or in the administration of justice and to aid the Commission in its statutory obligation to serve as a national clearinghouse for information on those subjects.

Commission regulations call for each Advisory
Committee to:

One: Advise the Commission in writing of any information it may have respecting any alleged deprivation of citizens' rights to vote and to have the vote counted by reason of color, race, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability, or that citizens are being accorded or denied the right to vote in Federal elections as a result of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination;

Two: Advise the Commission concerning legal developments constituting discrimination or a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age or

disability or in the administration of justice; and as to the effect of the laws and policies of the Federal government with respect to equal protection of the laws;

Three: Advise the Commission upon matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports and the Commission -- reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress;

Four: Receive reports, suggestions and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials about matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Committee;

Five: Initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission about matters that the Advisory Committee has studied; and

Six: Assist the Commission in the exercise of its clearinghouse function.

The purpose of the meeting today is to obtain information and views on law enforcement policies, practices and procedures in Sonoma County. Participants in today's fact finding forum have been requested to address the following issues:

Law enforcement's policies, practices and procedures in Sonoma County;

Community concerns regarding the administration of justice in Sonoma County;

Law enforcement concerns regarding public

safety; and

Recommendations for matching public safety objectives with community concerns for objective treatment.

Among those invited to address the California

Advisory Committee today are Sonoma County law enforcement

officials, community activists, and representatives of

advocacy groups.

Based on information collected at this meeting, a summary report will be prepared for the United States

Commission on Civil Rights.

Other members of the California Advisory Committee in attendance during this meeting are: Luz Buitrago, Michael Carney, Dr. Edward Erler, Dr. Kevin D. Franklin, Rose Boon Fua, Deborah Hesse, Sharon Martinez, Andrea Patterson, Mitchell Pomerantz, Socorro Reynaga-Emmett, and Dena Spanos-Hawkey.

Also with us today are Commission vice-chairman
Cruz Reynoso and Yvonne Lee, and we thank them for joining
us in this endeavor. Also with us is Philip Montez,
Regional Director of the Commission's Western Regional
Office in Los Angeles, as well as Thomas V. Pilla and Stella
Youngblood, Arthur Palacios, Civil Rights Analysts, and
Grace Hernandez, Administrative Secretary.

This fact-finding meeting is being held pursuant to Federal rules applicable to State Advisory Committees and regulations promulgated by the U.S. Commission on Civil

Rights. All inquiries regarding those provisions should be directed to Commission staff.

I would like to emphasize that this is a fact-finding meeting and not adversarial proceeding.

Individuals have been invited to come and share with the Committee information relevant to the subject of today's inquiry. Each person who will participate has voluntarily agreed to meet with the Committee.

Since this is a public meeting, the press and radio and television stations as well as individuals are welcome. Persons meeting with the Committee, however, may specifically request that they not be televised. In this case, we will comply with their wishes.

We are concerned that no defamatory material be presented at this meeting. In the unlikely event that this situation should develop, it will be necessary for me to call this to the attention of the persons making these statements and request that they desist in their actions. Such information will be stricken from the record if necessary.

Every effort has been made to invite persons who are knowledgeable in the area to be dealt with here today. In addition, we have allocated time between 4:00 and 5:00 p.m. to hear from anyone who wishes to share information with the Committee about the specific issues under consideration today. At that time each person or

organization will be afforded a brief opportunity to address the Committee and may submit additional information in writing. Those wishing to participate in the open session must contact Commission staff before 3:30 p.m. this afternoon.

19.

In addition the record of this meeting will remain open for a period of 30 days following its conclusion. The Committee welcomes additional written statements and exhibits for inclusion in the record. These should be submitted to the Western Regional Division, United States Commission on Civil Rights; 3660 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 810; Los Angeles, California, 90010.

Thank you for joining us this morning and let us proceed.

I would like to acknowledge the presence and invite the vice-chair of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Cruz Reynoso, to give some opening remarks on behalf of the Commission.

MR. REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I want to emphasize the importance of the 50 Advisory

Committees, including the California Advisory Committee. In terms of their reports to the Commission, we found that they, being the local eyes and ears of the Commission, render a particularly valuable service to the Commission in its own statutory responsibilities.

On a personal note, I want to mention,

Mr. Chairman, that it's a particular pleasure for me to be in the Rattigan Building. It was about 29 years ago that I met then Senator Joe Rattigan when I was an assistant to another State senator. And I had the pleasure of being both on the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of this state while Justice Rattigan was serving. He is not just a great Californian for this part of the state but a great Californian generally. So it's a particular pleasure for me to be in this building for the first time.

With respect to the hearings today, I just want to emphasize that the Commission has a long history, going back to 1957, of having hearings like this with respect particularly to community-police relations. The Commission has been particularly successful in recent years. We've had hearings in Tampa and Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles and other places.

I recall just a month or two ago we had a follow-up report to a study that we did in Washington, D.C., with respect to issues that came up there between the police department and the Hispanic community where the Commission made a series of recommendations, all of which were accepted by the D.C. Police Department. And the report we had was that they had -- both the community and the police had profited immensely from those recommendations.

So we come here today to hear from all of the parties involved and to make recommendations that, if our

history proves correct, will be of value to this local community.

1.2

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner.

I would also like to invite Commissioner Yvonne Lee to make a couple of minutes of opening remarks.

MS. LEE: Thank you very much. And good morning.

I want to add my welcome to the panelists and participants
to today's fact-finding hearing.

Growing up in San Francisco, my family would take me up to Sonoma County for weekend trips just to escape the hustling and bustling life of San Francisco. I haven't had the opportunity to visit Sonoma County for the past decade, but I understand Sonoma County has become a more vibrant community, largely due to its population increase and also other demographic changes.

Last May the Asian-American community called to my attention the death of Mr. Kuan Chung Kao, a 33-year-old resident of Rohnert Park. According to official accounts and reports, Mr. Kao was shot to death by Rohnert Park Police within 30 seconds after the police responded to 9-1-1 calls of disturbance outside his own home. The official account also reported that Mr. Kao was extremely intoxicated, and he was holding a six-foot wooden stick, apparently in a martial arts stance. The stick was three-quarters of an inch in diameter and less than a pound in weight.

.25

The staff was directed to look into this matter and subsequently it was reported back to the Commission that there had been eight police-related deaths that had occurred in this county since April of 1995.

The purpose of today's fact-finding hearing, as mentioned earlier, is not to delve into the specific circumstances of these individual deaths, but an honest, constructive and respectful discussion of broader public safety concerns and issues from the county's residents and law enforcement officials.

I expect to learn from both the law enforcement and community representatives on their perspectives on the state of community and police relations. And I hope to learn from the officials and experts on what demonstrative projects and/or strategies are in place or being planned to continue and better protect the community that is expected to grow not only in terms of population but also in its diversity racially, ethnically, socially, economically, and linguistically. And, more importantly, the community's role in ensuring an accountable and mutually cooperative public safety strategy for all residents in this county. And I look forward to today's proceedings.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner.

I would like to now proceed with the first panel.

I'd like to call forward Elisabeth Anderson, Director of

Sonoma County Center for Peace and Justice.

Ms. Anderson, for the record, would you please state your name and your position and your organization for the record.

MS. ANDERSON: My name is Elisabeth Anderson. I'm the Executive Director of the Sonoma County Center for Peace and Justice.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I'd like to ask each presenter to please limit their remarks to no more than about 10 minutes so that we can give the panel an opportunity to follow up with questions.

Thank you. You may proceed.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you. I'd like to say thank you very much for coming here today on behalf of our community and also from the center and to help us investigate and air some of the challenging issues that we face around police-community relations.

My name is Elisabeth Anderson and I represent and am the Executive Director for the Sonoma County Center for Peace and Justice. Our center has a vision of a community where differences are respected, conflicts are addressed nonviolently, oppressive structures are dismantled, and people live in harmony with each other and the Earth. We're committed to compassion, solidarity and reconciliation in human relations.

In the first four months of 1997, four people died at the hands of law enforcement in Sonoma County. After the

number of incidents grew, the Peace and Justice Center became involved with the issue. We met with other local community groups and also with local police. As we met and talked with them, we had many questions unanswered related to those specific incidents and also the existing system that is currently in place for the review of law enforcement.

I want to make it clear from the outset that we are not anti-law enforcement. To gain a broader perspective in my research, I attended a 12-week citizen police academy put on by the Santa Rosa Police Department. I also attended national conferences about civilian oversight of law enforcement.

While strong and diverse community interest has been aroused over the issues of death and violence at the hands of law enforcement, we also have encountered many barriers in gaining serious consideration by law enforcement and local government.

We've come to believe that the current system of review doesn't work for the public interest and that we should create a civilian police review commission to assist the current internal system by law enforcement.

There is a broad community -- There's a broad concern that exists in the community over the current system of review that involved the deaths, serious injury and also disrespect of the rights of the citizens of Sonoma County.

There are currently at least 15 groups that are working and many, many more individuals who are actively working on this issue all from within Sonoma County. We have a wide range of participants crossing all of the lines of color and class. Many groups already existed and new ones were formed from police watchdog organizations to lawyers and professionals researching civilian police review boards.

12.

Last year there were many community meetings and demonstrations that brought several hundred Sonoma County residents together. And we have a database of over 400 people who are concerned about police violence in Sonoma County. We collected over 300 signatures in three weeks to request these independent hearings.

The Peace and Justice Center has a membership of over a thousand households in Sonoma County. The Sonoma County chapter for the American Civil Liberties Union has membership of over 1200 families. And the Redwood Empire Chinese Association has over 300 members. And the other community groups represent many more thousands of people in Sonoma County who are concerned about these issues.

Members of these groups and coalitions have been asked to speak to schools, churches, local groups, conferences on police accountability, the Democratic Central Committee, and also Leadership Santa Rosa and other weekly discussion groups that occur in the county. Each week there's at least one meeting or event that has taken place

since May of 1997 throughout the county showing that the strong community interest and concern has not diminished with time but, in fact, has increased.

Law enforcement and local government has not been responsive or inclusive to our efforts to bring change. In the fall of 1997, the United States Department of Justice brought several law enforcement chiefs together with some local community groups. Originally, this was designed to bridge the gap between the law enforcement and the Asian communities.

After the first meeting, it was broadened to include other concerned community groups. During that second meeting, we focused on the use of deadly force, the lack of gender and ethnic diversity among the ranks of sworn officers, civilian review boards, and the lack of accountability of law enforcement to the community.

Three days prior to our third meeting, the Chiefs' Association announced that they were creating a civilian advisory panel and that this advisory panel would be reviewing the policies and procedures of the law enforcement, and that the Chiefs' Association would be selecting the people to be on this panel.

Secondly, they made a recommendation that the Grand Jury would be the independent body to review any future critical incidents involving death or serious injury. But with only one year to their terms and many,

many other areas to cover in Sonoma County, we feel this is not a satisfactory alternative.

12.

1.9

. 25

All of the groups involved with these meetings felt completely betrayed. Law enforcement had made unilateral decisions affecting the community without asking the community at a critical time when the community-police relations were already strained. Not one elected official has spoken out on behalf of mistreated civilians or for the victims' families.

We approached our Santa Rosa City Council, asking for dialogue about the high number of deaths in Santa Rosa Police Department. Their response referred to our scheduled meetings with Police Chief Dunbaugh and we have not heard anything from them since.

In conversations with council members, we have always been encouraged to speak directly with the police chiefs. All our attempts to reach out an open dialogue with our elected officials and local leadership has been met with closed doors.

It has been challenging to get unbiased information out to the public. The media is responsible for investigative reporting and to give a complete picture of the community through television, radio and newspapers. Some of the media has worked hard to deliver nonjudgmental perspectives while some of the local media has shown a lack of depth in the coverage, which makes it difficult for the

public to receive complete information, unbiased information about specific incidents. But also about the widespread community involvement.

For example, an editorial in the local daily newspaper accused the Peace and Justice Center of being biased and lacking objectivity in judging police performance. We have never attempted and nor do we want to judge police performance.

We are working toward a system for independent review of law enforcement for citizen complaints, critical incidents, and policies and procedures. In short, a civilian review board.

We believe that the majority of law enforcement officers perform often difficult and stressful work and at times at risk to their own personal safety. However, it is essential that law enforcement be held to the highest standards of accountability not only from a criminal perspective but to the community itself and that the policies and procedures of law enforcement reflect the values of the community.

We have become convinced that the current system of review by law enforcement doesn't work. We at the Peace and Justice Center receive many calls each week from victims who feel that they have been mistreated by law enforcement. The options that I tell them is that the aggrieved citizen has basically three options currently. The first is to file

a complaint with that -- the department that caused the alleged misconduct. The second is to file a complaint with the Grand Jury. And the third is that they can file a complaint with the City Manager's Office.

Filing a complaint to the alleged perpetrator is intimidating and many victims or alleged victims of police misconduct are very reluctant to do so.

In addition, the Grand Jury report from 1996-97 reported that many Sonoma County law enforcement agencies had a lackadaisical attitude toward civilian complaints. And some went so far as to discourage citizens from filing the complaints.

As to the Grand Jury, that body selects the issues and topics that they will investigate, and they could not possibly investigate all citizen complaints since they only have one-year term limits. The City Manager's Office currently does not have the resources to effectively handle and investigate each complaint.

The most frustrating part for the victim has been that no one is able to fully hear, investigate and act upon their complaints. There is no system in Sonoma County where a civilian can make a complaint about law enforcement to an agency or group that is not connected to law enforcement.

We at the Peace and Justice Center have become convinced that an independent civilian review commission is the solution to effective police oversight and to also

improve police community relations.

To that end, we will continue our work with the media, with the local law enforcement, with local government, and all of the groups and individuals.

And I would like to say thank you very much for your part in this effort. And we hope today's hearings will help speed us to that goal so that we can reduce the number of incidents of violence, we can restore the public confidence in law enforcement. But most of all, benefit the larger community.

And I would like to add I do have some materials, the letters of reference that I made here that I can hand out.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Could you remain there just then and I'll ask the other two members of the panel to please come forward and ask Mr. Shinagawa to step forward and give your remarks and limit it to about 10 minutes so the panel will have time to ask questions. And then any materials that you would like to give to us for inclusion in the record, we will accept.

MR. SHINAGAWA: Thank you very much, Honorable members of the Civil Rights Commission both at the state and the federal levels.

I very much thank you for hearing our concerns in Sonoma County, the concerns of many, many persons in this county who have felt that there needs to be some greater

dialogue between the community and the police here in this county.

what I am going to do outside of this talk is to talk about a number of items and I will use some overhead materials so as to indicate some of those types of items very clearly.

I'm going to first talk about demographics. I'm also going to talk about the issue of diversity here in this county. I'm also going to discuss the idea that the training of existing officers is not enough. And I'm also going to talk a little bit about the context of the Asian-Americans here in this county. And finally, I'd like to make some positive statements about what we can do to change the situation.

Let me show the first overhead. Let's put this overhead up about facts about Sonoma County. Sonoma County is -- excuse me one second.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And this is a slide of facts about Sonoma County?

MR. SHINAGAWA: Yes. Some of the demographic facts about Sonoma County. Right now, in 1996, which is about the earliest date -- the latest date that I can get information about, roughly about 424,000 persons reside in Sonoma County. Probably around now it's coming closer to half a million.

The growth rate, as you can see, has declined

overall but that is because of population of Sonoma County has increased over the years so proportionately it has become smaller. In 1980 to 1990, it was 2.6 percent. Now in 1990 to 1995, it was 2.3. It's in the future projected to be 1.6 percent on an annual basis.

The major factor of the growth between 1988 and 1993 was the migration of persons into Sonoma County.

That's very important. What we are seeing is that the face, the complexion, the nature, the class composition the cultural attitudes and the cultural composition of this county is changing. 75 percent are out of this area and have moved in. Only 24.8 percent are due to natural increase. In other words, births over deaths.

Half of these newcomers who are coming into this county are between the ages 30 to 34 and have some of the highest average incomes in terms of household income.

It's also interesting to note that Mr. Kuan Kao is in somewhat that same category of age. And I'd like to pinpoint that for a second here.

The racial composition of Sonoma County is still largely non-Hispanic white. 82 percent at this moment in July 1996 was non-Hispanic white. The Hispanic population is the second largest population, which is 12 percent. The Asian population, a fast-growing population that is rapidly moving into this area, is 3 percent. The black population comprises about 1 percent. So, too, the native American and

other populations.

1.2

We are seeing a large increase overall in the rise of Hispanic and Asian populations to this area. I've also shown you on the same overhead the incomes. The incomes are fairly comparable to the rest of California. Slightly higher, however; but not that much different.

Let's go to the next overhead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And you'll make these available -MR. SHINAGAWA: Yes, I will. The point I'm trying
to make here is that California is changing and Sonoma
County is going to have to confront the changes that are
happening across California.

If you look at this figure, this overhead, what you see is the net population growth by race between 1990 and July 1996. And as you can see, there has been a significant increase in the Hispanic population, the Asian population, the African-American population. And the white population has only grown slightly overall. There's been a change.

We are estimating by the year 2002 to 2003 that the overall population in California will be the minority majority. It's estimated in that range. Bay Area already is now at a point where the majority of the citizens are no longer white overall.

Net migration. The next overhead. If you look at this, this is also a very interesting slide. What it shows

is that the migration that comes to California is very different in composition. Whites overall in California still remain as moving out overall in this period of time. The Hispanic population and the Asian populations have been moving in to California.

Let's go to the next one. And this overhead is called the "Natural Increase by Race." And here you see that one of the largest populations in terms of a growth by natural increase, births over deaths, are the Hispanic population. A growing community of Sonoma County, a growing community of the Bay Area. A growing community of California. Eventually, somewhere around 2040, it may be the majority of Californian.

Let's to go the next overhead. I'm not going to going to try to explain this entire table, but this is for your records so I put this inside the packet. It's hard to read. All I can say is that this is a county estimate, year by year, of the increases of population for California. And as you can, see the minority populations have increased substantially year by year.

Let's go to the next one. And this is of Sonoma County. Sonoma County. And, again, you can't see this but it's, again, for your records. Sonoma County is somewhat different. While California is growing in leaps and bounds in terms of its diversity, ethnic composition diversity, Sonoma County has not grown substantially in terms of its

ethnic diversity to the same extent. Yet. At least according to 1996 figures.

.25

My understanding, and this is what I feel very strongly, is that it is about to. Sonoma County will become a member of the Bay Area. It will become more and more similar to the Bay Area at large. There will be more persons coming in who will migrate to Sonoma County who will move from San Francisco and other localities of the Bay Area and move here.

Who are those citizens? Very likely,

African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and also Latinos. Those

populations will increase as well as higher income

non-Hispanic whites.

The point I'm making here is that the diversity in Sonoma County is at a cusp. We're going to see a change. It's not now but it's going to come. We're starting to see the first inklings of a movement of population into this area. We notice that Rohnert Park has a large population of racial minorities in comparison to Sonoma County overall. The same thing is true of Santa Rosa. I can say that in particular the Asian population in Rohnert Park is roughly about 6 percent. The population of Asians in Santa Rosa is roughly about 8 percent. And it's increasing.

So what we're seeing is that in certain localities of Sonoma County, people are moving in and that change is affecting things.

Let's now go to the next overhead. While the diversity that is in Sonoma County is one in which about 82 percent of the population is still non-Hispanic white, 18 percent are racial minority, as I mentioned.

.17

In terms of the composition of the sworn police officers, as far as I can get the information -- and it was very difficult to get that information, let me tell you -- as far as I can get that information, this is an example of the figures for late 1997. For each of the jurisdictions here by count.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Could you just summarize quickly what we're seeing here because the slide is not --

MR. SHINAGAWA: Sure. I'd be glad to. I'd like to describe that in the next overhead. Because a count is very difficult to interpret in comparison to a percentage. So let's go to the next one.

This is now a table that shows the percent composition of females, Latinos, African-Americans, Asian and Pacific Islanders and Native Americans for each of the police jurisdictions. As you can see, the Sheriff's Office in Sonoma County has 3.1 percent female. The Latino population comprises 5.8, percent the African-American population 1.8 percent.

I was not able to get the Asian information so I put it as a dash. I was not able to get the Native American information. So that information I still have not obtained.

This as current as I could get it at this moment.

Santa Rosa is a complete set of information.

8 percent are female. 7.4 percent are Latino.

2.5 percent are African-American. 1.8 percent are Asian and

Let's go to Rohnert Park. Rohnert Park is 7.4 percent female, 1.9 percent Latino, 1.9 percent African-American.

Pacific Islander. And .6 percent are Native American.

Overall for Sonoma County, as far as I can ascertain, only 6.9 percent of the entire police force is female. That is abominable. I don't think there's any excuse for this. There's a real need to have a diversity in terms of gender and I think you would have a very different impact in terms of how they handle police-community relations if there was a different composition there.

Also, if you might notice, overall for Sonoma County, the minority composition comes out to be 8.7 percent. Again, much smaller than the 18 percent of racial minorities who are here in this county.

We have a problem. We don't have diversity. Even in this county even though there isn't as many minorities as in the Bay Area.

What's the solution? I would argue very, very clearly that what we need to do is we can't talk only about training officers in the existing ranks. I served personally as a cultural diversity training person for the

Sonoma County Sheriff's Office. I did a good job, in my opinion. I tried to do my best to serve the needs of the community and the police officers. But at the same time, every time I did these presentations, I saw the constituency. There was not a representation of racial minorities, nor was there a representation of women.

In order to have real diversity and real sensitivity, I believe that we have to have diversity within its ranks.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much, Professor.

MR. SHINAGAWA: One last presentation and then I'll finish.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Because we're running out of time.

MR. SHINAGAWA: The last slide indicates the location of the 11 deaths in Sonoma County during the past three years. And as you can see, it's extremely clustered in a very small area of Sonoma County. Primarily in the areas of Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park and along the road between Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park are located. That's the bulk of the deaths. And other speakers in my panel will also discuss more clearly about the specific deaths and the context of that. But something needs to be done.

In my opinion, a civilian independent police review will be all important so that there will be true dialogue, true community relations with the police so that

people can effectively engage to make their lives better for all the public safety of this citizenry. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Professor.

I'm going to move to the next panelist. Before I do that, I just want to say that staff has asked that because there are so many people wanting to get into the hearing, what we're going to do is, after each panel, we're going to ask the people in the audience to please give up their seats so the next group of people can come in and attend. So we're going to be rotating people throughout the day so that we can get everybody that wants to get in a chance to listen to the testimony and to participate in the hearings.

Okay. The next person is Judith Volkart, Chair of the Sonoma County ACLU. Welcome.

MS. VOLKART: Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And could you state your name and your organization for the record.

MS. VOLKART: Thank you, Chairman Hernandez and members of the California Advisory Committee and Honorable Justice and Commissioner Reynoso and Honorable Commissioner Lee.

My name is Judith Halfpenny Volkart, and I have lived in Santa Rosa for 20 years. I work as assistant general counsel and assistant vice-president at Fireman's Fund Insurance Company. And as a volunteer, I am the chair

of the American Civil Liberties Union of Sonoma County. And as Elisabeth mentioned, we have 1200 families who are -- we count among our membership.

You have seen a snapshot of Sonoma County that has been presented by the last two speakers and now you have before you both the heart and the hard statistical facts of who we are. And I am here to present to you the concerns that this community has.

We are very seriously concerned about the state of criminal justice administration in our county. And that concern touches three primary areas. They are very generally described. We are very concerned about the high level of police killings and general police violence in this community. The eight deaths in the last two years have shocked our community and have created a great deal of concern among its individual members as well as outside of the community asking us, those of us who live here, "What are you going to do about this?"

In addition to the eight deaths, there are also two inmates that you should know about who died while in custody because of medical -- lack of medical treatment and another inmate who died after five days of being in jail several hours -- about six hours after the release.

So the numbers can go as high as 11, according to some counts deaths -- police-involved deaths in this community in the last two years. We cannot say nor will we

say that each one of those deaths should not have occurred. But they're clearly an indication that there is something wrong in this county. This is not South Central, this is not Oakland. This is not a high crime area. We are a relatively peaceful community and something is wrong and we don't know what is wrong.

. 12

. 26

The second area of concern that we have is one that Larry has alluded to in his presentation, and that is a general pattern of discrimination that you can see by the lack of diversity, particularly gender diversity, in the law enforcement. And also deficiencies in the training that compound those problems.

You will have speakers later today talk about the lack of cultural sensitivity training, training that doesn't really promote responsible practices in dealing with members of our community who are incapacitated because of drugs, alcohol or mental illness. And several of the deaths occurred were by individuals who were under the influence of drugs or mentally ill.

So we believe that are some gross deficiencies in the training area. But the area that I would like to just focus on and give a little more detail to is what we see as an absence of accountability to the community by law enforcement. And not just an absence of accountability but a resistance of law enforcement to be accountable to any organization that they cannot control.

Most of the information that the community gets we get through information that law enforcement gives to the press. And Elisabeth explained some of the meetings that we had with law enforcement. But as you have seen from press releases I'm sure that this Commission has had the opportunity to look at, that there is misleading information that is being reported in the press.

. 12

This Committee, this Advisory Committee, is fair, it's impartial. The community push for police reform is local. It's not outside of this community. There is a broad-based movement very strong in this community crossing racial, cultural and socioeconomic lines for police reform. It's not just a few fringe elements and political activists.

The problem with this misleading information is that we are examining -- it causes us to examine the wrong questions. And just last week, there's an article in the newspaper saying that the officers had been cleared of all wrongdoing, they'd been exonerated and vindicated. That is not true. The criminal investigations -- there have been criminal investigations that have taken place. They have taken place, in some instances, by the very law enforcement agency that was involved in the killing. And in some instances, by the sister or, in our case, the brother law enforcement agency in the county. Criminal investigations have taken place by the District Attorney's Office and by

the Department of Justice.

But the main point is not whether law enforcement in Sonoma County -- the officers are criminal. The point -- the questions that we want to ask is: Are they professional? And we want to hold our law enforcement to the highest standards of conduct to the values that this community embraces.

So there are many questions that are not being asked. And those are questions such as, you know, did the officer act reasonably? Did he violate department policy? Was there any official written policy about the use of deadly force, the use of physical force? And do those policies reflect the values of the community while still providing safety to the officers?

What about the policies for dealing with mentally ill, with drug and alcohol incapacitated individuals? Had the officers received proper training? And most importantly, what can be done to stop the cycle of killing, officer-involved killings?

And are there any patterns in the eight deaths that have happened in the last two years? And if there are, what can we learn from those patterns to prevent this from happening again?

The front line for accountability is not the courts. It's not the criminal court. It shouldn't be the civil court. It should be the community who the officers

are here to serve and to protect.

But unfortunately, law enforcement has been creating the impression that they have something to hide. And this resistance to independent review by even this panel is evidence of that. And further evidence of that is the seriously flawed two review mechanisms that the Sonoma County Chiefs' Association and the District Attorney's Office have established since we began meeting with them.

One is the Chiefs' Citizen Review Panel, which Elisabeth briefly mentioned. We were informed about the citizen review panel at a community meeting, but we had absolutely no opportunity into the input of the development of that panel and we've seen nothing in writing. We've asked this Commission or this Committee to ask for any documents from law enforcement that reflect the composition and the procedures and practices that this citizen review panel will take.

We understand from the Chiefs' Association press release that the citizen review panel members are going to be hand picked by law enforcement. So this is not an independent professional citizen review by any means. And there are serious flaws, as you can see.

The second mechanism that law enforcement has suggested is a Grand Jury review of officer-involved deaths and serious injuries. This, again, we learned about from a press release, Sonoma County Law Enforcement Chiefs'

Association and the District Attorney's Office. There was no discussion with the community about this, although we had been engaged in meetings, talking about civilian review.

18.

The press release said that this Grand Jury model will serve as -- as a model for this community on civilian review and that the justification for it being such a good model was that the members of the Grand Jury are randomly selected.

But Grand Jury review is not independent professional civilian review for a number of reasons. And I will submit as a supplement to my testimony very detailed reasons why that is not the case. But I'd like to just touch on a few of the most obvious here.

The Grand Juries in this community lack diversity, both racial and income. They're very few low income people on the Grand Jury. They're selected by the judges in Sonoma County. There's no opportunity for the Grand Jury to develop any kind of expertise. They're in for one year and that's it. And they deal with a very broad range of topics. Everything from zoning to traffic lights. So there is no way that a Grand Jury can focus on the policies and procedures and practices of 11 law enforcement jurisdictions within our county.

The matters that are being referred to the Grand

Jury are only after the fact. After there has been some

serious injury or death. This does not stop or deter future

events from happening.

And Grand Jury proceedings are closed to the public. And we all know they sort of have this aura of Star Chamber-ness about them that may or may not be true, but the public is not invited to participate in the Grand Jury process. In fact, the only attorney who is allowed in the Grand Jury room is the District Attorney's Office. And who is the District Attorney? The chief law enforcement officer of the county.

The Grand Jury relies on the County Counsel's Office for legal advice. Lawsuits brought against law enforcement officers for abuse of process are defended by the County Counsel's Office. So the Grand Jury is not independent of law enforcement by any means.

I think that these two policies that have been implemented -- and, again, we haven't seen any documentation about how the Grand Jury review process will happen. And we would ask this Committee to ask law enforcement for the procedures and practices of how they see this happening. That these -- the development of these two policies while community meetings were ongoing, the unilateral development of these policies, indicates, really, a refusal to give up control to the community by law enforcement.

Now, the police know that the best weapon that they have is the confidence and the trust of their community. And if they are confident that their policies

and their procedures are professional, they will welcome an open review of the same. Because it will legitimize their claims to professionalism.

We have a number of recommendations that the community has passed that we would ask this Committee to consider. Top of the list you've already heard is the recommendation that the Committee recommend -- our recommendation is the Committee recommend that both the elected officials and the community get together and create independent effective civilian review boards. And I'll be submitting as a supplement to this testimony a list of the elemental criteria that ensure objectivity and independence.

But, also, we think it's important that the civilian review board be empowered to be able to take a look at a broad range of policies and procedures and practices of law enforcement in this county.

The policies relating to the use of deadly force, the use of physical force. The numbers of discrimination claims. Identifying -- Putting some kind of an early warning system into place that will allow the identification of officers who are involved in multiple incidents of physical -- of excess use of physical force and who are involved in multiple shootings. Taking a look at the hiring practices to raise the bar to eliminate officers who may have a proclivity towards violence.

So what we are suggesting is that a civilian review board be empowered with the ability to take action to deter future shootings from happening again in this county.

I thank very much this Commission for taking interest in our problems here in Sonoma County. I am very pleased that you will be rotating the audience so that the dozens of people who are downstairs, many of whom are members of the families of the officers (sic) who have been killed, will have the opportunity to participate in this very important inquiry.

Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

I'd like to begin the questioning. And I'd like to invite the Commissioner Reynoso to begin the questioning.

MR. REYNOSO: How long have the community groups that you folks, at least two of you represent, been meeting with the various police representatives in this county? Has it been mostly in the last two years, since these last killings, or did it precede that?

MS. ANDERSON: I can speak for -- this is
Elisabeth -- and I can speak for the Peace and Justice
Center. And we started to meet with law enforcement last
summer. So I think it was June of 1997.

MR. REYNOSO: So it's been relatively recent that much of this activity has taken place.

MS. ANDERSON: Exactly.

MR. REYNOSO: What -- I'm sorry.

MS. VOLKART: Although the meetings with law enforcement began during the summer, the community began organizing and discussing among itselves its concern about the high level of police violence as early as January of 1997.

We at the ACLU began to look at some deaths that had occurred in '96, and we did not realize in January of '97 that we were going to have four more deaths occur within a four-month period of time. So the community's serious concerns about this level of violence escalated very quickly at the first quarter of last year.

MR. REYNOSO: Sometimes police departments or counties will bring in independent experts from outside. That is, they will hire them themselves to come in and advise them internally about what to do about community reaction to, for example, the killings that have taken place in the last two years. Bring them in on a contract basis.

Do you know whether or not that has been done?

Because from your testimony, I take it that you feel there's been some resistance on the part of the District Attorney and the police department to some of your suggestions.

Sometimes even when you see that, you'll see them hiring their own experts who will come in and independently review what is happening and make internal recommendations.

Do you know whether or not that has happened yet?

MS. VOLKART: To my knowledge, certainly law enforcement has not advised us that they have, in fact, taken that step.

MR. REYNOSO: One final question. At least two of you, perhaps all of you, mentioned the relative lack of diversity by gender and race and ethnicity in the overall representation in Sonoma County.

Have there been any reports back to you from the leaders in the various police departments that you've met with in terms of what's being done to increase that diversity? I ask that because those things take time and I just want -- I'm wondering what response you've had in that regard.

MS. VOLKART: I think that the answer to your question will be provided very fully when Tanya Brannan has an opportunity to address this panel. She has been working with law enforcement for many, many years, working to expand law enforcement to include more women.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Luz Buitrago?

MS. BUITRAGO: Can you let us know when the two clauses that were adopted were adopted and what happened? I assume that you complained and the results of your complaints, what were they?

MS. ANDERSON: We were notified in November that the civilian advisory panel would be formed. To this date, I haven't heard when and what the policies and procedures

are.

H

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Carney.

MR. CARNEY: Thank you, Mr. Hernandez.

You speak of these civilian review boards and how you expect that they might help with respect to those situations that law enforcement is involved in. How would you propose that they be made up? How would they be assembled?

MS. VOLKART: Do you mean the composition of who sits on the boards?

MR. CARNEY: Yes.

MS. VOLKART: My proposal is that each individual community come to a decision itself about the composition of its community civilian review board. We do not envision one civilian review board for the entire County of Sonoma. We have 11 law enforcement jurisdictions so it's a big job.

The people in Rohnert Park need to sit down and determine what composition they want to have on their civilian review board, the people of Santa Rosa may have a different perspective. The people in the entire county and the unincorporated areas of the county need to make that decision.

I think the important thing is that whatever that composition is, that it be reflective of the values of the community and that it be law based and that it be independent and not controlled by law enforcement.

MR. CARNEY: Well, you would have the administration of it, the political administration of each jurisdiction controlling to some extent the makeup of these review boards. Isn't that correct?

MS. VOLKART: I'm not sure what you mean by the "political administration."

MR. CARNEY: The mayor, the city council, the board of supervisors, et cetera. My question is really geared to comparing it, the makeup of these review boards, to the similarity that you have with the Grand Jury. You have judges who appoint -- refer -- I'm sorry. Recommend for appointment to the Grand Jury membership friends. And we don't expect judges are going to be in the ghettos and the barrios and, you know, hoisting a couple with the local gentry there.

And then the other thing is the requirements of the Grand Jury put a burden on the individual to be available for service with the Grand Jury. So you're really narrowing down, on a year's basis, you're narrowing down membership to those who can afford, either by financial means or by the fact that they're retired, not only the economic loss by taking off work but the time element.

I would envision that unless you are going to put up some guidelines, you're going to have a similar kind of a structure in a civilian review board that you have with the Grand Jury. A limited access to the common folk, if you

will. And I have -- I mean, it's just a question I'm throwing out there. It's almost rhetorical, because you're obviously not going to be able to control each jurisdiction and how they want to assemble a review board.

. 26

MS. VOLKART: No, but I want to. I mean, I think those decisions have to be made locally by the community that -- to whom law enforcement is accountable. Those are very important discussions that need to take place inside the community, what is the composition of the review board?

I can see that there are a number of options.

There are options that the members of the community -- the panel, the review board could be elected positions. Much as the supervisors and city council members are. I can see that city council members could have the right to be able to appoint a representative of the civilian review board from each of the city council jurisdictions. There are a number of options.

MR. CARNEY: Well, aren't you still, though, under those conditions, you're still looking at people who are acquainted with those elected officials and they're in that upper echelon, if you will. They're not the housewife that has the husband that goes to work at a job at a factory every day. You're not going to get the common person is what I'm getting at. And how broad a base are you going to have? You're still going to have that compacted, if you will, membership. And more-of on the elite side, so to

speak.

21.

And that's one of the questions I have with the makeup of civilian review panels and how independent are they going to be? And what voice are they going to have? What strength are they going to have? I realize that you're not going to be able to answer these questions but these are questions that come into my mind. What is the -- I mean, I look at Los Angeles City's situation and there's all kinds of conflicts developed there and the police commission versus the potential of a civilian review board and all of this other business.

If you're going to talk about reaching the community, then let's have a way that the community can participate. Are you going to elect these people at the ballot box? And then, again, you have the same situation. Those that have, are able to campaign. Those that have not, are not going to be able to on an equal basis. And that's the concern that I have. How do you make up these review boards?

MS. VOLKART: Mr. Carney, I think the issues that you have raised are very, very important issues and these are the sorts of things that need to be discussed inside the cities and the communities themselves. I mean, I share your concern about the potential for a lack of diversity under certain models of selecting membership of community review.

But I think the most effective review will be when a

-

community decides that its review board will be very diverse and will reflect the various elements within that community.

Now, how that composition is accomplished, there are a number of ways that can be done. And I think that the issues that you have raised highlight, you know, the need for the communities to begin discussing, raising these very, very important issues that have to do with the administration of criminal justice.

Review boards are human institutions and they are not perfect. And there has been a lot of controversy about review boards. But the interesting thing is that the review boards are giving the opportunity for these issues to come to light in the community so that there can be meaningful discussion about how to resolve the power, if you will, that we give to the police with the rights, if you will, and the respect that's deserved in the community.

MR. CARNEY: I have a question with respect to what you had addressed us with, Professor.

MR. SHINAGAWA: Sure.

MR. CARNEY: And that is with the training and discrimination factors involved. You mentioned cultural sensitivity training, and my question there is: To what effect does cultural sensitivity -- what effect does it have on a police officer? If a crime is a crime and a police officer is out there trying to take care of investigating

11.

the crime and finding out who is at fault or whatever -MR. SHINAGAWA: I can --

MR. CARNEY: -- there's the stereotypical Mexican family who has a husband and wife dispute and the officer goes to that call. They're historically and traditionally the most dangerous call a police officer can go on because he just does not know what to expect. There may be a weapon. And when he arrests -- if he arrests, as I say, the husband, the perpetrator of this domestic violence, the wife goes nuts and then she may attack the officer.

And so they're kind of in a hot pocket, if you will. Because -- and, again, I'm saying it's a stereotypical thing in the Mexican community and I'm addressing my own experiencing of knowing about these things in the Los Angeles area. The situation arises where the husband comes home and he gets a little toasted on the weekend because he's not going to have to go to work on Saturday and he gets a little belligerent with his wife and it escalates into an incredible situation.

Does the officer take into consideration the cultural background of the family? That this is a kind of a -- maybe this is an expected activity? Is that what you're talking about, cultural sensitivity?

MR. SHINAGAWA: Let me address that in odd ways.

Mr. Kuan Kao -- and I have to be specific in this particular case -- was presumed to be a martial arts expert and there

was already a stereotype about that. At the very first, the next day, what happened is that there will be a press release that will indicate that he may have been using this weapon in a martial arts fashion and so on. How do we know this? This is a stereotype. It's presumptive. It's something that many people have about stereotypes about Asian-Americans.

1.2

Let me say something about Sonoma County. The majority of African-Americans in Sonoma County are middle class or upper middle class. Most of the Latino population is lower middle class. The majority of Asian-Americans here are middle class and higher here. Many of them are highly cultured and highly versed in the English language.

The kind of stereotypes that we have about
Asian-Americans and African-Americans and Native Americans
and all of these other persons of color -- and many times
white working class members, too -- is that they're
illiterate, that they have some social problems of various
sorts. And these kinds of images don't fit the reality all
the time of most of the citizenry of these constituencies
here in Sonoma County. It may fit some of them and it
certainly is reflective of it, but it is not all of them.

When people act upon their prejudices and when they act upon their presumptions, I think we have a situation that could be very, very deadly. We need to have the kind of cultural sensitivity to be aware that culture is

12.

. 25

more than just about race or about ethnicity. Culture is about gender. It's about socioeconomic background. It's about where people are moving to and so on and what their lifestyles are and where they're aspiring to. It's much further than what our simplistic notions might be in our opinions in the past about what race is.

The African-American community is no longer what it was in the past. It's changing very markedly. There's an under class, there's also a very well-to-do middle class more and more so. These kinds of realities are changing. Our perceptions, however, are still mired in the '50s, '60s and it hasn't changed as much as it should.

I think it's very important for us to realize that we are living in a multi-racial society, that we are living in a multi-class society, and that there are an increasing mix of native-born as well as U.S.-born persons -- as well as foreign-born persons here in the United States. And we need to have the kind of training that will give that kind of attentiveness to this.

I know I can't say that I think that directly they should keep every bit of this in mind whenever they're acting upon any particular incident. That's a lot to do. In particular when we're talking about an incident in which one has to take a lot of action. All I'm saying is that think twice, in a sense. Have the ability to have the knowledge, to have the training prior to the incident so

that you could lessen the types of stereotypes that might affect the situation.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm going to have to move to Commissioner Lee. Commissioner.

21.

MS. LEE: Thank you. I have a question for Professor Shinagawa.

You provide diversity training to law enforcement officers. Are they mandatory or voluntary or how extensive are your training programs?

MR. SHINAGAWA: I participated as a training officer in a group of persons who are providing that kind of training in Sonoma County. I did that during the time period of 1992 to 1994, I believe. And during that time, what happened was that I focused primarily on -- my attentions on the Asian-American community concerns.

My own feeling is that that type of training in particular was not as sufficient for the changing realities of Sonoma County in California as it could have been. I would have preferred that rather than to have the training which would have one person and a dog and pony show talk about Native Americans, another person do it about lesbians and gays, and another person doing it about African-Americans that, instead, we have more of a holistic, more synthetic, more broad-based and comparative approach to how to deal with these types of situations. And to include class in the kind of training that would occur.

Currently I do believe that it is mandatory here in this area in most of the jurisdictions. I had the presumption, at least, that it was in Sonoma County at the time that I was doing it. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'd like to ask a question.

I think a couple of you alluded to the fact that the press has not been accurately reporting some of these incidences. Could you talk a little bit about that or some of the experiences you might have had. Is this basically the local press or is it the press in general? What were you referring to there in your remarks?

MS. ANDERSON: I was referring to one piece, specifically an editorial that was written about the Peace and Justice Center. At one point it referred to saying that the community was stupid and ungrateful with their questions of law enforcement and their procedures, which showed a bias to their perspective.

A lot of the community concern and activities have been excluded from some of the local press. I should also add some of it has really gone out of its way to cover it. Some of the stories recently about the Commission coming have been very slanted towards the law enforcement, around the subpoenas, and not gathering full information about certain incidents.

After a critical incident, the press will go to a press conference put on by law enforcement and primarily the

22 ·

coverage the next day is mostly what they recovered from that press conference and not from investigative reporting and actually speaking to eyewitnesses who would be able to give them a different side to the story as well.

MS. VOLKART: I share in Elisabeth's comments and also would add that there seems to have been a concerted effort to define those of us who are asking for independent review, who are pushing for an improvement in law enforcement, as being law enforcement critics. Or fringe elements. Or out of the mainstream. And I very much believe that that tends to disenfranchise what really is, in my view, the operation of good government. This is my responsibility as a member in this community to try to make it the best place I can, to be sure that law enforcement standards are as high as the standards that my community holds.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes?

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: Dr. Shinagawa, you touched on the cultural diversity training. And I was curious, out of the 11 jurisdictions, how many of those jurisdictions recently or on an ongoing basis have had this occur?

MR. SHINAGAWA: I've been looking at some of the documents that have been available to me. Let me say very clearly that it's extremely difficult for me to receive any of these documents from the jurisdictions. Some of them have been forthcoming, some jurisdictions, such as

Santa Rosa, have been very willing to provide that. Other jurisdictions are very unwilling, and it is very difficult to get that information.

I will say that the majority of jurisdictions have some form of training and that may not necessarily be called "cultural sensitivity" in particular. In most instances, that kind of training, however, is one done by professionals either within their own ranks or by specialists that they hire. But very few times is it a training which involves community members of a variety of communities in the jurisdiction to participate.

In my opinion, it would be extremely useful to get the insights and the clarity of some of these community members, some of the community leaders, to say something about what some of those concerns of the community are.

What cultural stereotypes that people may hold in these communities and so on. I recommend that very, very highly in any kind of training or seminar.

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: I would request that each jurisdiction that comes in today and talks about their program also include that in their comments because I'm very curious about who is doing your training and how it's working out and for how long and so forth.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes?

MS. HESSE: Deborah Hesse.

You talked about, you referred today about

training and equipment of the police forces and Sheriff's Office. I'm curious. Does any of your community groups have input into the budgetary priorities of the Sheriff's Department or local police departments?

12 .

. 25

MS. VOLKART: I do not have any direct knowledge about the budgetary concerns except to note that in the Sheriff's Department there have been, I believe, about seven discrimination lawsuits brought, civil lawsuits brought, that have resulted in payment of four, and there still are others pending. When you consider, as you'll hear from the future community speaker, the very, very pitifully small number of woman who are working in the Sheriff's Office who are in uniform and you compare that to the number of discrimination claims, there is a significant liability exposure of law enforcement for not having procedures that encourage a hostile-free environment and encourage nondiscriminatory practices against women and other minorities.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. I have to leave it there.

MS. HESSE: I have just one quick question.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll ask -- Just one? Okay.

I'm trying to keep us on schedule.

MS. HESSE: Okay. All right.

Q You mentioned the Grand Jury review as one of the new procedures of officers\_related deaths -- related citizen



deaths. In this press release that you received, was there any information as to whether or not the Grand Jury budget had been increased to this new activity? And you mentioned that they're not really independent, they're dependent on County Counsel. In large counties, the Grand Jury has a separate budget. Do you know if they increased the budget to handle this new responsibility?

MS. VOLKART: I would note that the Grand Jury has always had the jurisdiction to be able to step in and investigate law enforcement in this county. So this is not, though it has been cast by law enforcement as a new way to begin to review critical incidents in this county, the Grand Jury has always had this as one of their responsibilities.

So -- and specifically, with regard to the press release in which we learned that specific policies are going to be put in place for a systematic review of every critical incident involving death or serious injury at the hands of law enforcement, there was no mention whether there would be additional staffing, whether there would be any additional budgetary impacts, such as independent investigators who would be working at the behest of the Grand Jury to go out and do independent investigations, whether there would be professional staff, money for expert witnesses to come in, take a look at procedures and policies. None of that was mentioned at all. Nor have we seen anything in writing.

\_

in asking for any documents relating to that new policy which may reflect the budgetary concerns that you're raising.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. I'm going to bring this panel to a close in the interest of time and given all of the other. . .

And I want to thank you very much for your testimony today.

I'm going to also ask that we rotate, then, the participants. We will ask those of you that have participated in this panel to please give up your seats so that other members of the community may come in and participate as well.

(Inaudible question from the audience.)

MR. HERNANDEZ: Give up their seats so that other people can go, and I don't have to call the officers in here to do it for me. So if you can do that. And then that way, we don't have to get hard-nosed about this.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights staff is taking names for people who would like to give a statement later this afternoon, from 4:00 to 5:00. You should have your name on this list by 3:30.

The next panel. And I think what I'll do is just ask all three panelists to come forward and then we'll go in the order that I call. I'd like to call forward Tanya Brannan, Steve Campbell and Karen Saari -- Is that correct?

For the record, will you please state your name, your title, and your organization. And I'd like to begin the panel with Tanya Brannan. About 10 minutes.

MS. BRANNAN: All right. My name is Tanya

Brannan. I don't have a title. I'm a Purple Beret. I work

with the women's organization called the Purple Berets.

We're a grassroots women's rights group who have spent the

last six years monitoring law enforcement and, in

particular, their response to gender-based violence;

domestic violence, sexual assault, child sexual assault.

In our direct advocacy for victims of these crimes, we participated in many meetings with police and district attorney personnel and we witness the criminal justice process from start to finish. We've also had our own direct experiences with law enforcement in our organizing for structural changes in the system to make it more amenable to women victims.

I'd like to use one case as a way of highlighting the problems that exist for women vis-a-vis law enforcement in our county. On April 15th, 1996, Teresa Macias, a 36-year-old mother of three, was murdered by her husband, Avalino, who then shot Teresa's mother before killing himself. Three days later, the newspaper headlines read:

"Cops Wrap up Investigation." And that was to have been the last we were ever to hear of Teresa Macias. But instead, Marie DeSantos of the Sonoma County Women Against Rape and

myself investigated Teresa's previous contacts with law enforcement. And we found that there were many.

Nearly a year before her murder, she had reported Avalino's physical and sexual abuse of her children. A criminal investigation was opened, no charges were filed. It was left as a social work problem with CPS rather than a criminal problem. Her situation worsening, Teresa then obtained a restraining order three months before her death. In her declaration for the order, she described not only the child abuse but the violence against her which included rape, battery, death threats against her and her family.

Between the date of the first restraining order and the time she was murdered, we can document at least 22 times that Teresa turned to law enforcement for help.

Despite a mandatory arrest policy on restraining order violations, Avalino was never arrested. And, in fact, only two police reports were ever written.

when the case hit the press, the lies from law enforcement began. The Sheriff's Department story about their prior contracts with Teresa changed almost daily. First, they'd only had two. Then it was four. Then it was seven. Then they released 9-1-1 tapes of calls that were not included in the seven. They lied about knowing she was in danger. And the DA lied about why he didn't file on the only two reports he ever saw. The Sheriff even lied about a California Attorney General investigation to be

investigating the Macias case even when the Attorney General said, "It's not true, we're not investigating the Macias case; we were never asked to."

25.

The AG did, however, launch the first of two investigations into domestic violence policies and procedures. Both investigations turned up glaring ineptitude. And, more importantly, had deep-seated attitudes that virtually assured continued failures of the system for women. Many very good recommendations were put on paper. Most never went further than that.

Finally, the family, despairing of change coming in any other way, filed a civil rights lawsuit. Since then, we've had a lot of attention to domestic violence in our county, some of which undoubtedly has yielded change for the better. But we've also had five more domestic violence homicides and our work with women victims shows us that most problems continue unabated.

For example, the failure even after the Macias case to enforce restraining orders. Everything we as a culture know about domestic violence tells us that the way to end domestic violence homicide is to treat the violence partially at its beginning and particularly violations of restraining orders. Yet, despite a mandatory arrest policy, I have never heard of a violator being arrested if his only crime was violating a restraining order. And I'm currently working with a victim whose expartner has violated now 15

times. He's still not in jail. And the prosecutor is indignant that the victim wants him in jail. In fact, an assistant district attorney told her he thinks the perpetrator is not dangerous, but only young and immature. This is after Macias. This is after Attorney General investigations. This is after the community has become (inaudible).

We also continue to see police reports that only vaguely resemble the incident they're documenting. Key information, including physical evidence provided to police on the scene, is not mentioned or is so distorted as to be meaningless. In one recent domestic violence case, the victim's words appeared in the report as statements made by the perpetrator.

Victims' rights are constantly being violated by police and district attorney personnel. We see victims denied their right to have an advocate present in interviews with law enforcement in defiance of the law.

I was recently denied access to information on a case handled by the Sheriff's Department despite the victim's written notification that they were to communicate with me. The lieutenant stated that this was not a case that he felt required an advocate. Clearly, this is not a decision not for law enforcement but for the victim. And in this case, this victim was emotionally disabled and lived in another state. Without an advocate, she was powerless.

Victims are lied to and blamed for the alleged problems that make their cases unprosecutable, treated with disrespect and outright disdain, discouraged from getting outside help when things go wrong.

I've seen a 15-year-old gang rape victim denied her right to have her mother in court when she testified despite a specific provision in the California Penal Code that allowed for the mother's presence. And in utter disregard for the safety of the victim, we continue to see the DA's Office refuse to give stay-away orders in domestic violence cases despite our repeated public and private requests and repeated assurances that they would be.

Our domestic violence sexual assault vertical prosecution team has never been weaker with only two prosecutors working felony cases, down from four. And one of the two was removed from the team after repeated complaints by advocates of his dumping cases and lying to victims.

While I know that the main focus of your inquiry here is into police behavior, I urge you not to forget the critical role that the District Attorney's Office plays in all of these issues. If the DA has a pattern of not filing on certain types of cases, arrests for those incidents decline. If the DA has a pattern of asking only for probation and no jail time on restraining order violations, judges almost always go along. If the DA rubber-stamps



1.8

2.0

every police shooting as justified, the shootings continue unabated.

Certainly, our problems here with the District Attorney's Office are equally as serious, equally as dangerous as our problems with police and sheriff.

We also have the issue of the coddling of known police officers and prosecutors who have been shown to be problems. As a women's advocate, three recent examples are of particular concern to me.

Two brothers, both sheriffs deputies, were the subject of domestic violence restraining orders. In one case, the restraining order was filed by an exgirlfriend who reported that the deputy had left a note on her car saying, "You will die, Bitch." Although an internal investigation was launched into the incident, Internal Affairs ruled that no department policies had been violated. The idea that death threats do not violate department policy is appalling.

Not surprisingly, it was this same deputy who most often blew off Teresa Macias' more than 20 calls for help.

He was IA'd for that, too. And, again, no violation.

Finally, only after at least 10 internal investigations and the airing of a San Francisco TV station's investigative report into the deputy, the deputy was fired.

His brother was also the subject of a restraining order by his wife whose sworn affidavit detailed a beating

where he ripped off her clothes, dragged her downstairs, and beat her head up and down on the floor until he was finally pulled off of her by a roommate. Although this restraining order was served on the deputy by the Sheriff's Department, now Sheriff Jim Piccinini was apparently in the room when it was served, no action was taken against this deputy.

Only a year later, after a third party reported the violence and after that same San Francisco TV station investigation was aired, the deputy was convicted of felony spousal abuse.

And in a stunning display of opportunism, the District Attorney now holds these cases up as an example of how the system is working to protect domestic violence victims.

In the third case, a sheriffs captain was arrested for felony drunk driving when he ran over his wife's head.

The captain who at that time was in charge of the Patrol Division, which means he virtually runs the Sheriff's Department, was back at work within a day.

Prior to being made head of patrol, this same captain had headed up the Internal Affairs Division. In that capacity, he presided over the IAs on Macias and the on the (inaudible) incident. He also handled many of the female deputies, of which I'll be speaking later, their initial complaints of sexual harassment. And was, in fact, the officer named in several of these sexual harassment

complaints.

It was only after six months of enormous and highly embarrassing public ridicule that any disciplinary action was taken against the captain. And then I think it was a six-week suspension. He since retired on a service-related disability due to a hearing problem. I quess he couldn't hear his wife yelling, "Stop."

In light of these examples, we were not the least bit surprised to learn that no disciplinary action would be taken against Jack Shields after he shot Kuan Kao dead some 30 seconds after arriving on the scene. In fact, Shields remains a field training officer in Rohnert Park. We can only expect that under his tutelage, the Kuan Kao case is the look of things to come in that community.

MR. HERNANDEZ: One minute.

MS. BRANNAN: Okay. Research shows that female police officers respond better to crimes against women, have better communications skills, are better at diffusing potentially violent confrontations and use force less often than male cops. All of these seem to be skills that are sorely needed in Sonoma County law enforcement.

Yet, as Larry Shinagawa pointed out, the number of female sworn officers in our county is extremely low. The national average is about 10 percent. Some big city police departments have 30 percent. We have barely 6 percent female. And our Sheriff's Department, the largest, has only

seven sworn female deputies in a department of 228.

That, in itself, would be bad enough. But that same department had seven sex discrimination complaints lodged against it in just the last two years. We know the problem is more pervasive. Santa Rosa also has some serious sex discrimination problems.

In virtually all of the cases where female officers complain of harassment and discrimination, the retaliation against the women is swift and virulent. They suffer even greater and more widespread harassment. They're publicly ridiculed by ranking officers. Their cases are sabotaged by fellow officers. They're put on performance improvement programs while the offenders go undisciplined.

Finally, feeling they have no other choice, the women leave. And, believe me. It's not lost on the remaining female cops that the women who reported being harassed are gone and the men they complained about continue to serve.

In a move that would be laughable if it weren't so tragic, our sheriff has now introduced a new sexual harassment policy which I'll be providing today. It's patently illegal. It puts all the focus on the woman will be disciplined if she fails to report and not on the man will be disciplined. He then sat down and had individual interviews with every woman in the Jail Division. And at the end of the interview, she was to sign a document if she

didn't report harassment, she was to sign a document saying she had not been harassed. This is clearly not to protect the women from harassment but to protect the Sheriff's Department from lawsuits.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'm going to hold it there and then we'll follow-up with questions.

MS. BRANNAN: Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm going to ask Steve Campbell to please state your name for the record and your organization.

MR. CAMPBELL: Steven Campbell, from the homeless -- the Sonoma County Homeless Coalition. And I'm also -- I've been working as an activist on the streets for the past 10 years and also a community outreach worker.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Welcome.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, sir. And I would like to speak on the lack of cultural sensitivity and discriminatory law enforcement in Sonoma County.

I would like to start by saying that I resent being targeted as a perpetual criminal suspect on what seems to be solely based on my skin color, style of dress and perceived financial status. I believe it is a nonsequitur to assume that a person of African descent who lives in or visits a community with a large percentage of African-American people should be prejudged as being worthy of suspicion which ultimately results in the substantial loss of civil rights and freedoms.

People who reside in what I call red line areas are generally people of color, people of rotten poverty, and people surviving on set income, such as General Assistance and Social Security.

Statistics prove that drugs are rampant and sold in every neighborhood across the nation. Statistics prove that the percentage of drug use is consistent across the geographic, racial and economic board of roughly 12 percent for each group. Ironically, these groups include the police community.

These statistics suggest that it is not reasonable to target any one community as the primary focus of America's drug problems. Yet our police do just that. Citizens who reside in Sonoma County's low rent areas as well as homeless people are often subject to harsh and violent confrontations detentions and humiliation at the hands of Sonoma County police who are using what they call a common profile are given the discretion to suspend a citizen's right to probable cause and right not to be subjected to unreasonable search and seizures and a right to dignity.

Although I believe it is true that the lack of ready access to drugs by people of poverty due to lack of resources often create an environment of violence, death and manipulation, I submit the analogy of tuna fishing where the dolphins are caught in the broad nets -- where the dolphins

which are caught in the broad nets are alongside the tuna with the -- die alongside the tuna with a total disregard for the ramifications of their actions and shame is apathy regarding the tuna's plight -- dolphin's plight.

Sonoma County unwisely bestowed the officers with the discretion to target, detain, question, search and arrest young African-Americans and Latinos for loitering on their own porches and front yards for congregating with their own families, sometimes for returning eye contact to an officer, sometimes for not initiating eye contact with the officer.

Far too many people have unnecessarily lost their lives at the hands of overzealous, poorly trained and undersupervised police officers. Far too often are police callous as being unnecessarily harsh for a homicide as a means of expediting a situation which offers multiple alternatives.

Too often do officers use stress as an excuse for a murderous and impatient heart. And too often are bad and sadistic police officers protected by their peers under a strict and criminal code -- a criminal code of silence which too many citizens protect. Let me see.

It should be realized that for each person unreasonably killed at the hands of our police, scores are tortured, maimed and disabled for life. Many simply to provide entertainment and stress release to sadistic cops.

Many, as dolphins, beaten for having the audacity perhaps to confront and question the authority of the force to act and deliver the -- to act and deliver the nebulous discussion.

routinely assaulted by various police agencies. These in-house assaults often involve numerous officers brutally beating one inmate. And though the assaults are done in open view to the entire jail staff, during investigations no officers or support staff persons have the heart to stand up for justice and speak out on the criminal actions of their peers.

I personally have been physically assaulted by police in Sonoma County on two separate occasions. Once in Cotati in 1989 in which I received a ruptured vertebrae; another time in Santa Rosa on January 18, 1997. Due to the fact that I have a lawsuit pending regarding this assault in a legal detention, I am not at liberty to discuss this case. I will say, however, the sole charge of resisting arrest was dismissed and the question regarding the fact that the only probable cause to stop, detain, question and search me was my skin color and the area which I was in. After the search was performed and no contraband was found on my person or car, I was still placed under arrest and delivered to the County Jail.

I have come to the conclusion that the Sonoma

County police departments in tandem are out of control, that

their administrators do not have the skill or will to constrain their actions, and that it would serve our communities well to initiate a citizen oversight commission with subpoena power.

I also am convinced that officers throughout the County of Sonoma are oblivious to the threat of perjury. I don't believe that they respond to it one bit. I believe an officer found to have committed perjury under oath should be immediately dismissed from the force.

Last, but not least, I recommend that criminal charges tantamount to accomplice after the fact be leveled against any police officer or police support staff person who fails to report any and all criminal activity or abuse of power under the color of authority committed by their peers to the committee within a given time span.

Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. I'd like to now ask Karen Saari to give her statement.

MS. SAARI: My name is Karen Saari. I am a member of a number of police brutality groups -- not police brutality groups, but the group of which I have the most affinity is the October 22nd Coalition.

October 22nd is a national collision of activists and family members. We have offices in New York City, Chicago, San Francisco and Los Angeles. We do two things. We sponsor a national day of protest, and we also are

sponsors of the Stolen Lives Project.

The Stolen Lives Project is a grassroots effort to identify all people involved in police-related deaths in the United States since 1990. And I, when I first became involved with October 22nd, I became very intrigued with this project. When I first started out in this movement I knew very little about the victim's side of the story, and that's what the Stolen Lives Project is all about.

And soon after joining, I started doing research.

And that was about a little over a year ago. I started doing research on the Internet by scanning Internet newspapers for stories about police brutality in the Bay Area, and I started a database to keep track of what I was finding. Recently, I have expanded my research to include all of California, Oregon, and Utah.

In doing this research last summer, I realized that Sonoma County had the highest rate of deaths by police of any county in the Bay Area. I'll just read some of the totals for you. Sonoma County has had 11; Solano County, three; Santa Clara, seven; San Francisco, six; Napa, four; Marin, two; Contra Costa, three; and Alameda none.

But Sonoma County is the highest. Even though it doesn't have the highest population, it has the highest number of police-related deaths, according to my research.

Because I live in Sonoma County, I've lived here for 25 years, I've had an opportunity to become familiar

with the 11 police-related deaths, more familiar with those cases than any other cases but I know them. I've also had an opportunity to meet with the families.

I'm going to be talking very briefly about those 11 cases because of the time constraints. I will talk about them in categories. We've had a number of police-related deaths as a result of 9-1-1 calls for help. There are three other cases which share similarities with some of those 9-1-1 calls that I will point out when I'm talking about them. And I also want to talk about the deaths at the Sonoma County Jail, particularly the heroin-related deaths that occurred in 1997.

I will first be talking about the five deaths that occurred as a result of 9-1-1 calls. And one other incident that was about a distressed person that ended up in his death.

The five people who died as the result of 9-1-1 calls are Kevin Saunders, Dustin Clark, Salomon Hernandez, Corey Goodwin, and Kuan Chung Kao. And I'm going to be very brief with these because I know I don't have a lot of time. So I'm going to be leaving out a lot of things that I think were important.

Kevin Saunders was shot and killed by the Santa Rosa police on August 29, 1996. Police were called to his home because he had threatened suicide. There was a short chase and a police officer caught up with him.

Eyewitnesses described Kevin as being confused, as being casual. The officer was yelling at Kevin to raise his hands. And he was also yelling at the neighbors to get away. Kevin just wasn't getting it. He wasn't raising his hands. Finally, he did raise his hands. He was mumbling during this interaction. And at one point, he started to lower, he just started to lower his hands, when officer Jesse Rangle shot him three times. Kevin died and he was found to be unarmed.

The next 9-1-1 call happened only about a week later. This was Dustin Clark. It was a 9-1-1 call from here in Santa Rosa. They called to report a young man running in the street, high on drugs and naked. The Sonoma County Sheriff's Department responded. The newspaper reports say that within minutes, Dustin had been restrained. And the way in which they restrained him is that they pepper-sprayed him. And when that didn't completely work, they hit him with the battery end of the flashlight. When that didn't completely work, they sicced a police dog on him. His mother, when she picked up his body, reported that there were over five bites.

When the police dog had knocked him down for the second time, three officers got on top of him and they hog-tied him. They remained on top of him even when they realized that he was no longer breathing and that he no longer had a pulse. They stayed on top of him until the

paramedics arrived and insisted that they get off of him.

And then they checked Dustin at that time and he was

lifeless. He was revived twice but he died later that

night.

The third case of a 9-1-1 call was on February 15th of 1997. Salomon Hernandez had gone to a local gas station. He bought \$5 worth of gas and he left without paying for it. After he left the gas station, I think within 15 minutes or so, he realized that he had forgotten to pay and returned to the gas station. In the meantime, the cashier had reported this nonpayment of \$5 to the police and had called the police. And when Salomon paid it, he asked the clerk to cancel the call and the clerk wouldn't cancel it. Salomon got very angry and he pulled out, according to the police reports, he pulled out a screwdriver and he threatened the cashier with the screwdriver.

In the meantime the cop arrived, Salomon got back in his car, he was interviewed by the police officer. The police officer went and interviewed the cashier. He was returning to the car to do a body search of Salomon. I guess Salomon was out of the car. According to the police officer, Salomon attacked the police officer with the head of the screwdriver and Officer Goldschlag shot and killed him. Shot him three times and killed him. Officer Goldschlag also killed David Lansing in 1989.

The next case was only about nine days later.

There was a 9-1-1 call, this time in Rohnert Park, about a man in an apartment shooting randomly in the street. The Sheriff's SWAT team responded to that call. They evacuated an area -- there was a lot of apartments. They evacuated the apartments. There was about a six-hour standoff. At the end of six hours, the Sheriff's SWAT team decided to throw a tear gas canister into the apartment where Corey Goodwin was hold up. They knew that this would very likely start a fire. They had already called the fire department before they threw the tear gas canister.

They threw the tear gas canister and it started the fire. As far as I know, no effort was made to rescue Corey Goodwin from the fire. When the fire was out, they went in and Corey Goodwin had died of smoke inhalation and burns.

Two months later, there was another 9-1-1 call.

This was about Kuan Chung Kao. Kuan Chung Kao had been out drinking that night. He had been subjected to a number of racial slurs, he was very upset. The police had been called. The police had refused to arrest the people who had been badgering him. He was taken home in a cab. He was outside of his house. He was attacked -- down in the street, kneeling. He was begging his neighbors for help.

There were many 9-1-1 calls. Two police cars arrived. They arrived without their sirens on, they arrived

without their overhead lights on. They shone their headlights onto Kuan Chung Kao's face and drove at him as if they were going to run him over. Apparently, this was intended to frighten him into dropping the stick that he was holding. It only served to make him angry.

One of the police officers decided to wait for backup. Another police officer decided to get out of his car. Got out of his car. He claimed that Kuan Chung Kao was going to kill him with a six-foot, three-quarter inch diameter pole and he shot him and he killed him less than 34 seconds after he arrived on the scene.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I need to interrupt you just for a second to give her a chance to change the tape. So if you'll just hang on a second for one of our technical problems. I want to make sure we get everything on the record.

(Off the record.)

MR. HERNANDEZ: All right. You may continue.

MS. SAARI: These were the five deaths that resulted from the 9-1-1 calls for help. None of these persons were criminals. All of them were in some kind --were having some kind of psychiatric episode. As far as I can tell -- I mean, in four of the cases, the people were killed within minutes of the arrival of the police department -- the police officials on the scene.

Something seems to happen when the police get into

a situation. The situation doesn't recede. It, in fact, escalates to the point where the person seems to appear very threatened and it escalates to the point that the police officer seems to feel that he needs to employ deadly force.

In the case of Corey Goodwin, a considerable amount of time had passed. But as far as I can tell, no effort was made to call in some kind of psychologist to talk him down and to deal with his situation as a psychiatric problem.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Can I ask you just to wind up in about a minute so that we can get the panelists to ask questions.

MS. SAARI: Okay. I'm going to talk about another death, Sonoma County Jail deaths. There have been a number of deaths at the Sonoma County Jail. Since 1990, the only three that I really have information about are the three that occurred in 1997.

Each of those people were heroin addicts. And they went to the jail. They were okay when they got at the jail. But very soon after arriving at the jail -- Joanie Holmes died within three days of arriving at the jail. John Banks was at the jail for about four days. He was released; he died within six hours after leaving the jail. Kenneth Stra arrived at the jail and he died within 27 hours. All of these people were heroin addicts and I don't think that they received any kind of treatment for heroin withdrawal



while they were at the jail.

I think -- I also want to mention that these 11 deaths are really just the tip of the iceberg. Tanya and Steven have talked a little bit about what is beneath all of this. I'm very concerned about the implications of this, how much harassment is going on in this county, how many beatings are going on in this county. A number of people are very much afraid of the police. A number of people are distrustful of the police. We have a lot of very serious concerns.

Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. And I'm going to start at this side of the panel for questions because I know. . .

Okay. Mitch Pomerantz.

MR. POMERANTZ: Yeah. I'd like some clarification from Ms. Saari regarding those statistics. Alameda County and San Francisco County are pretty high-crime areas.

Perhaps you could clarify over what period of time those statistics cover and more information, perhaps, on how that data was gathered. It just sounds a little incomplete.

MS. SAARI: It may be. This is grassroots research. It's research that I do on the Internet. I personally only started doing this research myself about a year ago. I got better at it as time went by. I got more

17.

thorough at it I'm not the Justice Department; I'm a person with a computer. So it's the best that I have.

MS. BRANNAN: If I could add. When Mr. Kao was shot, we were writing an article about it. And one of the things I did to make some kind of comparison was I called Oakland. And at that time I think we'd had seven deaths in the last -- or maybe it was six deaths in the last two years. Oakland had had zero. So I don't think her stats are that far off.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Hesse?

MS. HESSE: Okay. Real quickly.

Ms. Brannan, you talked about the restraining order activities. What years did those occur? Was this last year?

MS. BRANNAN: Teresa Macias was in 1996. The case that I'm working on now is in court right now. These occur -- have occurred -- are cases in the last few months.

Q Isn't there a Penal Code section that prohibits anyone from having a gun permit if a restraining order has been filed against the individual?

MS. BRANNAN: Yes, that's true. And it certainly came into play with these police officers. I know that's why one of them fought so hard to try to get his case dropped. Because, as a police officer, he'll never be a cop again, which is a very good thing.

He is also an officer who had complaints of



domestic violence victims to whose calls he responded. And he was arrogant, he made denigrating comments about how women are more often responsible for domestic violence than men, and things likes that. So good riddance.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Lee?

MS. LEE: I have a couple of questions.

The first one: Have any one of you or are you aware of any groups that have been contacted by the law enforcement agencies to help them in terms of police recruitment and police training? That's question No. 1.

Question No. 2 is: For the victims who have filed complaints, what kind of treatment have they gotten? What kind of information have they been getting? Any follow-ups? Basically, after they file the complaint, what happens to them?

MS. BRANNAN: Okay. I can take the first question. No, law enforcement has not been connecting with any of these groups trying to get help with the diversity issues.

In fact, we had set up a meeting -- we'd been having ongoing meetings with the Sheriff's Department. And when we were talking about what do we want to talk about at the next meeting, we decided it would be about women in law enforcement. And when we made that decision, I said, "You know, I'd really like to open this to a broader segment of the community. I know there are a lot of other women who

are interested in this issue." They said, "Fine."

We set up a meeting of 15 women in leadership positions in the women's community. The Sheriff's Department was to bring in their recruiters, their trainers so that we could just look at the whole thing. You know, how they recruit, how they promote, what's the testing look like, where are women getting shut out, and how do we fix it? The meeting was first postponed twice and then it was canceled by the Sheriff's Department.

Since that time, a formal task force on women in policing has been formed, and that task force then went to the Sheriff's Department and said, "We're concerned that this meeting was canceled. We as the task force would like to meet with you with these same ideas in mind." They've received no response. They've refused to meet with them.

So, I mean, what we've seen is the community is just blown off. They don't really want our input. They don't want -- I mean, it appears that they want things to go on as they are.

What was your second question? Oh, complaints.

MS. SAARI: I have a response to that, to the second part of your question.

I work with the families of the victims of the shootings. Dale Hughes was shot and killed by the Santa Rosa Police Department last November. The police department claims that Dale had shot at them and that's why

they killed him. The family still has not received the police report from the police department or the District Attorney, and it's been three months. It was three months vesterday, and they still have not received the report.

It's a very serious charge against their son, and they have received no evidence of those police claims to date.

MS. BRANNAN: We're also -- I don't know if you've seen a copy of the Grand Jury report. But we we've had two separate Grand Jury investigations that criticized the Sheriff's Department for their complaint procedure. It's almost impossible to figure out how to make complaints. When you do, they don't know where -- you don't get advised back. This is continuing despite two Grand Jury reports criticizing them for that.

We just had another incident, and I think he'll be testifying in the public hearing later today, of a man who was harassed by the police when he called the Santa Rosa Police. He wanted to file a complaint. He made repeated contacts with the police. He was discouraged again and again. He was told, "Well, look; I'm the guy that's going to review your complaint, and I can already tell you I don't think it has any merit. So I don't think you need to bother to file a formal complaint." He had to insist on getting the forms to file a formal complaint and hand it over to a man who has already prejudged it without reading it.

So the situation for citizen complaints is abominable.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Buitrago?

MS. BUITRAGO: Yes. I have two requests of Ms. Brannan. One is you may already have the Grand Jury reports. But if you don't, can you provide that for us.

And, also, I would be interested in getting some of the research documents that you talked about, the effects of hiring females, what effect it has on the way the police behaves in terms of public safety issues.

MS. BRANNAN: Okay. I do have a packet to give to you today. I don't think the Grand Jury report is in it, but we can definitely get that to you. And the information -- In fact, it's right here. And much of the information -- One good place to look at the information on female police officers is the Christopher Commission did a report of Los Angeles police in the wake of the Rodney King incident.

And that -- One of the things that they showed in that report was about -- I think it was 120 officers with the most complaints of police brutality against them. Not one was a female. And yet, women were not reluctant to use force when necessary. So the evidence is very, very compelling.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Fua?



.23

MS. FUA: What recommendations do you all have for how things can be changed? Concrete, you know, suggestions

MS. BRANNAN: My primary recommendation -- We had an Attorney General investigation. They made recommendations. Most of them have not been implemented. We had a Blue Ribbon Commission report. They made many good recommendations. They haven't been implemented.

Our concern is when things stay on the recommendation level -- and I understand the power you have is recommendations -- that nothing really changes. We've got rooms full of recommendations.

So what I would really ask that this panel recommend is that the Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, open an investigation into Sonoma County law enforcement to investigate whether we indeed have pattern and practice of police misconduct. In two ways. In the police brutality issue and in the sex discrimination issue on the police forces.

I know that DOJ has the power to do that. If they find that pattern of discrimination, they can come into this county and make things change. And that's what it's going to take. You know, the sugar and the honey has done nothing. It's time for the stick from the government.

You know, the other thing that I really want to say is that the fact that the Civil Rights Commission is here, it's so appropriate. I mean, in the same way that the

federal government had to come in in the South -- and I grew up in the South -- had to come in in the South in order to break through the tightly knit racist community. We're in that same situation.

We have a very tightly knit, closed community controlled by law enforcement. A very compliant daily paper that mouths whatever law enforcement wants them to say. And for we, as the community, to get the truth out about what is going on here has been almost impossible.

So the importance of you being here and of you communicating what you see here and what you learn here, I can't overstress how important it is. We really appreciate it.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Are you saying that the newspaper is in league with law enforcement at the --

MS. BRANNAN: Absolutely. And, you know, I know it sounds like a conspiracy, but they have been active players. They not only don't report barely, but they have been active players in most of the political struggles that I've been involved in in this community.

We've seen them again and again -- and in the police killings, what we're seeing is they give all the room in the world for law enforcement. I mean, we just had a two-page -- huge two-page article by Police Chief Mike Dunbaugh telling how much it hurts a police officer when he shoots someone dead. But we can hardly get a letter to the

editor in.

. 14

and what the reporting in the <u>Press Democrat</u> -- I might as well say the name -- has been just incredibly in favor of the police and demonizing the victims. Even domestic violence victims. What we read about domestic violence victims is: "Oh, well; she just wanted too much too fast. She should have gotten away from that guy but she wanted his money." You know, come on. We had a 12-year-old child whose body was thrown off a freeway overpass and the <u>Press Democrat</u> demonized that child.

So, yes, our local daily newspaper is definitely in league with law enforcement. They print anything that law enforcement wants printed and suppress the voice of the community again and again and again.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes?

MS. SAARI: Could I make a response to your question about what can be done?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Let me ask Ms. Hawkey first and then we'll let you respond. Because I've got to get the members of the panel.

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: I'm not in favor of the vilifying all of the law enforcement folks in Sonoma County, but I do have a question.

How long are they to wait before they make the decision that their life is in danger or those around them are in danger? I mean, what is the scenario that you see?

Many times an officer who takes a little bit longer than a millisecond ends up dead. So, I mean, there needs to be a balance here.

MS. SAARI: Usually not from a screwdriver or a six-foot wooden pole. And my feeling is that Officer Goldschlag could have protected himself from a screwdriver by simply backing up. A screwdriver doesn't shoot the way a gun does. It doesn't go off the way a bomb does. The same is true for the six-foot pole.

Kevin Saunders wasn't even armed. There was a situation with Dale Robbins in the police station supposedly yielding a club. There were four officers there. As far as I can tell, no effort was made to physically restrain him. They pepper-sprayed him, they hit him with a baton and then they shot him dead. But nobody made any effort to physically restrain him. They wouldn't have -- you know, a club is not the same as a gun. And I think some effort should be made to physically restrain.

No effort was made to physically restrain Dustin Clark. They just went in with pepper spray, they went in with a flashlight and then sicced a police dog on him. They never tried to physically restrain him. He was very vulnerable. He was high on drugs. He was completely naked.

And what I'm saying is that -- I personally think that some effort should be made towards physically restraining people yielding screwdrivers and poles. A gun



.12

is a different story. But with a screwdriver, with a pole, a club -- even a club. That's my personal feeling about it. Too many people are dying.

MS. BRANNAN: I think when we look, in particular, at the killing of Mr. Kao, what all of the investigation has looked at is that moment when the police allege that Kuan Kao was coming at them with a stick and having to make that decision to shoot.

What they -- What none of them looked at is what the police did to escalate it to that shoot-or-don't-shoot situation. And they did escalate it. If you read the reports, if you read the background on that case, there's no doubt in my mind that they created that situation.

It would have been very easy for Jack Shields to do what his fellow officer, the first on the scene and the guy that was in charge told him to do. And that is: "Back up, wait for backup. Don't get out of your car." So there's no doubt that Jack Shields escalated that situation unnecessarily.

Once he did that, then maybe he did feel like his life was threatened and he had to shoot. But it didn't have to go there.

MR. HERNANDEZ: This would be the final question from the panel -- from our panel.

MR. CARNEY: I'm concerned with the comment that
Ms. Saari just made about the individual in the jail. And

also, I just want to comment regarding the officer's perjury that the gentleman, Mr. Campbell, commented about.

And my question mainly is in the rhetorical sense in that regard is: Has the District Attorney's Office been questioned about this and did you give an accounting of what they are doing or are they taking any action at all?

Now, with respect to the -- my only comment with respect to the individual in the jail, your inquiry about lack of physical or attempt at physical restraint. You commented about pepper spray and a baton and the use of a dog.

Are you requiring the officers to go in there and get into physical combat with somebody that is acting in a bizarre manner and endanger their own safety? I don't think that when they take the oath to be police officers, that they're required to go in there and put their life on the line in circumstances like this.

I'm not saying that deadly force is the answer, but I don't think that -- I mean, you're talking about attempts at physical restraint. It sounds like to me that they did that. And it's at what point do you stop and then initiate the use of deadly force?

Again, I don't know all of the facts of the situation. I'm just making a comment, really. And I think that you have police officers, especially in the days of PCP, where people were acting in an incredibly bizarre



1.9

·25

manner, the police officer is stuck in a position of having to evaluate the circumstances; and then is he the one that has to go out and get into a fist fight?

It's not the Marquis of Queensberry rules out there. And whether it's in the jailhouse or not.

I'm not condoning the officers' actions. I'm just making a comment about what you said. I think it sounds like the officers made efforts to physically restrain the individual and they weren't successful. Maybe they weren't prudent in their decision of shooting him. But, you know, I wasn't there and I can't tell and I don't have all of the facts. And I'm not going to make --

MS. SAARI: Are you talking -- I'm not following which incident you're talking about. Are you --

MR. CARNEY: I'm talking about the jail incident where the individual -- no attempt to physically restrain the person.

MS. SAARI: That was the police lobby.

MR. CARNEY: Okay. Again, you're still talking about attempts were apparently made. And it's at what point do you ask the police officer to go in there and suffer a beating?

I mean, you're not putting gloves on. There is no referee out there to, you know, say, "Okay. It's time to go to your neutral corners," et cetera. And, again, I don't have the facts. I don't know if you have all of the

facts --

1.2

MS. SAARI: Nobody does.

MR. CARNEY: Okay. Well, that's the problem we deal with and that's why we try to ferret out some of this business.

And, again, I don't think that the oath the officer takes puts -- I'm sorry. That he is required at that point to put himself in physical jeopardy at that point. I think that there has to be some line of demarcation there. And, again, whether deadly force is the answer, I'm not sure. Again, I wasn't there. But it does seem --

MS. SAARI: So you're saying a policeman should never ever, like, get hit by someone -- he should never get into a situation where someone hits him, or he should never have a bruise, he should never have a broken bone? He should always go home with his body in perfect shape? Is that your position?

MR. CARNEY: No, it's not my position. But I don't think that you're inviting -- I mean, you're asking police officers, it seems anyway, based on what you're saying, you want them to come up and physically restrain the individuals themselves.

MS. SAARI: That's right.

MR. CARNEY: Well, there are other means. And I think that they were trying to do that. And maybe there are



instrumentalities, if you will, other than a gun that could have been engaged and utilized in this situation. But I don't think that it's always the situation that the officer is going to get up and get into a fist fight with a guy.

MS. SAARI: Well, I think if it's a choice between that and the deadly force, I go for the fist fight.

MR. CARNEY: Well, again, I don't have all of the information to make that assessment.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Let me ask -- Ms. Spanos-Hawkey has a request.

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: Ms. Saari, I would like, since you were unable to complete your presentation on the victims, I notice there is a lot of information that has not been included in the media. And believe me, we've read all of them, including the local. If you could submit that so it would go into the record so those other individuals who have died in police-related deaths, that we would have that information in the testimony.

MS. SAARI: I'd be very happy to. I'll get it to you in the next five days.

MR. HERNANDEZ: All right. I'm going to bring this part of the hearing to a close.

I'm going to ask for a 15-minute break. And during that time, those of you that have been part of this session, could you please give us some assistance and move out so we can get people -- the people downstairs are

complaining that they can't get in the session. It's creating a security problem and the Highway Patrol is starting to get some real nervous people down there.

So if you could just give us some help. So during the break, we're going to clear everybody out so that a whole new set of people can come in.

Thank you very much. We'll take about a 15-minute break. Any input to the record that you have in a written form or whatever, please let us have that now.

MS. BRANNAN: Could I make one more very quick comment. I think it's important that the Commission be aware that there has been a tremendous amount of police repression against people wanting to come to this hearing, including community outreach workers who, when they told people that the Civil Rights Commission was going to be here and they should come, their bosses were called and told that that was inappropriate.

So I think -- I mean, you can see the repression in the room and I just want to make sure you're aware of the repression in the community.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Let the record reflect that.

MS. BRANNAN: Thanks.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. 15-minute break. Thanks.

(Break taken at 11:30 a.m. until 11:45 a.m.)

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Calling the meeting back to order.



Sitting on this panel in front of me is Jim
Piccinini, Sheriff of Sonoma County; Michael Dunbaugh, Chief
of Police, City of Santa Rosa; and Pat Rooney, Chief of
Police, City of Rohnert Park.

I'm going to ask Sheriff Piccinini to please lead off with on opening statement. Please state your name, title and position for the record.

MR. PICCININI: My name is Jim Piccinini; I'm the Sheriff of Sonoma County.

Members of the Commission, I. Have lived in this county for about 47 years. I grew up in this county ast this county has gown and changed. I have witnessed its transformation from largely a rural county to one that is now both urban and rural. A county that is diverse in its beauty, its economics and its people.

I have spent the past 29 years in public safety service, serving the citizens of this county first as a firefighter and then as a law enforcement officer. My whole life has been dedicated to serving fellow citizens.

When I talk to people who have recently moved here for a short period of time -- or have been here for a short period of time, I often hear a common theme as to why they chose Sonoma County to settle in. This theme is that people who have settled here have done so because they believe that this is one of the best places to live in all of the nation. It is a county that is small enough to have a true

community spirit and large enough to provide the jobs, health care, entertainment, education and safety that all of us as citizens pursue.

I have been with the Sonoma County Sheriff's
Department for 22 years. I became the Sheriff of that
department this past October. As I have witnessed this
county change, I have also witnessed the Sonoma County
Sheriff's Department change. The changes I'm talking about
are not just new laws but our transformation from delivery
of police services in a traditional manner to one of
community-oriented policing. We pride ourselves on our
ability to deliver law enforcement and quality detention
services.

In an effort to reach out to the community we serve, this department has implemented several programs to facilitate community involvement and feedback in the type of service that we provide.

As an example, in 1990 we established the county's first formal community-oriented policing program in the Roseland area. Since then, we have implemented the community-oriented policing philosophy and program throughout the department and throughout the county.

We have for the past eight years, and will continue to, host community meetings in various portions of Sonoma County on nearly an every-other-month basis. And, in fact, I just went to one last night.



.23

We host and participate youth events and school activities, such as bicycle rodeos, DARE programs, Hug a Tree programs, police visits to school grounds, Floyd the Shark, Stranger Danger, and a variety of others.

We participate in a variety of community events. Our employees, on their own time but representing the department, participate in fund-raising programs for youth sports activities, fund-raising for public educational television, participate in American Heart Association fund-raisers, Schools Plus, Project Graduation, and a long, long list of other community events.

We provide several crime prevention programs in the community. Neighborhood Watch, Farm Watch, Personal Safety programs, and many more.

And we host a Citizens Academy that began in 1997 as a tool to educate our citizens as to the complexity of law enforcement and to solicit their ideas and input. This program seeks to provide factual information and to dispel television cop show tactics by providing an in-depth view of our organization, what it does, how it does it, and why.

In a five-year period of time, our organization has, through its outreach programs, contacted over 123,000 citizens in this county. And this does not take into account the numerous presentations to community groups and clubs that I as the Sheriff and other staff members do on a regular basis. As an example, just this past month, I have

personally spoken to more than 350 citizens at different functions on topics ranging from Citizens Academy to use of force and unlawful harassment.

.25

perhaps a more significant indicator of our department's desire to reach out and communicate with our citizens is our commission of a citizens community survey. In 1994 the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department sought input from the community through a community survey.

The department contracted with a private consultant to assist in the construction of a credible document for the purpose of determining public sentiment regarding the Sheriff's Department service delivery. The survey returned with an 85.3 percent of the respondents rating the Sheriff's Department overall service as excellent or good.

This past October, we again initiated a public survey. The preliminary results that were just delivered just this week show the overall satisfaction rating has increased to 88.1 percent.

Additionally and perhaps more important, there was an increase in the number of people who felt comfortable calling to, quote, "offer information" or, quote, "make a complaint." Those numbers went from 84 percent in 1994 to 86 percent in 1997. And those willing to make a complaint went from 83.8 to 87 percent in 1997.

I believe I have a fair assessment of how the

citizens feel about law enforcement in Sonoma County. I believe overall that they are confident in what we are doing. I am concerned that this Commission may have been misled by certain special interest groups who have distorted or misstated factual information.

1.8

2İ

As an example, I know that criticism has been forwarded to the Commission regarding the death of inmates that have occurred in our facility. Please understand that the death of an inmate in our facility causes us great anguish. Unfortunately, jail custody deaths are not unique to Sonoma County. Tragic as it is, custody deaths do occur throughout the state and throughout this nation.

In 1996, there were 95 county jail deaths throughout California. And while custody deaths do occur, our department provides some of the highest quality detention services in this nation and we go to great lengths to ensure the safety of our inmates.

All detention facilities in the State of
California must be inspected by the California Board of
Corrections on a biannual basis. In the recent inspections
of 135 correctional facilities in the State of California,
only 16 were found to be compliant, fully compliant, with
state standards. It is with pride that I can report that
both of our facilities here in Sonoma County were two of
those 16.

Additionally, our facilities are fully accredited

by the California Medical Association for providing medical care and health care services which meet the standards developed by the American Medical Association. I would also like to note that of the 58 counties in California, only 19 are accredited medical facilities. That 19 out of 58, again we are one of those 19.

Our facilities are what is referred to as direct supervision facilities. The concept that began in 1987. Our facilities under the direct supervision concept were so well run and well known that we receive visitors from throughout the nation and the world to view how it should be done. In fact, I am so proud and confident of our facility, that I would offer and encourage the Commission to accompany me on a personal tour of our facilities following these hearings or at any time you would like to do so. I believe that you would be impressed with the type of facility and how we run it.

I believe the Commission is informed, also, of the series of harassment lawsuits, and I know it's been talked about here today, that have plagued our department. I can also state that as a new sheriff, one of the first issues that I have concentrated on is the elimination of this cycle of lawsuits. One can read about unlawful harassment cases in news clippings every day. We can read of these cases in every work group at various levels of federal government, state government, local government, and private enterprise.

It is not unique to this department.

11.

In our county, I, along with representatives of the Sonoma County Counsel's Office and the County Affirmative Action Department and the County's Risk Management Department have spent hours in personnel meetings and personal meetings with our employees to solicit their input on what we as an organization can do to improve the overall work environment of our department.

One of my first acts of Sheriff was to implement a new unlawful harassment policy that I feel will be an important tool in making our organization an even better place to work. We also are implementing a Peer Support Program, and I am organizing a panel of private business human resource managers and experts to assist me in the recruitment and retention issues of recruiting and retraining women and other minorities. I am committed to taking these steps to enhance the work environment.

I am also aware of the issues of domestic violence. And, again, while I cannot comment on some of the past cases that were mentioned here due to litigation pending, let me advise the Commission of our current strategy and programs for domestic violence which we are very proud of.

In November of 1995, the Sheriff's Department applied for a federal grant for domestic violence. In October of 1996, the Sheriff's Department created a new unit

of domestic violence/sexual assault which focuses on family violence.

Thanks to a partnership at the YWCA, the District Attorney, and our department, the unit now consists of a detective sergeant, five detectives, two victim advocates, two victim counselors, a deputy district attorney, a district attorney investigator, and clerical support all under one roof in an off-site facility that is user friendly.

The program goals are prevention through education, suppression through enforcement, and diversion through advocacy and counseling. This program is now being used as a model program throughout the State of California.

Ladies and gentlemen, I know that you are here to provide a forum for all individuals and groups to express their thoughts and beliefs. As Sheriff of Sonoma County, I'm responsible for law enforcement and detention services for all of the 432,000 citizens in this county. I assure you that I have and will continue to listen to all groups and individuals regarding their comments on our service delivery and I will provide the best quality of service possible to the citizens of Sonoma County.

In our department, 75 percent of our budget is dedicated to salaries and benefits. We are a people organization. We are people serving people. The men and women of the Sonoma Sheriff's Department are dedicated

.

. 25

professionals who strive to provide the absolute best quality services they can.

while we always look for ways to improve our service delivery and while we do have issues to address, I must say that based on community support from the very broad spectrum of our residents and the recent results of our public survey, I believe the men and women of the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department are doing a great job of serving our citizens.

I must also state that as one of the lead law enforcement officers in this county, it is also my belief that the level of dedication and commitment and professionalism from the other law enforcement agencies in this county is second to none.

Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much, Sheriff.

I'd like to ask Chief Dunbaugh.

MR. DUNBAUGH: I'd like to welcome and thank the Committee for allowing me to attend by invitation. It meant a great deal to the community and to me personally.

I'd also like to thank you for working with us last night and allowing us to find a way to provide you with the information that you seek in a way that won't cost our community. And we've evaluated that and it's forthcoming.

I've provided you with a copy of my bio and resume. For the sake of time, I'm going to refrain from

further details except to mention that my commitment to my community is both personal and professional.

My roots in law enforcement go back to the mid-'70s where I can recall, as a young patrol officer -- naive and idealistic, wanting to help people -- spending an eight-hour shift counting the number of times I was called "pig" or some other derogatory comment due only to my appearance. When I got past 200, I stopped. However, to this day, I still remain that idealistic, maybe not so young and not so naive, person who wants to help people.

I've been with the Santa Rosa Police Department for approximately 18 months now. In the past 24 months, the Santa Rosa Police Department has experienced tremendous change. Not the least of which involved my arrival and introduction to the organization.

During these months, we've accomplished much.

Most of which has a direct bearing on the question of our police-community relationship, a question you have asked. I am impressed with the quality of the people with whom I work. I'm an outsider coming in, and I had the privilege of being able to evaluate, critically. I'm also impressed with my community.

The entire structure of our organization has been modified, streamlined and developed with the intent to provide superior professional services to the people in our community. All people. Our structure was further designed

to facilitate our neighborhood oriented policing approach to conducting businesses.

Santa Rosa has some very distinct neighborhoods and we've taken the approach to conducting -- providing law enforcement services, of working closely with neighborhoods their associations and the people who live there. Many of whom work for me.

A new management team has hit the road running and in the process we've put into place the following in the last 18 months: A Citizen's Police Academy in partnership with Santa Rosa Junior College. Today approximately 75 graduates. A Volunteers in Police Service Program with nearly 30 volunteers working with us already and a goal of achieving 200 in the next five years. Improvement to the Officer Involved Shooting Policy, as recommended by the Grand Jury. We were criticized. We responded to the criticism.

Introduction of less lethal weapons in the field for officer use; to continue to try to find ways to deal with physical confrontation and not have it result in death or tragedy. Greater attention to personnel needs. Healthy employees provide positive services and it helps create a healthier community. Partnership with the Santa Rosa Plaza, resulting in a substation and improved staffing of the downtown area.

Implementation of a partnership program with the

City schools involving school resource officers. Currently in two of our five high school service areas. We've successfully navigated through five budget reduction exercises with the loss of seven and a half positions but the maintenance of full service.

So if you were a little curious as to why I was a little bit emotional last night about spending money, that's why. It's tough trying to maintain level of services when you're going through cuts. And it's amazing that with our economy as good as it is in this state, that this is one city that is going through that and is experiencing that.

Procurement of a grant from ABC to improve conditions related to our youth and substance abuse; specifically, alcohol. Procurement of a grant in partnership with the Drug Abuse Alternative Center and City schools to improve services to our youth. Development of the Domestic Violence Prevention and Response Program in partnership with the YWCA.

Procurement of a Crime Analysis and Career

Criminal Apprehension grant to improve resource allocation

and more importantly to improve our ability to provide

timely information to our community.

In partnership with County Mental Health, we've developed and implemented a Mental Health Response Team which is averaging approximately 10 calls per month. Trying to put our officers in a position where they receive the

expertise and assistance of those who have a specialty in dealing with individuals going through mental health episodes.

We strengthened our Employee Assistance Plan and we stretched those services of our licensed contract psychologists to provide help to neighborhoods and people living in those neighborhood who have been victimized by episodes of violence as well as some witnesses.

Apple Valley is one of our neighborhoods. It's a very depressed neighborhood. It's received a lot of media attention. We've worked in very close cooperation with the Redevelopment Department and with the neighborhood's community organizer to try to improve the living conditions there. We've been involved in community endeavors to install a children's park at that location. We're constantly on foot in the area, talking with people. And, yes, we do enforcement in the area, too.

Our involvement at the Community Baptist Church during the Martin Luther King Day celebration is resulting in an agreement to work with the NAACP and an organization known as 101 Black Men for recruitment efforts focused on African-American officer applicants.

Our Human Resources Department has met with a task force on women in law enforcement, which was previously mentioned to you. And with their effort, we're moving towards partnering on efforts to focus greater attention on

bringing female applicants into the police officer force.

This past summer, the entire organization went through professional diversity appreciation training and sexual harassment prevention training. We received a commitment from Professor Larry Shinagawa from Sonoma State. He agreed to developed a cultural diversity training curriculum with our training managers. This occurred in 1997. We are very hopeful that Professor Shinagawa will follow through with that commitment.

We have held department-sponsored community meetings in each of our 11 zones in our community. The largest attracting nearly 200 residents. To intermingle, mix, and ask questions, and converse with the police officers, dispatchers, records clerks, the chief. Broad representation of the department.

These efforts and accomplishments reflect our commitment to work with our community. We know how our community rates our services.

In 1993 and 1995, professional surveys were conducted by the Results Group, a private firm. In 1993 and in 1995, 82 percent of our citizens gave the police department an overall rating of good to excellent.

Additionally, during late 1997, the City conducted a voter survey focused on a pending utility tax issue. This survey also sought a simple rating of police services. 78 percent of the responders provided a high evaluation, A or B grades,

of the quality of police services in the City of Santa Rosa.

2.0

Inside the Santa Rosa Police Department, we take pride in policing ourselves. During the five-year period you have asked us to review and provide information to you about, we received 44 formal citizen complaints on conduct-related matters. Additionally, there were 77 other internal investigations generated by supervisors on conduct-related matters. Out of these 121 total administrative investigations, 77 resulted in findings of sustained, 10 cases were unfounded, 31 were exonerated, and three were inconclusive.

Those cases that were sustained resulted in 48 written reprimands, 2 corrective interviews, 22 suspensions, totaling 910 suspension hours and four terminations. We are tough on ourselves. Our community and our elected leaders expect this of us. We agree with being held to a higher standard and we value what this brings to us as an organization. It brings pride.

Tremendous goals and objectives loom before us.

During the next 24 months, we will focus our attention on the following: Implementation of our Neighborhood Oriented Policing Community Advisory Board. It's comprised of 11 zone representatives from throughout Santa Rosa, two labor representatives, and one teen council representative. As someone previously mentioned, it's comprised of the common folk. The first public meeting will be in March or early

April.

We will be working with redevelopment and re-energizing our Neighborhood Oriented Policing Program. It needs a kick in the pants, quite honestly. And we're ready to get up and going. We've held off doing that until we have the Neighborhood Oriented Policing Community Advisory Board in place because we wanted input from this cross section of our community.

Implementation of an internal peer counseling program. Replacement of our automated systems with a countywide integrated system. I'm constantly asked by people in the county, "How well do you work with the other law enforcement organizations so that you save tax dollars?" That's one of our efforts.

Reduction of 3,000 pages of policies and procedure into a usable format. I've inherited 3,000 pages of policy and procedure. You're welcome to all of it. It's been made available to anybody who has asked for it.

Growth of our School Resource Officers Program in partnership with our schools, our parents, our students, and most importantly, our social service providers.

Our department is an open organization. We routinely provide information that is requested, assuming that we can do it with without violating a law concerning confidentiality in the process. We are protective of our crime victims. Perhaps overly so on occasion. We feel that

we owe them a great deal.

We are not a department that harbors secrets.

What you ask for, you'll get. No one gets turned away. The open door policy is external and internal.

We're committed to fixing problems and building improvement. We choose not to take a negative approach to conducting business. We try very hard to be in sync with community as we recognize we will never be successful without striving to be one with those we serve. We're not perfect but it makes us try harder.

Our nearly 300 employees have various expertise.

Many instruct at the junior college. Many others are involved in their community. The following is a list of some of those relationships: Santa Rosa Evangelica Free Church youth leader; Mark West Little League; Cub Scout leader, Troop 145; Piner High Parents Group; Sonoma County Soccer League; Kenwood Women's Soccer League; Rincon Valley Grange; Pleasant Hill Christian School; Leadership Santa Rosa; West County Softball Association; Hessel Church; Santa Rosa Stallions, a Pop Warner team; Cub Scouts, den mother; Sons of Italy; Faith Lutheran Church; Konocti Girl Scouts; Santa Rosa Neptune Swim Team; Schaefer Life Elementary; Boys Little League, Rincon Valley; El Molino Little League.

I'm not going to bore you with the list; you have it. But it goes on and on and on. We are very much

involved in our community we treasure it.

Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much, Chief.

Chief Rooney.

MR. ROONEY: Honorable members of the Federal and State Commission on Civil Rights. I am Pat Rooney and I am the Police Chief of the community of Rohnert Park. My resume has been submitted to you previously and so I'm not going to go into my experience.

I've had the honor of being the chief in this organization since November of 1993. I am pleased to have the opportunity and have been invited to share the level of service and commitment to the community that our agency demonstrates on a daily basis.

The city of Rohnert Park is a city of approximately 40,000 population, covering 7.5 square miles. It is the third largest city in beautiful Sonoma County.

Rohnert Park was developed in 1963 as a planned community aimed at providing affordable, reasonable housing and a high quality of life. This is evidenced by our parks and our school and recreational facilities.

Rohnert Park is public safety. We have a public safety department. They have been around since 1950 but ours was formed in 1966. What this means is that it's a combined police and fire at the operational level. All of our sworn personnel are not only certified by POST, which is

Pa .

Peace Officers Standard of Training, in the State of California, all of the way through to the highest certification according to the rank, but our sworn personnel are also Certified State Firefighters.

We also are somewhat unique. Years ago someone in our organization, previous chief and his staff, created what was called Youth and Family Services. One of the divisions which I command deals solely with family issues and problems as they relate to diversion programs and counseling. Their annual report is part of the package that I have submitted to you.

The Department of Public Safety is the fourth largest law enforcement agency in Sonoma County. Our hiring policies and procedures are directed at hiring the best and most qualified personnel. Our standards are consistent and, in fact, exceed the professional law enforcement agency's criteria as laid out by POST.

We ensure quality, intensive -- extremely intensive -- recruitment and background procedures. They are directed at hiring those people who are going to come into our community and share the values and become a fit within their community. The department is made up of a diverse group of employees.

We target our recruitment program to solicit applicants of diversity. Our distribution list includes, but is not limited to, Advocates for Women, Association of

Latino Americans, California Oriental Peace Officers

Association, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Latino Democratic

Club, National Indian Justice Center, Northern California

Asian Peace Officers Association, and the Purple Beret here
in Sonoma County.

Training is of the highest priority to our organization. We are constantly on test and under the microscope because we are one of the approximately 70 Peer Public Safety Organizations throughout the nation. During 1997 alone, we provided 2,072 hours of internal training using experts to come into our organization. This is just in law enforcement. The figures I just gave you do not include firefighting. During 1997, we provided 2,009 hours of outside training whereby we take advantage of the numerous POST-sponsored courses throughout the state.

State law enforcement under POST requires an average of 24 hours of training per peace officer. We provide approximately 120 hours per officer each year. In addition to traditional subjects, we also have had training in discretionary decision making, sexual harassment, critical incident stress management, cultural diversity and developmentally disabled interaction skills.

We pride ourselves on being responsive to the community and including the community in our processes. Our Strategic Plan of 1994, which is also included in your packet, was in fact developed by a cross section of the



community to include educators, Chamber of Commerce. Based on that Strategic Plan, it laid out the action plans and the strategic issues that we wanted to accomplish in the next five years and in fact drives our budgetary process.

We employ a "5 a Day" Program which solicits information from five calls selected randomly from our Support Services Division which follows up to assure customer service, quality assurance, and suggestions for improvement. A copy of that form is included in your packet.

All complaints are investigated as Internal
Affairs issue. Several years ago, 1986, we actually adopted
the San Jose model for citizens' complaint. We were not
satisfied with our citizens' complaint procedures prior to
that. Essentially, any and all complaints receive a
tracking number and are investigated. A copy of our
policies is included in your packet.

Members of our department participate in numerous community events including community planning and development of projects. They recently took place in the community summit, which is long-range direction towards the ultimate future planning for the community. Kind of a general plan for the next 20 years.

In response to a single incident involving a racial-directed vandalism in 1996, we initiated and developed a project known as Building Bridges which has

since been used in other communities. This group strives to bring an understanding of cultural diversity to our community and is in partnership with the schools.

17.

Our department and all of your employees are committed to the community. 92 percent of our officers live in our city. That's by policy. All of our officers, 100 percent of our sworn strength, lives within a four-mile radius of our community. This is consistent with President Clinton's plan to encourage police officers to live in the communities and neighborhoods they serve. Ladies and gentlemen, we've had that plan since 1966.

The department and its members participate in numerous programs. We are in partnership with our school district and DARE and have been since 1994. We have five officers assigned to the DARE Program. Our sworn strength is only 62. We have graduated 3200 students since conception in 1994.

We have a full-time officer assigned to the middle and high schools. Part of the cops fast track from the federal government. It has been there for two and a half years. Acts as our liaison, dealing with specific issues within our community and schools.

We are the host agency for the Torch Run for the Special Olympics and have been for three years. Free Fridays is a unique program in our community and has been in existence for over six years. Every Friday night our sports

center is opened up to junior high and high school kids. It is staffed -- 50 to 60 percent of the staffing comes from our law enforcement agency. Many on a volunteer basis. It is attended by 2 and sometimes 400 juveniles on Friday night.

26-

Beat the Heat. We participate with other agencies within our county where we take the kids out, high school students, to Sears Point Raceway and interact with them on something that they really relate to, and those are cars.

As an agency, we also sponsor and, in fact, coordinate programs. Again, our Youth and Family Services Program. We provided last year alone 4,000 hours of counseling to children and parents that would not otherwise have gotten that counseling. It's a unique program whereby we use interns working on their MFCC accreditation from local universities; and under supervision, they provide this counseling.

Our Diversion Program consists of the juveniles in the community going into our system for counseling. Very few are referred to County Probation. Ride Along Program. We've had a Ride Along Program for many years and it continues to create interaction in the community.

Neighborhood Watch Programs. With few exceptions, there's a Neighborhood Watch Program in virtually every section in our community.

The department has a strong internal commitment to

2.5

quality insurance. In fact, the most serious disciplinary actions that have resulted in the last two to three years have come from our internal audits and internal investigations. They include discipline from written reprimands to, in fact, terminations.

In closing, I'd like to share our mission statement. The department of public safety pledges to respond to community needs with professional, personal commitment to safeguard the health of our community. This goal will be accomplished in community involvement, education and innovation.

Rohnert Park Department of Public Safety strives to reflect and serve the needs, desires and attitudes of the community we serve. Through aggressive recruitment, proactive training and constant review of procedures and programs, we are committed to providing the highest level of professional service to our community.

The officers and staff of this agency are members of this community and feel a sense of ownership and pride in preserving the personal sensitivity and friendliness that is the hallmark of our community.

Thank you so much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chief. And I'd just like to note that, for the record, that all of the chiefs are here voluntarily. And I want to -- appreciate all of the cooperation that we've\_received from you in that

regard.

I'd like to now open it up for questions.

Yes. Ms. Spanos Hawkey. Dena. I'm trying to be formal here.

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: Thank you.

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: I would like to congratulate the three of you on all of your public service activities. But the reason that we're here today is to look at your policies and procedures that have possibly caused the high per capita number of police-related deaths. And I would like to hear your opinions on why that is occurring. I live in Los Angeles. You know, when you top us, you're doing --- I mean, that's pretty incredible.

So please explain to me why that is occurring.

MR. DUNBAUGH: Let me start first. I'll try to speak on behalf of Santa Rosa.

One of the things that seems to have been occurring is the generalization of Sonoma County law enforcement. And I would suggest that there are other parallel examples of similar generalizations that probably most everybody in this room can relate to that indicate a significant degree of bias and unfairness.

But for the City of Santa Rosa, we have had five officer-involved shootings -- I'm sorry. Seven in the last five years. In the five years prior to that, there were 11. From our point of view, one is too many. Period. But

if we're going to play a numbers game, let's look at the numbers. Seven in the last five years. Five years prior to that, 11.

11.

In terms of some of the statistical analysis of it, I would heartily recommend the Committee utilize the services -- and I know you have your own staff analysts that really have their act together -- to perform an objective analysis of those figures before you draw your own conclusion. Thank you.

MR. ROONEY: In the community of Rohnert Park, since being formed in 1966, we have had two officer-involved critical incidents involving a death. Both of them have been referred to today. And I would also encourage the panel to review the investigations into those incidences, including the investigation that the FBI conducted separately outside of the data and information of the investigation that the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department did. I agree with Chief Dunbaugh. One, two. It's too many.

I moved up here from Southern California four years ago. And as far as I was concerned, after having 27 years -- excuse me -- 24 years in Southern California, I never wanted to experience another officer-involved shooting fatality.

And the county is growing. There are certain things that I think we're going to be looking at, we're

already looking at. But I think the panel -- I would suggest or urge the panel to look at the cases more specifically.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Lee.

MS. LEE: Were you --

MR. PICCININI: Yes; I would just like to quickly comment, also, that from the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department perspective, the two jail deaths that we've experienced in our facility, as I said before, causes anguish for all of us. And it is a situation that I don't know that anybody has a clear answer for as to what causes them. I don't know that anybody has an answer as to what causes some of these citizen-officer confrontations to result so tragically.

And I noticed just recently in the <u>National Peace</u>

<u>Officer Memorial</u>, a magazine that came out, that a

40 percent increase in police officer deaths occurred last year. And nobody can explain that, either. And it is a societal problem. One that I'm sure we would all feel more comfortable having an answer to and one that we all struggle to find and that one I don't know if we can.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner?

MS. LEE: I have several questions.

Obviously, I'm getting a little confused. The earlier two panels presented a completely different picture from the one we just heard. It seems like there was a

gloomy picture of police-community relations presented earlier and we just heard a very sunny picture from the three of you. That's why we're here, to get all the facts.

I have several questions. No. 1: You had all mentioned about your active effort to recruit new officers. Can you give us in detail the current makeup of your law enforcement force?

No. 2: When was the last time you had actually hired new officers, and what are those makeups?

And the earlier panels had mentioned community really was not asked to help in terms of your recruitment and hiring. Can you also go into detail how communities have been assisting you in these. And what are the goals? Have you set up goals to achieve a parity in terms of having officers represent the community that they are serving?

MR. DUNBAUGH: I have specific information for you in regards to the makeup of our organization. I think it's important that it be compared to the makeup of our community, which another speaker previously attempted to do.

Our community, according to the U.S. Census data, is 84.52 percent white. Our police officers in 1998 are 86 percent white. Our community is 1.69 percent black; our police officers in 1998 are 2 percent black. Our community is 9.47 percent Hispanic; our police officers in 1998 are 8 percent Hispanic. Our community is 3.2 percent Asian; our

police officers in 1998 are 2 percent Asian. Our community is 1.02 percent Native American; our police officers in 1998 are 1 percent Native American.

.23

Our minority representation in total population in the community is 15.48 percent, according to the United States Census data. And the makeup of our police officer force is 14 percent minority representation. We're not there. That's why we have asked for assistance.

The first two meetings that were held with representatives from various groups concerned, for the most part, in terms of the shooting incident with Mr. Kao in Rohnert Park. A lot of the discussion in those two meetings did focus on recruitment and retention efforts. And we openly invited and requested assistance for that. We will continue to work on that.

And for more specific information on the city, I would refer you to the Human Resources Department. They are present here today and that's because the police department is not a stand-alone entity. There are numerous departments in every city. I don't need to give you folks a civics lesson; you're more aware of it than I am, probably. We don't operate as an independent, isolated organization.

MS. FUA: Can you give a gender breakdown as well for all the same questions.

MR. DUNBAUGH: I have a gender breakdown, I believe, in the packet of information I provided to you.

And, yes, I can, if you give me just a second because I think it's important.

The previous speaker mentioned to you either the statewide or the national average was 10 percent. We currently have 10 percent female in the sworn ranks. We do not have good gender representation throughout the supervisory and management ranks, and that is something we are focused on improving.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Do you consider 10 percent adequate?

MR. DUNBAUGH: Adequate?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. Do you think that --

MR. DUNBAUGH: No, sir. No, sir. Not at all.

MR. HERNANDEZ: What would be a target that you would shoot for?

MR. DUNBAUGH: Well, if you're going to play parity, it would be 50 percent. And perhaps we'll see that some day. We'd have to see a dramatic increase in the number of female applicants when you consider that 100 applicants results in one hired. And we're not seeing large numbers of women today, particularly in our area, and I suspect largely because of the advantages associated with the Silicon Valley and higher paying private where there's no risk and no shift work. Or low risk.

So it is very, very tough. And we need assistance from throughout the community and partnerships. That's why

we're pursuing those.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'd like to follow up on something just very quickly. Some of the previous panels criticized the current Grand Jury system and the civilian -- the Chiefs' Advisory Council. They felt that what was really needed was an independent civilian review board. And some of the reasons they gave was that they felt that many citizens were being discouraged from actually filing complaints. In fact, there was one -- testimony given before us that there were -- it was actually a gentleman that went in and was told, "You don't have to do that. I've already decided it's not going to going anywhere."

Could you comment a little bit on the call for a civilian review board and the procedures that you use for taking a complaint, how that complaint then is followed.

And what would happen if you indeed found out that one of your officers discouraged a complaint?

I know that's a mouthful but I guess a civilian review board and the review process. How does somebody get a complaint to the police department and what happens afterwards?

MR. PICCININI: Let me talk from the Sheriff's Office perspective as far as somebody filing a complaint with the Sheriff's Department. Complaints can be filed in a couple of different ways.

First of all, you can make a telephone complaint.

There are written forms. We will mail you a written form or you can come into the office and pick up a written form.

What we try, in our philosophy, is try to resolve the issue as quickly as possible. If a citizen walks in and says,

"I'd like to file a complaint," we'd have a supervisor make contact with them as quickly as possible and see if we can resolve the issue right there.

If they can't resolve the issue or the citizen doesn't feel that it's been resolved to their satisfaction, they are given a citizens' complaint form which they then fill out and mail into our department. At that particular time, when we receive that citizens' complaint form, we then send it to our Special Investigations Unit which is an Internal Affairs, basically, Unit that is staffed by a lieutenant who supervises two sergeants. That unit is answerable to the administrative captain which ultimately answers to the Assistant Sheriff.

That unit will make a decision if this particular complaint is maybe best looked into from an administrative level such as the Assistant Sheriff or the captain in charge of the division where the complaint came from. Or if it's serious in nature or complex in nature, it will be investigated by the actual Special Investigations Unit itself.

In either case, it is assigned a number, it is tracked, there is an expectation that it be completed, and

we send the complaining citizen a result of the investigation in writing.

12.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Now, what happens if a citizen feels -- and how do you prevent -- I guess, this is the question:

If I'm a citizen and I go into a police station and I'm making a complaint against another police officer.

Some citizens might feel intimidated that they would be retaliated against by another police officer for filing such a complaint.

How would you address that concern, that another police officer is not prone to investigate one of his own?

MR. PICCININI: Well, first of all, if you feel intimidated by coming into the law enforcement agency, as I said, over the telephone you can ask for the complaint form be sent to you.

The complaint form has actually a dual purpose. In our department it also serves as a comment form. If you'd like to comment on the service, whether it be good or bad. So you can take that form via mail and not have any initial contact with a law enforcement officer. You can fill it out and send it in and be contacted on the telephone to discuss what it is that you'd like us to do and how we would like to look into this investigation.

MS. LEE: How will the complainant know the status of his or her complaint. Who contacts them and how will



17.

they be notified?

MR. DUNBAUGH: By law, they have been to be notified.

MS. LEE: How?

MR. DUNBAUGH: And they're notified by letter, sometimes in person. Sometimes perhaps with the investigated individual or occasionally a manager who oversees that individual will make the contact.

MS. LEE: By the investigative officer?

MR. DUNBAUGH: No, ma'am. And a follow-up, just to finish the question that Mr. Hernandez asked with regards to what would happen if an officer was discovered to be playing a role in trying to prohibit or eliminate or dissuade an individual from making a complaint. It's up to and including tetermination. And in a case like that, it would probably be termination.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Has that ever happened in your department, where you have terminated an officer for discouraging a complaint from a citizen?

MR. DUNBAUGH: No, not in the Santa Rosa Police
Department. You have to understand, my tenure here is
short.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Just one quick thing now because the other panel made quite a point of this. And that was the whole idea of a civilian review board, the idea being that a citizen might be much more comfortable walking into a

civilian facility.

And I think, to some extent, I think it is understandable that if you walk into the -- police stations are not usually seen as places where most people want to be. And I'm not trying to criticize that, I don't think anybody wants to be at a police station --

MR. DUNBAUGH: We understand that.

MR. HERNANDEZ: So what I'm trying to do is I'm trying to run through a citizen's scenario here that I'm walking into a police station, and a fellow comes out to greet me and he has a gun strapped on his side and he looks big and he looks intimidating and he looks tough, and I think that's the way he probably should be looking that way. Or she should be looking that way, too.

MR. DUNBAUGH: Our mayor is about five foot, six and 120 pounds, and they can visit her and she'll hand them --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. But what I'm saying is not -- I'm trying to paint another scenario. I'm trying to get a feel for this as well.

And then the other scenario, I walk into a civilian facility where there is no one with a gun on, there is nobody that has a badge on. It may be somebody with a suit and tie who has no connection whatsoever to the police department, who is an independent civilian review board that is set up to oversee complaints from citizens.

What's the difference? And is there a reason why you would be for or against such an arrangement?

MR. DUNBAUGH: I think we already have an arrangement like that in terms of our city council and our mayor. And we have individuals who walk into their offices. Again, they have an open door policy. They are not confronted by uniforms or guns or the law enforcement presence.

MS. BUITRAGO: If I can just follow up with this thought, if I may. One of the problems that I see with the city council and mayor is that they're intricately involved with the police department.

And my question -- I guess I have one specific question. I'd like to hear reasons why it would be a bad idea to have an independent citizens' review board. That's the first question.

The second question is that I would like to get a description of how the panel that is created in November was actually created, what the purpose of it is, and how community was either involved in the process or not.

And then just one last thought in terms of the outreach regarding hiring. I'm not really sure what kind of outreach you do. It seems like you distribute lists to different groups, to minority groups and women's groups; but I think in terms of hiring, you need to do much more. And there are a lot of actions, I'm sure, that maybe you do but



I would like to hear some more specifics about the kinds of outreach that you do.

MR. DUNBAUGH: I can start with a couple. I apologize if I'm overriding. I have the two peers here.

In the packet we gave you, you have a rather lengthy list of all of the outreach that we do. And I could read that here, but it would probably take another five to ten minutes. So, please, I would refer you to that. And it is very lengthy. Although as lengthy as it is, we still accept very willingly the thought that we can do more. It's a question of with who and how? And we appreciate any recommendation.

MR. ROONEY: We also have several times a year, we go to the colleges, to the Chiefs' Association. And in our particular case in Rohnert Park, and it's costly, but what we've been doing is sending out recruitment teams which include minorities into the Southern California area and to the Fresno area and trying to broaden the pool of applicants and encourage them to come to Sonoma County.

So there's a lot that we're doing. But as Chief Dunbaugh said, there is always more. But we've put a lot of energy in the last few years into broadening our recruitment base and the applicant pool.

MR. PICCININI: As an example -- I'm sorry.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Please, go ahead.

MR. PICCININI: I was just going to say as an

example, something that I believe all of our departments participate in is a career fair by youths coming out of high school. And up to 3200 youth attend this career fair that is represented there from female deputies, minority deputies.

And the outreach program for our department also goes beyond, out of our county. We sometimes send people to organizations and other portions of the county to try and target certain minority groups to get more interest to coming to work in Sonoma County.

MR. DUNBAUGH: You asked what was bad, and I wanted to answer that before we got shifted. I don't think anything is bad with what you asked.

MS. BUITRAGO: And then a description about how the citizen review panel was created. And what it --

MR. DUNBAUGH: It's not created yet. We're working on it. There's been a lot of discussion about it. I'm going to pass the buck a little bit to Sheriff Piccinini, whose -- the Chiefs' Association has broken into a subcommittee to work on it and Sheriff Piccinini is involved in that more directly than I am.

But, again, this is -- just to set the flavor for you of what the Chiefs' Association is, we meet monthly so we can coordinate in areas that make sense for our communities to have consistency.

For example, citizens' complaint is an area that

for next year's agenda will be delved into so we have consistent policies countywide.

And one last thing here. We gather for the purposes of sharing information, too, and seeking information. It's not a formalized body of people that direct, manage and run countywide law enforcement resources.

MR. PICCININI: As far as the advisory panel that is being put together, as Chief Dunbaugh mentioned, it's not actually formalized yet. One of the things we're in the process of doing is taking the idea back to our respective governments, such as the county -- city managers, county administrator, and also the board of supervisors and the individual city councils to get their input as to how we would select members to represent the representations on this panel.

The idea is to have a panel that would be an advisory one to the Chiefs' Association that would be representative of all of Sonoma County from the different cities because the Chiefs' Association is made up of all of the different police chiefs in the cities. So the idea is to make those representations as broad as possible. And the selection procedure is still being discussed at this time.

MS. LEE: Do you foresee any of the organizations that testified earlier today, any of them will be serving on these advisory boards?

MS. PICCININI: I would suspect that that would



12.

occur. I don't know that all of them would, but I suspect that one of them or some of them might.

I think our ideal goal is to be as reflective of all of the good citizens of Sonoma County as possible.

MS. BUITRAGO: How will the community people, maybe some of the people who have been involved in these hearings, be involved at all?

MR. PICCININI: I'm sorry?

MS. BUITRAGO: How will the community people, including some of the people who have made presentations earlier on, be involved in the advisory panels?

MR. PICCININI: Well, in the advisory panel that we have selected to proceed or to go forward with is one that is a representative from each specific jurisdiction of a community. And so they would be selected by whatever process that community has decided upon and they would be appointed as part of the panel.

MR. DUNBAUGH: I have to add one thing, though, in regards to this. I'm sorry. Very sort.

This idea was discussed with the individuals who have previously testified at the second meeting as coordinated through the Department of Justice, and it was thrown out as an idea that we were interested in pursuing. And the response was, "You can do whatever you want but that's not what we're here to discuss. We want a civil review board with subpoena\_power." So I'm not sure that



Ż1

.25

they're interested in this.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Can I just -- you're not for a civilian review board with subpoena power.

MR. DUNBAUGH: No, sir. That's not what I said. That's not what I mean.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Dr. Erler.

DR. ERLER: Yes. The incidents that have led to our presence here. Have they caused you to review your use of force policies? And, in particular, your policies regarding the use of deadly force? And if so, what have been the results of your review and reflections on those policy issues?

MR. DUNBAUGH: In Santa Rosa's case, yes, sir.

And it's routinely reviewed. It has to be in order to keep up with case law. And the direction that is coming to us from the courts has not resulted in any change at the city level. We have modified the countywide protocol. And I don't have the specifics with me but they are included in the packet that you'll be receiving.

And at this point in time, our use of force policy, which is in the packet that you have in front of you, is in conformance with state law and with our City Attorney's recommendations.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Carney?

MR. CARNEY: Gentlemen, Chief Dunbaugh mentioned -- I'm sorry.

20<sup>°</sup>

Chief Dunbaugh mentioned that there is in place some psychiatric training of officers or by -- I'm sorry.

Training of officers by psychiatric professionals regarding the handling of mentally ill individuals.

That just caused me to ask: In relation to that situation, do you, all of you gentlemen, have you implemented any type of program for stress management with respect to your own employees? By that, I mean sworn personnel.

And additionally, so that you can answer these questions as you wish, I'm concerned about what policies you may have in place regarding personnel who are -- who are suspects, either charged or uncharged, and/or convicted of domestic violence. And I'm talking about sworn personnel now, in relation to the federal and state requirements regarding firearms for those individuals who have been convicted of domestic violence charges.

MR. PICCININI: If I can start off with that.

From the Sheriff's Office's perspective, we are fully compliant with state and federal guidelines as far as the use of firearms and those people that have had prior convictions of domestic violence. And that was not the case in the Sheriff's Office initial review when that law first took place.

The department has had, unfortunately, one of its members who was accused of that, convicted of that, and that

member is no longer a member of our department.

As to employee assistance programs, we do have an employee assistance program through the county; it's offered to all county employees. Ourselves, much like the city, it's not just the Sheriff's Office standing alone as far as the personnel agency. We go through the County Personnel for all of the hiring practices.

And in addition to the employee assistance program, we are also putting together a peer support program, sort of an in-house mentoring program to assist employees.

MR. CARNEY: You mentioned about the program of all county -- available to all county employees. My concern is that in a job involving law enforcement officers, the stress level, to me, seems to be a heck of a lot higher than it would be to some pencil pusher -- not to denigrate their job -- in a clerks office or something like that. But they're faced with some severe confrontations on a daily basis.

And my concern is that are you folks putting into place something specifically designed to the police officers' needs? And if it isn't in place, are you contemplating it? And to what extent are you implementing it?

MR. DUNBAUGH: Yes, sir. We have it in place and we're working on improving it. For example, not that it was

a confrontational situation, but earlier this week we had an accident that was extraordinarily tragic and traumatic in the community, and particularly for the people who responded to it. Paramedics, fire and police. There were three deaths, one decapitation, and seven people that went to the hospital. It looked like a war zone. The officers, the paramedics, when they responded -- at the end of the shift from that, they all went through critical incident debriefing. Two days later, again, they went through a critical incident debriefing.

It's routinely applied. And to the degree where we've actually taken critical incident debriefing to the neighborhoods now that have experienced something like that so that they, too, could avail themselves to an area we're very knowledgeable on.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Patterson, I think you had a question.

MS. PATTERSON: Yes. I have an impressive listing of community -- listing of programs, community services and also personnel policies that you've implemented. And my question is: How often do you evaluate those policies, and what your evaluation criteria is?

MR. PICCININI: First of all, most of our policies and the criteria for evaluating them and making sure they're sound is based on common practices, current case law, any new government law. You know, we're talking policies, we're

talking everything from use of force, code three driving, mandatory reporting of certain incidents, domestic violence. We're talking a spectrum and we have to follow the case law, any new laws coming down from the state or federal level, and also taking a look at it from current trends, practices and the best way known to do business today.

So taking a look at what are the new ways of doing business? And is it what we want to implement in this county? And is it a sound practice?

One of the things that is somewhat unique in this county, it's not repeated too often, is the Sonoma County Law Enforcement Chiefs' Association of which was mentioned before which every chief is a member of. We actually sit and evaluate and try to merge our policies that actually impact all of the critical incidents so that we're all operating on the same page.

So that whether you're from Petaluma Police

Department, Cotati Police Department, Cloverdale Police

Department, Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park or the Sheriff's

Office, the critical policies are mirrored so that we're all pooling our resources, if you will, of what is the best way to do business and doing the research and investigation into what does the law say is the best way to do business?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Fua?

MS. FUA: Other than the survey in which you had conducted about community response to your police force,

what other efforts have your police departments done to solicit community input in various ways, especially on the use of deadly force given what has happened in the community in the last two years?

22.

.25

MR. DUNBAUGH: I have personally in the last year have been at over 100 speaking engagements with literally thousands of people from my community. And those are not episodes where I tell people what is going on. Those are shared communication episodes where I have an opportunity to explain what's happening, what we're doing, what we're trying to accomplish; and, at the same time, sit and talk and receive feedback from literally thousands of people in the last 12 months.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'd like to just to follow up on one question that we just kind of glossed over here, and I just want to get back to it because I really -- it was raised with such fervor that I'd like to get each one of your feelings about the suggestion of an independent civilian review board with subpoena power.

How do you feel about an independent civilian review board with subpoena power being the agency or the entity that would handle all police complaints? How would you feel about that?

MR. PICCININI: I think my personal reaction is that we have those mechanisms in place now and what we're talking about is another bureaucratic duplication of

services and something that will be costly and at a time when we're struggling to put more dispatchers in our dispatch center, more officers on the street, more detention people in our jail.

If we have a system that is responsive to citizen complaints and utilizing current practices and law which enables the Grand Jury to function as a review body, it doesn't make a lot of sense to me to duplicate a process that will mirror another process.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes?

MR. DUNBAUGH: Did you want each of us to respond to it?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, I would. Then Commissioner Lee.

MR. ROONEY: I also believe we have processes that can be used. However, if there is going to be a review process, my only plea and request would be that it -- my concern would be the process. If it's an objective process whereby which the predetermined findings are not discussed or planned out ahead, and the participants are of the nonpartisan frame of mind as far as the council goes or whatever -- the advisory board, that would be okay.

The problem I've got is I'm somewhat prejudiced.

I'm from Southern California. Down there, if the finding doesn't come out, you now have a review board to review the review board. And so I don!t know what it would

. 

18.

accomplish. So much depends on how it is formulated, structured, and then how the process takes place.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Chief.

MR. DUNBAUGH: I'm open to the concept of civilian review. I have been in my entire career. I come from a community that now has a civilian review board. That's Santa Cruz. And, interestingly, Santa Cruz had an officer-involved shooting back in October or November and the review board wound up evaluating it and deciding that the officer acted within policy and procedure and there's now a movement on board to replace the review board. And that's what I would be concerned about.

I've studied Berkeley's and San Francisco's. I understand that we have a state law in place now largely because of those two review boards being unable or unwilling to complete citizen complaint investigations in a timely fashion. So the unions were capable of getting a law in place that says you have one year from the date that you know, and there's certain exceptions, to complete an investigation primarily because of those two situations where they're taking sometimes three and four years to conduct a citizen complaint investigation.

Secondly, the San Francisco model has a budget of about \$1 million. The Berkeley model has a budget of about half a million dollars. I've already explained to you what I'm going through in terms of finances, and my preference



would be that we put the money out there for services for the community. But I'm open to the concept.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Commissioner Lee, and then Ms. Spanos-Hawkey, and then Ms. Hesse, and then Mr. Pomerantz.

MS. LEE: I'm just so eager to get all of the information from our experts. I have a few more questions.

Can all of you or one of you walk through for me the scenario. What is your policy and what is the officer expected to do in response to a volatile situation involving someone whose mental state may not be completely normal at that time?

You mentioned you have a psychiatric support team. When are they being called? How are they being used in that situation?

And also, we heard from earlier panels about 9-1-1 calls involving some of the police deaths. What kind of information from those 9-1-1 calls are being transmitted to the officers? Or how are they being transmitted to officers before the officers actually show up at the scene? If you can just give me -- bear with me because I'm not a law enforcement person -- step by step how this situation happens.

MR. DUNBAUGH: Yes. One of the frustrations of this forum, probably for you as well us, is that there isn't enough time to cover everything we'd really like to have

covered.

I can address the issue in regards to the Mental Health Response Team. They respond after the situation is under control. What we discover frequently is that families are terribly victimized by family members who become mentally ill and they struggle with trying to find ways to deal with it. And their preference is not that law enforcement intercedes and takes their loved ones off to the psychiatric unit; their preference is, instead, that they get the social service and therapeutic help that they can in a home, preferably, and that doesn't result in an incarceration.

So this team responds when it's safe to respond.

And they're not responding from the police department. As I said, they're not funded solely for this purpose. They come out of the mental health unit. It takes them roughly 15 to 20 minutes to get someplace.

MS. LEE: So who calls the psychiatric team? The officers?

MR. DUNBAUGH: No. Our dispatch will do it as soon as the officer advises that the situation is under control.

MS. LEE: So the officer -- let's just take the Kao case, for instance. He was extremely intoxicated. In your opinion, do you think the officer should have called the psychiatric team to diffuse the situation first before



the shot was fired?

MR. DUNBAUGH: The officer was there 34 seconds. I don't think the officer had time to do anything except save his life.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Order please. Order.

MS. LEE: So bear with me again. You have the psychiatric support team in place, whose primary responsibility is to assist the officer -- officers to diffuse a very volatile situation that could escalate with very minimal contact.

Under what circumstance are officers trained or told to utilize that psychiatric team before the officers take action?

MR. DUNBAUGH: The officers in our organization have all gone through training with mental health situations. In fact, in just the last four months, there's been training on this topic.

Now, you're asking who is responsible, as I hear it, just so I understand the question, who is responsible for coming into a situation that is out of control and bringing control to it?

MS. LEE: We'll, I'm just using the San Francisco model.

MR. DUNBAUGH: I'm sorry, but you'll have to tell us what that is.

MS. LEE: If somebody is viewed as someone who is

just out of control, they're not holding a gun at anybody, they may be a danger to themselves. The officers may -- especially you mentioned you have the psychiatric support team who is backing them up -- who should be backing them up.

Do you think the officers should contact those people for assistance because this is clearly a psychiatric situation?

MR. DUNBAUGH: Once they figure out that it's a psychiatric situation, absolutely.

MS. LEE: Okay. So within 34 seconds, officers would not be able to judge whether it's a psychiatric situation. Is that what you're saying?

MR. DUNBAUGH: If Chief Rooney and I stood up and started to fistfight in the middle of this room and it was your responsibility to stop it, you would have to do something to stop it. And I don't think picking up the phone and calling the psychiatric team to respond is going to stop us from fighting.

MS. LEE: But if you're fighting among yourselves, if you're yelling among yourselves. . .

If I could just ask one more question. You mentioned that you have a personnel support program to assist your officers to deal with the personal needs of whatever. Do you have any policies in place to monitor the officers' ongoing physical and emotional status to make sure



1.8

that they are in continued good physical and emotional shape to carry out the work that they are sworn to carry out? And how often are those processes being made? Or evaluation.

MR. DUNBAUGH: They're routine in our organization, yes. They're in place and they're integrated and involved with the Human Resources Department for the City of Santa Rosa.

MS. LEE: And how often are they being done?

MR. DUNBAUGH: Every six months is when we'll --

MS. LEE: For each officer?

MR. DUNBAUGH: Every employee will go through an employee review every six months.

MS. LEE: And the review is by whom? The review is by. . .?

MR. DUNBAUGH: Supervisory and management staff.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Spanos-Hawkey.

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: First of all, I'd like, since we got all of these materials just today and haven't had the time to speed-read them, if this is not included in your packets, I'd like to have a copy to go into the record. First of all, I know the Sheriff has given his mission statement, as you have. Guidelines for conduct of behavior. What are your alternatives to violence? Your policy on cultural sensitivity?

And I just want to say that I'm a graduate of a Citizens Police Academy in Pasadena. It's one of the best

in all of California. And one of the things that happens after you graduate is that one of the requirements is that you serve on a review panel, which is not only the citizens but also police officers. And I think that's an important thing to consider.

18.

I also urge you wholeheartedly to include the Purple Berets, the ACLU. Because what we're looking at here is distrust of a government organization. And the only way you're going to find ways to eliminate this is by inclusiveness. And I would like to see you do that.

Now, I have a question that came up in regards to something quite different from this. Sheriff, I'd like you to explain to me your policy on sexual harassment. I'm a little boggled by the policy. You're asking someone to waive their rights by signing off on this. Now, how is that protecting that female?

MR. PICCININI: First of all, let me make a comment. I said earlier that I thought that there were certain people who have greatly misled this panel, and this is a perfect example. We are not asking people to waive their rights on the policy.

When we came out with a new unlawful harassment policy, it was because we felt -- I felt that it was extremely necessary to take a look at how we were doing business and what could we do to stop the cycle. Because it seemed like everything else we were doing wasn't working.

11.

22.

So let me describe the policy a little bit first.

What the policy does is to set up a procedure where a person who is a victim of unlawful harassment, whether it be sexual, job harassment, or any other kind of harassment where their work environment makes them feel uncomfortable, they can bring it forward. In fact, we've made it mandatory to bring it forward.

And I know that there's also an accusation that our policy is unlawful. Our policy was looked at, several other agencies' policies, and brought it together and it was reviewed by County Counsel and it was reviewed by our Affirmative Action Department, and it was found to be right in line with what we need to do today.

The purpose of making a mandatory reporting of being a victim of unlawful harassment is twofold:

No. 1: I can't deal with it if I don't know that it's happening. Somebody has to tell us. Sometimes we don't see what's going on. Sometimes those little nuances of things, somebody has to bring it to our attention if we're going to deal with it.

No. 2: We want to take the burden of somebody having to come forward. We don't want the spotlight turned on them because they, in fact, came forward and reported that they were a victim of unlawful harassment.

So by virtue of the paramilitary organization that the police departments sometimes are, we said, "We're taking

that burden off your shoulders; we're telling you that you have to come forward and tell us."

The third thing we do is we ask the victim, the person who comes forward, "What would you like us to do? How do you want this handled?" Because in the past, what used to happen, in our department anyway, was an automatic Internal Affairs investigation. And when you do that, sometimes the spotlight is turned on very bright to the victim.

So what we've chosen is a different path to ask the victim, "What is it you'd like?" And the victim may just say, "All I want is for it to stop. That's it." And if it's a minor issue, we'll take immediate action to talk to the suspect, if you will, the other employee.

## Q (Inaudible.)

1.8

MR. PICCININI: Yes, I know. And that's why it's part of the policy. And we will then take and talk to that employee and we tell that employee in no uncertain terms that it is to stop immediately. We will document it, we'll go back to the victim and ask the victim: "This is what we've done. Are you satisfied or should we be doing something else?" And we've already had occasion where this has worked and the victim said, "I'm very happy. That's all I want to do." And the case is closed.

Now, what we have our people doing, and it's not just the females of the department, it is every member of



. 26

the department, was asked to sign that they got a copy of the sexual harassment policy. So that if we had a problem down the road, nobody could say, "I didn't get a copy, I didn't know about it."

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: Is that in there?

MS. PICCININI: I believe it's in your folder.

And if not, I'll certainly make sure you get one.

And the other thing that we've done is our performance evaluation programs, which we do evaluate, we do it on an annual basis -- new employees, every six months -- right in the evaluation format the requirement of the supervisors is to say, "Are you familiar with the critical incident policies?" And depending on what your -- if it's in the patrol, it will be patrol policies. If you're in the detention system, it would be a critical detention policy.

But all of the employees have one thing in common, and that's an unlawful harassment policy. The supervisor is required to say, "Are you familiar with it?" And, "Have you had any problems with it?"

And it's our goal to try and reach out and make it as easy as we can for the victims, to make it as tough as we can for those who have violated it, and to make it as quick and as responsive as possible so that the citizens of this county aren't paying any more money on lawsuits.

And I need to add one more thing. I sat down with many of the females in our department and talked about this



and asked if they were comfortable with this. And the response so far has been very positive. I have to do something. And it is compliant with state and federal law.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Hesse.

MS. HESSE: This morning we received on the record a copy of a Grand Jury report, I think, that was critical of how you handle citizen complaints. By law, I believe that you're required to respond to a Grand Jury report. So we would like to complete the record by also receiving the response that you sent to the Grand Jury at that time.

A lot of what we're talking about this morning has to do with the profiles of your departments and policies, and we're also talking about budget, and we're talking about training and what your department looks like and where you put your money.

I would like to get some information from you.

I'd like to know in terms of when you're negotiating

contracts with your officers, what departments do you use as
a benchmark? Who do you compare yourselves to? Because

that will tell me what you pay and what you think you look

like or who we would compare you to.

We received a lot of statistics this morning on the number of deaths. We need to know -- I'd like to have a second set of statistics that show who it is that you're comparing yourself to in labor negotiations.

"Also, we've talked a lot about -- there's a very

gratuitous letter in here from the Sheriff, he's included it in his packet, from the county supervisors who said that they've met all of your budgetary needs. That's basically what it says here. The Board of Supervisors has responded very positively to the requests from the Sheriff's Department to fund new programs in training and critical needs of that community.

When we talk about recruitment and training of the officers, I think years ago it was the Kerner Commission that said that an educated police force or educated law enforcement was a better law enforcement. Is there an educational incentive package that you offer your officers? What is the minimum requirements to become a police officer or a sheriff?

I think this information is relative to what we are looking at. If you can answer that today, that would be fine. If you want to submit that in written form, that would be fine, also.

MR. DUNBAUGH: We have all of that available to you and everything that you've mentioned, we have. And it's all very good, to be quite honest.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Pomerantz. And this will be the last --

Let me just -- before you respond, Mr. Pomerantz.

Let me just note for the record, since you brought it up,

Ms. Hesse, that we have received a copy of a letter of

4 5

. 

support from Paul Kelley, Chairman of the Sonoma County
Board of Supervisors in support of the law enforcement -the Sheriff's Department in this county. And there were
copies to you, Mr. Sheriff, and copies to the
Press Democrat.

So just let the record reflect. And the letter of support from Paul Kelley, Chairman of the Sonoma call County Board of Supervisors, will be entered into the record.

Mr. Pomerantz.

MR. POMERANTZ: It was mentioned previously that a survey had indicated that 85 or 86 percent of the residents in the area are satisfied with the level of law enforcement. Additionally, Grand Juries are typically comprised of individuals who aren't working because of the commitment in time.

Given the fact that that means that we're talking a significant number of retirees, I guess I have two questions. One is if you know what the current sex and ethnic makeup of the Grand Jury might be. I think that would be helpful.

And then how comfortable are the three of you with the Grand Jury as it is constituted as a body that, at least superficially, can impartially review those actions that are brought before it?

MR. PICCININI: As far as the makeup of the Grand Jury, I don't have that. I'll certainly be happy to provide

you with that information. As far as the comfort level of the Grand Jury, I think even the speakers that were here earlier indicated that the Grand Jury is not afraid to be critical of law enforcement or, for that latter, any form of government. They have.

And it's my belief that law enforcement has been responsive to the Grand Jury's criticisms. So I'm pretty comfortable with their ability to take a look at what we do and how we do it.

MR. DUNBAUGH: They have been quite critical in the past, it's been my experience so far. And in some cases, deservedly so and we've been responsive to that.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Lee has one last pressing question and then that's the last one.

MS. LEE: I promise. This is just a use of force or level of force question.

In situations involving people who are not holding hostages, not holding a gun, or chemical bombs or whatever, what kind of policies do you have for your officers in terms of baton use, pepper spray or anything to diffuse the situation before a gun is being used as a last resort?

MR. DUNBAUGH: It's in the policy that we've provided you. And officers start with the continuum of verbal control, trying to control the situation by ordering people to stop, and raising their voice and taking control of the situation that way if they can.

There is no requirement that you then graduate to your mace, and you then graduate to your nightstick. There is no requirement that you retreat. Those are options, all of those. And those are options that will be Monday morning quarterbacked if you're wrong and consequences if you're wrong that will affect the rest of your career.

22.

MR. ROONEY: What you'll find when you look through your packet is that Rohnert Park's use of force and officer shooting policy are very consistent with everyone else's because one of the unique things about the county is we have the county protocols. So what Chief Dunbaugh has described to you, you're going to find fairly consistent throughout Sonoma County.

MR. HERNANDEZ: All right. I'm going to -- I want to thank the Sheriff and the Chiefs for being so forthcoming and so open with us. And I also want to note again and I want to tell you how much we appreciate your voluntary participation before us. And we very, very much appreciate that.

Thank you for taking time as chief law enforcement officers to be before us.

We will recess for a half hour. We will be back -- We're going to recess for 15 minutes.

(Break taken at 1:15 p.m. until 1:35 p.m.)

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'm going to call the meeting back to order. I want to do some housekeeping here

r)

. 26

and noting we received some letters for inclusion in the record.

We received a letter here from Linda McCabe,
President of Sonoma County Chapter of National Organization
for Women. Please let the record show that her letter of
February 20th, 1998, testimony submitted to U.S. Commission
on Civil Rights, will be entered into the record.

I also have a letter here from the Southwest Area Citizens Group. Mr. David Buchholz, Southwest Area Citizens Group, signed a letter. It's dated February 20th and directed to myself as Chairman and Honorable Cruz Reynoso, Vice-Chairman, and it will also be entered into the record.

I also have a letter from the West-End

Neighborhood Association signed by Carol Dean, President of
the West-End Neighborhood Association, directed to the Civil
Rights Commission; dated February 18th, 1998. It will be
entered into the record.

I also have a letter from Lea M. Barron-Thomas, directed to U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and dated February 19th, 1998. It will also be entered into the record.

I also have a letter from the mayor of
Rohnert Park, Linda Spiro, dated February 20th, 1998,
directed to Ms. Ruby Moy, Staff Director of the U.S.
Commission on Civil Rights. It will be entered into the
record. And it is dated February 20th.

And I also have a letter here. Attached to this letter from the mayor of Rohnert Park is a letter from Patrick Rooney dated February 2nd -- a letter to Mr. Patrick Rooney, Police Chief, Rohnert Park Department of Public Safety. And it's signed by Richard W. Roberts, Chief of the (inaudible) Section of the U.S. Department of Justice and dated February 2nd, 1998, and it will be entered into the

record.

Okay. I think that's all of our housekeeping.

This afternoon's panel, we will continue with the law enforcement section of the hearing. With us today addressing law enforcement employment, training and discipline is Michael Mullins, Sonoma County District Attorney, and Jerry Schoenstein, Director of Basic Academy, Santa Rosa Training Center, Santa Rosa Junior College.

And I'd like to have Mr. Mullins open the hearing. Welcome, Mr. Mullins.

MR. MULLINS: Yes. Thank you. And thank you for inviting me and asking me to be here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you for being here.

MR. MULLINS: You're welcome. According to the letter I received, you would like me to address the issues of the policies and procedures that my office implements in investigating the use of deadly force by law enforcement officers.

As the elected District Attorney of Sonoma County,

of course it's my function to enforce the state statutes with reference to all uses of deadly force, whether it's by a police officer or not, with reference to law enforcement use of force and conduct. It's my duty then to determine whether or not any penal statutes have been violated with the exercise of that particular force.

To that end, I'm sure you have my resume. I've been here a number of years as a prosecutor and as the Assistant District Attorney, which is the title for the second person in command, to Gene Tunney, my predecessor. I was elected District Attorney in 1994 and began my service in 1995.

So I've had the opportunity to serve both as a Deputy District Attorney assigned to a particular critical incident -- and I'll explain that terminology, if I may -- and as a supervisor of people assigned.

MR. REYNOSO: Excuse me; but you left out that you were a UCLA grad.

MR. MULLINS: Yes, sir, I did. A lot of people don't want to hear that up here. Thank you for reminding me.

Before 1993, the District Attorney's Office operated in conjunction with the different law enforcement agencies in Sonoma County under a mutual agreement so that if they would request our services to respond to a particular scene to assist-in the investigation, we would do

so. Usually it would be a prosecutor and one of the investigators from our investigative section.

And by the way, I left with a member of your staff a document which has some statistics that was requested yesterday by Mr. Montez. I could not provide all of the statistics in that period of time but if there are additional statistics that you wish, you could notify me later and I'll be happy to do so.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MR. MULLINS: This simply indicates that we have 10 investigators assigned to our criminal division.

In 1993, in conjunction with the chiefs and the sheriff in Sonoma County, we undertook to write a protocol, an agreement, if you will, which would describe what a critical incident was and how the District Attorney would function within that particular protocol.

This was to ensure that when an incident did occur, we would be immediately notified and could respond. It was to assist us in our channels of communication.

The critical incident -- quote, unquote -- I don't know whether you have the document or not. I would hope you will get it in the future. But you will see that it defines a number of different incidents when the law enforcement officer may be a victim, may be an actor, a participant, the one who uses the deadly force, or may be simply involved, not on duty in a possible criminal violation. So it's a

broader definition than I think the issues you're addressing today, but I may be presumptuous.

Since 1993, we've been operating under that particular protocol. It's designed to ensure that there is a concurrent investigation. The District Attorney, again, is present with an investigator. We concurrently investigate the facts surrounding the particular incident. And, of course, the District Attorney's perspective is to look at the issues of criminal liability.

However, the investigative team is also looking at the issue of administrative discipline if policies and procedures may be violated. But again, the District Attorney is looking at the criminal issues.

In the protocol, you will see, although at this time I do not believe we have ever invoked it, the District Attorney does, of course, have the option of relieving or breaking away from the concurrent investigation and investigating the incident solely with the resources of the District Attorney and separate and apart.

But again, during my tenure here, both as a deputy and as District Attorney, we've never used that particular section.

Normally what would happen, we have a list of deputy district attorneys that are on call so that they can respond to a lot of different issues, search warrants, et cetera. But if that deputy is called and notified there

is a critical incident, the instructions to the deputy are to call myself; or, in my absence, my assistant or one of the chiefs. Because we want to assign the most senior people to these particular types of incidents.

2i

And we have six people that we are assigning besides myself, which would be the chief deputies, there are three; the Assistant District Attorney; and two other deputies who are very senior and have been in the office for a number of years.

That, in a nutshell, is how we respond under the protocol to these particular types of incidents. After it's over, the investigation is completed, the forensic reports have been forwarded to us, which takes some time -- usually an investigation is lengthy because we're waiting for the lab reports to come back -- the Deputy District Attorney assigned writes a report, forwards the report to me, which is a summary but includes with it all of the police reports and forensic laboratory reports that have been gathered together.

And I will make a final decision as to whether or not criminal liability is involved. If there's a great deal of press interest, I will issue a press release. Usually I also write, of course, to the chief of police or the sheriff, depending on the situation.

Thank you for the time to explain my role, and I'm ready to answer questions after my co-participant finishes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

2i

You may proceed, Mr. Schoenstein. Please state your name and what you do for the record.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: I'm Jerry Schoenstein; I'm the Director of the Basic Law Enforcement Course at the Santa Rosa Training Center at Santa Rosa Junior College. And I'd like to thank this Committee for allowing me to be here today to testify for you.

I'd like to begin a little bit by explaining what it is we are and how we may relate to law enforcement training in this community. The Santa Rosa Training Center is a part of the Santa Rosa Junior College. It is a regional public safety training center of which one of its tasks is to provide law enforcement training to this community and also to this region.

The Santa Rosa Training Center, in conjunction with the state regulatory agency, which is the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, and our local law enforcement partners presents law enforcement training in the following areas. The basic course, which is the one I manage for the program; continuing professional training, which includes skills and knowledge programs and advanced officer training; supervisory training; and other specialized training such as dispatch training for law enforcement.

We also partner with local law enforcement

agencies to provide citizens police academies in four jurisdictions in this county. Sonoma Sheriff's Department, Rohnert Park Department of Public Safety, Santa Rosa Police Department, and the Petaluma Police Department provide citizens academies to their citizens. The junior college, through the training center, assists them by providing financial reimbursement for instruction because some of their instructors are on our staff.

And these academies allow citizens in those particular communities the opportunity to gain insight into the officer's perspective of providing law enforcement services to the community.

In addition to these activities, we also share costs with our law enforcement partners to permit in -- recruit women and other underrepresented groups to law enforcement careers. The college sponsors Careers in Law Enforcement and Women in Law Enforcement seminars three times a year.

We utilize agency resources and our own to advertise these activities by advertising in local newspapers, in both English and Spanish language papers, radio advertisement on both English and Spanish language stations. We do theater on-screen advertising for these programs.

We advertise through the Santa Rosa Junior College catalog which is distributed countywide. We have developed



brochures in English and in Spanish for these programs which the college distributes and a variety of others types of programs.

And those programs are high school career days, participating in our Hispanic Chamber of Commerce career day, and doing outreach to community and business groups by speaking at breakfast, luncheon and dinner meetings, such as the Rotary Clubs, Elk Clubs and business groups along those lines.

So we're active in trying to recruit folks from a broad spectrum to our programs and to explain what a law enforcement career might offer them.

We also work with the Latino Peace Officers

Association to identify police academy students who may
qualify for school scholarships while attending our academy.

And we've done that now for about the last four years. And
we've provided a method by which that particular
organization can identify prospective students who may be
eligible for those scholarships.

I was also asked to address the issue about law enforcement training and what it does for our society. I believe that quality law enforcement training can and does influence the profession in a positive fashion. I believe that influence has a dramatic impact on society as a whole.

I believe our students, our training is of the highest quality. Our training system is influenced by law

18.

21.

enforcement needs and by society we serve. We are regularly contacted by interested parties who are concerned about the curriculum which we deliver to our trainees.

During the last year, I have spoken to regional advocates of the developmentally disabled, the mentally ill, sexually and physically abused advocates -- or advocates for those particular groups. And these advocates have a valid interest in how officers respond to the needs of their clients. They have generally been satisfied that our curriculum meets the requirements.

The document which I provided to you earlier is an outline of the hourly breakdown of the police academy curriculum.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Excuse me just for the record. Is that the document entitled, "Basic Academy Hours"?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: That's correct.

MR. HERNANDEZ: That you gave us that has kind of a spreadsheet format?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Yes, it does.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: The column on the far right of that document shows the hourly distribution of our basic academy. The column on the left shows the minimum hourly requirements set by the state regulatory agency, POST. This curriculum does deal with the use of force and firearms proficiency.

)

1:9

However, much more time in the aggregate is spent on other topics which assist in the development of skills and knowledge which officers need in order to reduce the hazards which normally occur in the performance of their job.

I think it's important to look at the number of hours that are there and recognize that while there are hours devoted to developing proficiency in certain of those skills, the ones that we have other than uses of deadly force or other than uses of force far outweigh the ones where we talk about use of force.

Finally, I believe that the Santa Rosa Training

Center and its law enforcement partners serve the needs of

the citizens of the county and the peace officers that serve

them by providing the best training possible during these

increasingly complex times.

I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have and I thank you for the opportunity to make a statement.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you both for taking time out of your busy schedule to be with us.

I'd like to open the questions now to the panel.
Yes, Commissioner Reynoso.

MR. REYNOSO: I have a general question for both of you. I'd like to precede it by making an observation in terms of my experience with this Commission. I've attended hearings in Los Angeles, Miami, New York, Mississippi and

many sessions in Washington, D.C., and I have -- and the issue of police-community relations have come up in many of those hearings.

In none of them have I seen sort of the intensity of interest that I've seen at the hearings here, nor have I seen what appears to be sort of a "they and us" attitude. I mean, for example, the wearing of the badge. And I don't mean to be disrespectful, but it seems to say, "By golly; we're the police." And then other people sort of on the other side, sort of a "we and they" attitude when, manifestly, that ought not to be. That is, that there ought to be a sense of confidence on the part of the police in all members of the community and all members of the community ought to have that sense of confidence in the police.

So my general question to the two of you is the following: What's up? What do you think is happening here in Sonoma? Because I just wanted to precede my question with that statement because there's something here, it seems to be not particularly healthy just in terms of what I have been able to see and in terms -- and hear at this hearing. So what do you think has gone awry? What should the community do? What should we do? The general question but a matter of some concern.

Yes, sir.

22.

.25

MR. MULLINS: Generally speaking, one thing that I personally believe has occurred over the years is that we,



. 25

meaning we law enforcement, and I'll include myself in the group, have handled critical incidents, incidents where law enforcement officers use force, like we do other criminal investigations. So I am very mindful of the problems of dealing with the media and how, of necessity, we are almost secret with what's going on while we're doing the investigation.

You get into habits. As a long-time prosecutor, I do not want to see myself quoted in the newspaper when I'm trying a case. It's something I just don't do. I've had to live out of town for three months at a time on change of venue cases, and I do not want to repeat those experiences and I do not want to have my people do so.

On the other hand, these are different. Incidents where law enforcement officers use force are different.

Other than the acts of random violence which, unfortunately, we experience at times. Because we have, as a society, entrusted our law enforcement officials to use deadly force.

Therefore, I think we need to be more forthcoming with statements about what has occurred to the media.

Because if we don't, the media -- this is not a pejorative statement -- it abhors a vacuum and information will come to the media one way or the other.

And, unfortunately, if it doesn't come from those who are in the position to have investigated the case and

talked to the witnesses, if it doesn't come from us, it comes from other places and it comes from rumor and it comes from neighborhoods. And so there's a lot of misinformation, not intentional, but just because we've created this vacuum.

. 25.

So what we've learned is that we've got to be able to inform the media so they can inform the public of what we're finding out as we find it out rather than wait for weeks, literally, for the investigation to close.

Now, there's a certain risk in that. There's a risk that you're going to look at some facts and all of a sudden a new fact comes in and changes it a little bit. Well, that's a risk maybe we have to take and be more forthcoming about it as the facts are accumulating.

So that's the first thing we've got to do. We've sort of created this, and I take a certain amount of personal responsibility for that. Okay? Because, quite frankly, I've been the one on the phone telling chief so-and-so, "Don't say anything. Wait a minute. Wait for me. Wait." Maybe that was something I shouldn't have done. Because these are different and I've learned that.

Number two. And I'll be brief. I think Sonoma
County is changing. Not think. I know it's changed. Our
population has virtually doubled in the last 20 years. Less
than 20 years. And so that has a certain amount of growing
pains.



12.

We didn't have media attention in Sonoma County, frankly. There was one newspaper. We didn't have TVs.

They still make me uncomfortable. I'm still not used to it.

I escaped from LA to go to bucolic Sonoma County. But I'm getting used to it.

But the point is that people in both law enforcement and advocacy groups are feeling their oats a little bit about the media attention, I think. And that results in some of this finger-pointing. I think. Those are just my personal opinions.

MR. REYNOSO: I'm very appreciative of that expression of opinion because I recall many years ago when I as a young lawyer in El Centro, there was a police citizen killing of a young Latino male and there was a great deal of tension in the community. And there was a coroner's inquest. And at that time the sheriff and corner were the same person.

And I was representing the sister of the deceased, and I was able to persuade the sheriff to allow me to cross-examine the witnesses, and she didn't have to do that at a coroner's inquest. But I think there was a sense of confidence in the community that all of the facts had gotten on the table because there was sort of cross-examination. And it had a tendency to taint the waters.

The killing was an unfortunate one but it wasn't a malevolent one. So I think, as you suggested, to get the

facts out quickly, I think on that occasion, had to be very helpful. So I really very much appreciate your reaction to it.

Sir, what's your reaction to my general question?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Since I'm wearing one of the

buttons. I don't find that that's -- you know, it's not

designed to act as a separator between me and the rest of

the community. I have another one on that I wear all the

time and that's for the California Academy Directors

Association.

So the particular button I'm wearing is obvious that I do support the law enforcement community. They are our primary client from the standpoint I work with them daily to provide a service to them so they can better serve this community.

MR. REYNOSO: I'd like to interject that I consider the ability of a citizen to walk safely on the streets one of the most important civil rights. So law enforcement is very, very important. I think we'd all agree with that. But I just wondered what your reaction was to my general concern that there seems to be sort of that division.

Because sometimes if there's tension, whether it's justified or not, tension alone is a fact that we have to deal with. And we on the Commission, when we go to various communities, often see that. So I just wondered what your

reaction is to that.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Well, I think the main thing that I can see is I'm relatively a short timer as far as a resident in this county, although I've worked here for about 13 years through the college. The thing that I can see here is the dynamic of this county has changed dramatically with the population, demographics are changing radically. And I think that, to a certain extent, causes some distrust. Okay?

It causes some needed shifts in perceptions. And those happen to probably take place last, not first, and they're not always graceful. And I think that there is some impact.

MR. REYNOSO: In that regard, you may have heard -- I don't know if you were here to hear the last panel, but we were told that surveys have been sent out, at least by the City of Santa Rosa and the County Sheriff's Office, asking the citizens, basically, "How well do you think we're doing?" And the reports were that 82 to 85 percent of the responses were affirmative.

We weren't told, though I assume the study indicates, what percentage responded. But I wonder if whether those responses, if you know, indicated the ethnicity, for example, of the individuals responding. That is, at the same time we were told that 18 percent of the population here is minority; and I just wondered whether the

minority community is overly represented in those 15 to 18 percent that had some qualms about the police department.

I should think that would be important data for you as a trainer and for the police departments to know how well they're doing in each community, if you will, in the county. You don't have to know.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Lee.

MS. LEE: A couple of questions first for Mr. Schoenstein. You conduct training, basic course training and advanced officer training. First question is for basic training.

Earlier today, some of the panelists had suggested that instead of just doing a one-hour or a couple of hours training on cultural and diversity, maybe communities could be brought into the academy so that they could learn directly from the community. Is that something that you are contemplating or are you doing that already?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: We're not doing that presently. I think the main concern that I have with a lot of this is we have a very short period of time, 20 weeks worth of academy training.

And one of the reasons -- I mean, this exceeds the state minimum standard but when we start looking at those particular issues, we are a regional training center. I



2İ

have students that come from outside of this community. Not from just Sonoma County. They come from Mendocino County, Lake County. As far away as Stockton Police Department. As far north as Shasta County Sheriff's Department.

So from the standpoint of bringing people from the community in to address special needs, it's a lot simpler to do in a program where an academy is run by a police department serving a specific community.

Los Angeles County, San Francisco or Oakland Police Department, for instance, you know, has the ability to identify a particular community or series of groups within the community to come forward and address students in their academy and have it be very effective as far as these are people you're going to deal with when you come out onto the street and these are the communities and the cultural backgrounds that you should be familiar with.

In fact, we don't have the ability to specifically identify particular cultural groups, racial groups to say -- to bring them in on cultural diversity training specifically in that one -- in that narrow context within just Sonoma County because we are dealing with broader aspects of it.

MS. LEE: So what kind of cultural and diversity training do you provide within your academy?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Basically, I could give you a curriculum outline for that, and I'd be happy to forward that. But basically, what we're doing is we're talking

about self-awareness.

Within that, we have a fairly diverse group of people, as I mentioned, that come in and we start talking about the students who are there. And, quite frankly, we're talking about a wide variety of students that come to us from a variety of different agencies and we do some self-examination. What's your cultural background? What's your heritage? And what languages do you speak other than English?

And by using that as a baseline in examining our own perceptions about ourselves and how we view ourselves differently from other people, we use that as the baseline to start examining about how, as law enforcement officers, we have to be aware that other people perceive -- our perceptions of other groups may be very different than how they perceive themselves. And that's how we do it as a beginning.

MS. LEE: Okay. Can you provide us a breakdown of your current and your last couple of academy classes; their ethic gender breakdown, just to see.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Right off the top, I have a current class in session. I have two women in the class.

MS. LEE: Out of how many?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Out of how many people? We have 24 students currently -- 25 students. Correction. So two females. One of those -- we have two blacks. Asians, I



think probably five. We're dealing with five Asians in this particular class. And beyond that -- several Hispanics.

And the rest of them would be white male.

MR. HERNANDEZ: What about your teaching staff itself? What kind of diversity do you have in the teaching staff, just out of curiosity?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Based on the fact that we draw from this particular locale, the majority, white male. We do have some Native Americans and some women who teach in our program. Out of about 50 instructors, I would say that the -- you know, the majority, again, probably 85 percent of those are white male.

MS. LEE: The second question that I have is in terms of your advanced officers training. Who gets selected to be a training officer? I imagine that's what you meant by advanced training -- officer training?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Okay.

MS. LEE: Officers who are training to be training officers? Is that what you meant?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: No. In some of our training -The advanced officer training that we have addresses needs
of specialties; crime scene investigations, which is maybe a
different type of focus, more skilled training for officers
who are doing that. How they get selected for those
courses? They're selected by their agencies based on agency
need.

.

<sup>25</sup>

MS. LEE: So for the training officers who are training the younger, newer officers, you won't be involved with that?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: We have what we call recruit training officers who work in our program. And they act as my assistants and working with new recruits who are going through the program. Those folks are part-time employees of the college who are full-time peace officers working for local communities here in this county.

We select them based on interviews with them and by having their chiefs or sheriff recommend them to us as role models and worthy of representing that agency in our program.

Because I work with so many agencies, we have a variety of officers from around this county working with us on a part-time basis in our programs. They're part-time employees for us.

MS. LEE: If I may ask one more question to Mr.

Mullins. You talked about the officers involved with
shootings or whatever. Do you keep records -- or who keeps
records of officers who are involved with using deadly
force?

MR. MULLINS: I have not kept records on how many critical incidents we've had. Recently I did see a compilation from Santa Rosa that was provided to me by their City Attorney, but I have not kept statistical records about

how many we've had.

MS. LEE: Do you plan to start keeping records?

MR. MULLINS: Well. . . If that is your

suggestion, I certainly would do so.

MS. LEE: That is my suggestion.

MR. MULLINS: I will.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Buitrago?

MS. BUITRAGO: My question is for Mr. Mullins.

I'm not sure to be concerned about this but I think that my question would be if you thought about potential problems that might exist by combining the criminal and the administrative investigation? And the reason for that is the criminal burden of proof to find someone criminally liable is very high. Whereas, when you're dealing with administrative, employment-related issues that kind of relate to the community, et cetera, that burden of proof is very different.

And in reading the newspapers, as a matter of fact, it seems I kept hearing, "Well, the DA investigated and there was no criminality and so-and-so investigated it."

And I'm just wondering whether there's a chance that, since the burden is so high for criminal, if you find that there was no criminal liability that then, by default, the administrative process is tainted by that decision.

MR. MULLINS: I try to be careful about how I respond publicly to the results of an investigation. For

obvious reasons.

First of all, I think that I have a role in educating the public as best I can as to what has occurred and why it occurred. For example, if I thought that a particular case may not be justified but I could not prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, I would say that.

I think the other issue is would the fact that the District Attorney decides not to bring criminal charges mean that a city or the Sheriff's Department would not impose discipline? And that would only depend, I think, on the honesty of each individual agency.

Certainly, they should not be unwilling to impose discipline simply because I have not filed criminal charges. One of the reasons, also, it's interesting for the reason we -- one reason we combine these processes is to ensure that we obtain all of the evidence.

You know, when a police officer is questioned about an incident, under the Police Officers Bill of Rights, the police officer, he or she, must respond. Is sort of compulsed. And one of the issues in the law that is yet unresolved, and we've been dealing with this issue tangentially on another case, is whether or not the District Attorney may use compulsed testimony. Fifth Amendment problem.

By combining the investigation -- and I've sat across the table, just like this, and questioned a police



officer with the police officer's attorney right next to him, I alleviate that situation, in my opinion. So that I don't have to worry about the testimony being compulsed because it is but I'm there and so there's a waiver.

And then, of course, you get into other issues about whether or not the compulsed testimony leading to other evidence, whether it be the fruit of a poisoned stream. I have to worry about that.

So by combining the investigations, when we first drafted this protocol, if you will, I was frankly attempting to alleviate some of those issues.

But, again, whether or not an agency would fail to impose discipline because I said there was not sufficient evidence is an issue for each agency and that is a very important issue.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I have a question. There was earlier testimony -- in fact, at the beginning of these hearings this morning, where a number of people suggested that maybe one of the -- one of the ways to handle this would be an independent civilian review board with subpoena power.

How do you feel about that particular approach to the problem of police practices and procedures and especially in officer-involved shootings and use of force?

MR. MULLINS: I've stated publicly that conceptually I do not oppose a civilian review board. As a

concept. It would depend -- And now I'm responding as a citizen and I'll explain that in a minute. It would depend on the will of the community, it would have to be supported by the community.

1<u>9</u>.

Number two; it would depend on the clarity, the mission statement. It would have to be very clear what this civilian review board were to do.

And, thirdly, it would depend upon who decides who shall be sitting upon it and how that person or persons how they will be selected.

Because my personal opinion as a citizen, and I'm only basing this on reading about other places because I've never been in a jurisdiction where there is one. It appears in some places it can be extremely divisive and that seems to have been the experience.

Where I know I've read one story, and I'm depending on the media for accuracy here, but I read one story where a member of the civilian review board was allegedly hounded off the review board because that member did not vote -- did not vote -- to impose discipline and segments of the community thought discipline should have been imposed. You see?

All right. But the bottom line for me, for the District Attorney is it doesn't change my mandated duty. If a civilian review board cleared a police officer and I disagreed based on the evidence that we had gathered, I

would be duty bound to file criminal charge. Because I answer to the State Constitution and the United States Constitution. So it doesn't change my duty nor my responsibility.

So from that point of view, it's not difficult for the District Attorney to say, "Go ahead and have one." All right? But that's why I, as a citizen, I think it's important that I couch my recommendation or my opinion with the idea that it's important that you do those three things.

MR. HERNANDEZ: By the same token, Mr. Mullins, if you -- if you disagreed with a review board and a review board found that there was some problem, you could also choose not to prosecute. Is that correct?

MR. MULLINS: Yes, Doctor.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Fua and then Mr. Carney.

MS. FUA: In the past five years, let's say, how often has a complaint been upheld by your office, percentage-wise, of a complaint of use of a deadly force by a police officer?

MR. MULLINS: I need to understand your question. How often has --

MS. FUA: How often --

MR. MULLINS: How often have we filed a complaint against the police?

MS. FUA: Yes. How often -- Basically, I guess it should be a two-part question. How often have charges been

filed and what percentage of those charges have been sustained?

MR. MULLINS: In the fast five years, to my knowledge, we have had — we have not filed a criminal complaint against a police officer for the use of deadly force. Correct. In the past three years, we have filed a complaint against a police officer for misuse of his authority.

MS. FUA: And how many -- When you said there were five or three, how many complaints do you get in a year?

Approximately.

MR. MULLINS: Okay. I don't know how many I get in a year. I've never averaged it out. I can tell you that I recently looked at a survey done by the Santa Rosa City Attorney, which had a review of their cases, and it went back 10 years.

And the interesting part to me is there was a period of two years where there were none. And then in a five-year period, there were several; I would say five to seven. And then from about '92 -- '91, '93, there were none. And then all of a sudden, there were five or seven.

The only thing I can say is, statistically, I have not seen an average. And they come in a wide variety. If we -- you can break out just use of firearm or you -- there are all sorts of other situations, too.

Critical incidents. When I think of these



19.

critical incidents, I'm thinking the broad definition of protocol. Not just the use of the firearm.

MS. FUA: Okay. Then in terms of critical incidents, how many incidents have been complained of and how many incidents has your office filed charges against an officer?

MR. MULLINS: I have not filed charges against an officer involved in a critical incident since I've been District Attorney.

MS. FUA: And how long has that been?

MR. MULLINS: Three years.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Carney?

MR. CARNEY: Q Thank you.

Mr. Mullins, as the District Attorney in this county, do you have any kind of a policy in effect regarding the convicted police officers for domestic violence and the -- and a follow-up situation, that is, for compliance with the federal and state mandates with regard to firearms? Is there any policy in effect in your office?

MR. MULLINS: Are you talking about the individual police officers that I supervise?

MR. CARNEY: No, no. I'm talking about police officers who may be convicted of domestic violence, spousal abuse, and the mandates of both federal and state law that indicate they cannot possess firearms.

Do you have any policy in place where you follow

up to ensure the community that those restrictions are adhered to?

MR. MULLINS: I have no written policy. But, obviously, if someone were found in possession of a weapon, just like anybody else, that was a violation of section 12021 of the Penal Code and the report were brought to me and I could prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, I would file a charge.

MR. CARNEY: I understand. Have you had any kind of conference or meeting of the minds with the chiefs of police and the sheriff regarding that particular issue?

MR. MULLINS: No. One chief asked me to -- asked me a question about the constitutionality of the statute, and I answered that question; and the answer was, "I believe it was constitutional, yes."

An investigators' association asked my assistance -- Well, asked me and I provided my assistance at that conference to discuss the federal law and its ramifications. Yes.

But other than those two incidences, I have not been asked -- I have not been asked to have a meeting of the minds. But if I were asked, I would tell them it's a violation of the statute.

MR. CARNEY: Now, with respect to your duties as the District Attorney, isn't it a fact that when you are presented with a case, it's presented by the police



21'.

department or the police agency administrative agency such as the Contractor's Board or something like that, or the Department of Employment or Insurance or something like that -- isn't that correct? You're presented with certain information regarding a crime.

MR. MULLINS: Yes, sir.

MR. CARNEY: And it's your duty to determine whether or not you have sufficient evidence presented to you to prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt.

MR. MULLINS: Yes, sir.

MR. CARNEY: And in that case, you would file the charges; correct?

MR. MULLINS: Yes, sir.

MR. CARNEY: Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. Are there any questions on this side? Ms. Spanos-Hawkey?

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: I've been reading about you in one of the local magazines, I believe. And there are some allegations that you are unresponsive, that your department is unresponsive to batteries, that phone calls are not returned, that women are kind of left out on a limb to deal with their abuser and many times have been killed, maimed. And I just would like your response to that.

MR. MULLINS: Yes, there have been groups that have been critical of our program concerning domestic violence. And, yes, we have responded to that.

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: In what way?

.13

MR. MULLINS: Thank you. First of all, we established a vertical prosecution unit, meaning that certain prosecutors will be assigned to a Domestic Violence Adult Sexual Assault Unit. A unit that is supervised by my assistant. That unit is designated to handle felony cases from filing until sentencing.

Second of all, we obtained a grant from the Department of Justice through the Spousal Abuse Prosecution Program. And in addition to that grant, we obtained funds from the Board of Supervisors for domestic violence counselors.

We believed that we should enhance our ability to communicate with the victims of domestic violence because, first of all, that group of people needs special support, and may find difficulty in communication with law enforcement. So the domestic violence counselor is modeled after the family violence project counselors in San Francisco.

In other words, the victim is assured of confidentiality and the counselors receive an extra copy of the police report. There are three copies of a police report submitted to my office of a domestic violence case. One is for the defense at discovery and one is for the prosecutor to make a determination on whether to file the charge. But immediately a copy is sent to the domestic

violence counselor whose object is to try and make contact with that victim.

We've managed to expand that to both felony and misdemeanor cases. To make contact with the victim to ensure a free flow of communication, to find out from the victim, usually herself, usually it's a female, what's going on. To provide support, to provide advocacy in the courtroom.

Next, in conjunction with the courts, we obtained funds from the Board of Supervisors to establish a Domestic Violence Court. The court is modeled on other courts. Specifically, those in the Rio Hondo Municipal Court, one other in Los Angeles, and the South Bay Municipal Court in San Diego.

The model is to take all misdemeanor cases which before were spread amongst the three other courts and put them into one court to assign an experienced prosecutor to the court who would be handling all of those particular cases up to a point.

To obtain access for the Public Defender inside the jail to the person who might be accused of the crime so the Public Defender immediately can establish some communication with that individual.

We also conducted training, and continue to conduct training, of police officers with the vision that we are trying to establish a case that may be proved beyond a

reasonable doubt without the assistance of the victim.

. 25

Victims, because of the dynamics of domestic violence, often recant or don't show up. And we were losing, prior to the advent of this procedure, at least 50 percent of our misdemeanor cases because we couldn't obtain cooperation.

But with enhanced investigation techniques, such as Polaroid cameras in every police officer's car, we require that those photographs be attached to the police report when it arrives in my office. The photographs then are available to the court, to the Public Defender. And more importantly, they may be shown immediately to the perpetrator.

We also require that the 9-1-1 tape be automatically obtained rather than wait for a request from the prosecutor. Because the 9-1-1 tape, if it exists, may be a unique repository of evidence because it's a spontaneous statement. We encourage our prosecutors to use spontaneous statements whenever possible, to use the Evidence Code, which has been changed and modified, and there's case law that's assisted us.

So those are the steps that we have taken in order to enhance our ability to handle these particular cases.

I'd invite you to come look at our Domestic Violence Court, if you wish and have time, so that you can see for yourself exactly how we are administrating that particular program.

.25

MS. SPANOS-HAWKEY: Actually, rather than my attending, I think maybe you need to take some of these people that have the diverse views on your department, explain it, and give them the tour. And that way, here would be some communication and have some questions answered.

MR. MULLINS: My Assistant District Attorney sits on the Domestic Violence Action Council and the Death Review Committee, and I would welcome any of the advocacy groups to come into court and watch at any time. In fact, I do see them in his office frequently.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Lee?

MS. LEE: For Mr. Mullins. When a police shooting case arrives at your office, besides the police reports, how are you -- or how should the office conduct the investigation? Do they talk to witnesses? Who carries out the investigation from your office?

MR. MULLINS: The investigative responsibility is with the investigator who is assigned to the deputy district attorney; but the deputy district attorney has the ability to actually interview with the investigator witnesses at that time.

For example, the police officer is interviewed by the deputy district attorney. Or if there's physical capability, you might in a situation have the investigator conduct the interview with the police investigator from the agency assigned. We call that the lead agency in the protocol.

In Santa Rosa, for example, there's the interview room and then there's a video camera that's in a separate room so that if the prosecutor chooses, the prosecutor can sit in a separate room so you don't have as many people sitting at the table and pick up the phone and direct that certain questions be asked rather than doing the questioning himself or herself.

Now, admittedly, we have staffing limitations. I don't have enough staff to do the entire investigation alone. We depend on assistance from the lead agency. Which now, under the protocol, must be a different agency than the venue agency, as I understand it.

So, yes, we have the ability and we do interview witnesses ourselves. A lot of the witnesses are interviewed by the lead agency, admittedly. But we certainly have the ability, if we want to, to go back and reinterview witnesses if we want to.

MS. LEE: A final question. Does your office welcome citizens to file complaints on the -- on police officers. Do you make an effort to welcome people to walk into your office?

Because there was a lot of discussion about whether people feel comfortable walking into a police department to file a complaint against the very same people



they're seeing. And they mentioned that other public agencies are also available to receive those complaints. Is your office one of them?

MR. MULLINS: If a citizen walks into my office and wishes to make a complaint about a particular police officer, the direction to the receptionist is to contact our investigative section and have that citizen interviewed by one of our investigators. Not to send the citizen in the circular motion back to the Internal Affairs Division.

MS. LEE: And that information is made public to the residents of the county?

MR. MULLINS: I can't say that it is. I can't say that I've made an effort to broadcast that information in some fashion, no.

But to give you a good idea, this morning I was going over with one of my investigators the establishment of a Web site. Yes, I've had to learn how to use the computer. And so he -- they have the ability to use a Web site; and I've looked at the Web site in Santa Clara and the Denver District Attorney's Office, the Santa Clara District Attorney's Office, and Los Angeles.

And what we're going to do is put the Web site up. And so I will take your suggestion and put on the Web site "citizen complaints."

MS. LEE: But also be mindful that there are a lot of economically disadvantaged people who may not have

1

MR. MULLINS: Yes, yes. That's not a bad idea.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. HERNANDEZ: Other members of the panel? Yes.

MS. HESSE: Does your office defend any lawsuits that are filed against the County alleging excessive force or civil rights violations by an officer?

MR. MULLINS: No. We have a County Counsel in Sonoma County and a Risk Manager.

MS. HESSE: Okay. Do you have any information on how many have been filed, lawsuits, and what the costs have been to the county?

MR. MULLINS: No, ma'am, I don't.

MS. HESSE: Okay.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Anything else? Yes.

MS. PATTERSON: Yes, Mr. Mullins. How many assistant district attorneys do you have?

MR. MULLINS: Okay. I brought my cheat sheet. I have 37 deputy district attorneys assigned to the Criminal Division; two chief deputies, managers; one assistant district attorney who is the number two person; and myself. In the Family Support Division, I have six deputy district attorney's and one chief deputy.

MS. PATTERSON: Can you tell me how many of them are women?

MR. MULLINS: In the Criminal Division, I have 11 deputy district attorneys and one chief deputy. And in the

Family Support Division, there are four of the six.

MS. PATTERSON: How about minorities, disabled?

MR. MULLINS: I do not believe currently that we have any minorities.

MS. PATTERSON: What is your plan to recruit minorities?

MR. MULLINS: Well, the Personnel -- we're a Civil Service county. So the Personnel Department does the recruiting. I ask them to usually advertise statewide because we've been very successful in getting people who -- one of our latest recruits was an individual from San Bernardino. So we've been successful in getting people from Southern California.

Sonoma County, to my understanding, still has an Affirmative Action Program. I must confess, though, that I have been assuming that that person is doing what they're supposed to do.

I did actively recruit for a bilingual bicultural investigator and interviewed two candidates and offered them positions, but they both felt they could not accept.

Recruitment-wise, we are in the unique situation of living in a lovely place but the salaries have not been commensurate with the Bay Area. And we are -- when we are compared to other counties for salary purposes, myself included, we're compared with Solano County and Monterey County. And I assure you we're not compared to Santa Clara

County or somewhere else. So that's a bit of a disadvantage.

12.

Other than that, that's all the information I can provide you on that issue.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much, both of you, for appearing before the panel today.

I just want to take a quick five-minute break so that we can clear the room so we can let more people in and then we'll start with the next panel. Five minutes.

(Break taken at 2:40 p.m. until 2:50 p.m.)

MR. HERNANDEZ: We are back in session.

Just a little housekeeping here. I have a letter that has been submitted to be included in the record from Antonio, it looks like, P. Serna, from Rohnert Park. And it will be entered into the record.

All right. This part of the afternoon we are going to focus on the complaint review process. We have with us today Donald Casimere, Investigative and Appeals Officer, the City of Richmond. We have Penny Harrington, who is Director of the National Center for Women in Policing. We have John Parker, who is the Executive Officer of the San Diego County Police Review Board.

I'm going to invite Mr. Casimere to be the first to address the panel. And I ask you to state your name and your title and position for the record.

MR. CASIMERE: Thank you, Dr. Hernandez, members

of the Civil Rights Commission and the California Advisory Committee. It's a pleasure to be here.

My name is Don Casimere. I am from Richmond,
California, not far from here, from the Police Commission.
My current title there is the Investigative and Appeals
Officer. Part of my responsibility has to do with staffing
and providing staff support for the Richmond Police
Commission. And so in that particular role, I am here to
appear before you today.

Just some brief comments, Members, about my background and then we'll get into what I was asked to talk about. And in the letter that I got, I think the concern was that I speak about general police oversight procedures, and I will certainly do that. But my background is in law enforcement in the City of Berkeley for about 12 years; six years as a sergeant.

From there, I went to the Office of Citizens

Complaints as a senior investigator. That office was

created in 1984, mandated. Voters voted no confidence there
in the ability of the police department's ability to police
itself, and they replaced the Internal Affairs Component
with a group of citizens. I worked there for approximately
two years, and now work with the Richmond Police Commission
and have been there for about 14 years now.

I also have served as the president of the
International Association of Civilian Oversight of Law

Enforcement and am currently on the national and the international boards.

I think of more importance is that here in the Bay Area, we also have an organization called the Bay Area Police Oversight Network which consists of about 10 or so cities that have one form or another of civilian oversight.

And I think Novato is the closest city that has a police advisory board that is affiliated with the Bay Area Police Oversight Network.

A little bit about the Police Commission created in 1984 in the City of Richmond. And I want to say this about the Commission because I want to make some points to this body in terms of civilian oversight and what it's about. But the Police Commission was created in our city of roughly 95,000 folks or so because there were problems in the community. There were real problems and there were perceived problems. And I think the biggest perceived problem was that there was a police department that needed some sort of police accountability other than internal controls.

The Police Commission was created; there are nine members of the Commission who are appointed by the mayor and city council. They serve three-year terms. The Commission was created after much dialogue. Let me tell you a little bit about how it was created.

The Commission was created by city ordinance. But



it was created after much dialogue had taken place in the community in Richmond. It was give and take. The people who were brought to the table were people from the community, community folk, community leaders, ministerial lines, participants. Obviously, the city council, the mayor, the city attorney. Also, the police executive management. The police chief. The police union, the NAACP, the Hispanic groups that we have in our community, and Southeast Asian groups. And they all came together to talk about this business of what we need to do to restore confidence in the police department and to improve the relationships between the police department and the various segments of the community.

Richmond is highly diverse. If you look at our community breakdown, we're talking about maybe 30 to 35 percent white; and then the rest are various ethnic groups that break down from there.

So we were created because there was a perceived need that the police policing themselves was not quite enough. So after this debate and this dialogue took place, it was determined that what would be created in the City of Richmond is the Police Commission.

Now, there are three basic purposes that the Commission was charged with carrying out, three areas of responsibility; and they are important and let me just throw these out because I think it's important whenever you talk

about civilian oversight.

.25

No. 1 is the investigation of citizens' complaints. There are people in every community who, when they have a complaint against law enforcement, would like to file that complaint. Some don't mind taking it to the police department Internal Affairs. Some do. I don't know how the police facility is here in Santa Rosa or in Sonoma County; but in our jurisdictions in Berkeley and Oakland and Richmond, when you walk into a police department to file a complaint, it is a highly controlled and sometimes intimidating environment. And what happens is that there are some people who are intimidated by that process.

So to get over that, to get past that particular area of concern, when the police Commission was created, it was created to investigate citizens' complaints. That is, to conduct independent investigations.

If a person has a complaint regarding the Richmond Police Department and they want to talk about force or they want to talk about race or any other type of complaint, they can come to the Commission and file a complaint.

No. 2 is the area of policy review. Many times when a citizen has a complaint or concern about police, it's not necessarily because of a specific incident or a particular contact between that citizen and the police. There's a concern about policy. So the Commission is entitled to review police department policy.

12.

Thirdly, and I believe most importantly, the Commission is charged with looking at ways of establishing and putting forward recommendations to improve police-community relationships.

And I think, basically, that's perhaps one of the reasons that you are here convening this hearing today, is because of the concern about police-community relationships. And I think it's something we all have to be concerned about.

But I think it's important that, prior to the time that a -- we start talking about what kind of civilian oversight agency and that sort of thing, there must be a considerable amount of dialogue that takes place.

There must be a certain amount of groundwork that is done to, number one, determine whether or not civilian oversight is the place that you want to go in the community or whether or not you want to pursue something else. And, again, when this discussion, when this dialogue is taking place, all involved parties should be invited to the table.

Here in the Bay Area, if you talk about civilian oversight, we are fortunate indeed because we have a veritable smorgasbord, if you will, of civilian oversight agencies. My good friend John Parker is here; and he'll talk later on. But he and I worked for the Office of Citizens Complaints in San Francisco.

San Francisco has a Citizens' Police Commission

that sets the policy of the department. The police chief works for the commission, the civilian commission. They also have an Office of Citizens' Complaints that handles citizens' complaints regarding police conduct. The City of San Jose in the South Bay has an Independent Police Auditor's Office where they can monitor Internal Affairs investigations and make recommendations in terms of policy and so forth.

The City of Novato has a Police Advisory

Commission that makes advisories regarding police-related issues. The City of Richmond, the City of Berkeley, the City of Oakland all have some sort of independent capacity to conduct citizens' complaints.

A couple of concerns about general oversight, police oversight, and some things that I'd like to relate to you. No. 1: If a community gets to the point that it determines that it wants to go forward with some sort of civilian review mechanism, the authority of whatever mechanism is to be created should be very clearly spelled out. And I believe the District Attorney who spoke on the panel before us made that comment.

This is very important. That everybody knows what's to be expected from this civilian review board.

There is -- One of the greatest ways to lead to an agency not looking as professional or as effective as it could be is to have that agency that is out there with expectations



that are well above what that agency has the capacity to carry out.

And so it is important that the authority of the civilian oversight agency be clear and well defined.

No. 2: If a community wants to go to consider civilian oversight, it is important that the staffing and the budgetary provisions be in accordance or appropriate for that agency to carry out its mandate.

I have been fortunate in the past several years to have met with and talked with civilian oversight practitioners, law enforcement executives from throughout the United States and many other countries as well. And one of the things that I come away from those contacts with, if you will, is a list of desired characteristics that I think are important when we talk about civilian oversight and what is necessary.

We want to have a civilian oversight agency. What type of characteristics need to be there in order for it to be effective?

Number one would be in the area of independence, whether it's an auditor form of civilian oversight, whether it is in the form of a police commission or a police review board. There needs to be a certain amount of independence there for that particular agency or group.

Budgetary independence. I think one of the biggest mistakes that I have seen made in this country is

when a civilian oversight agency's budget has been tied directly to the police department and under the control of the police chief.

Another area that has to do with in terms of independence is that of reporting authority. Who does the civilian oversight agency report to? Or if there's hired staff, who does that staff report to?

I'm not here to say that the City of Richmond has the best civilian oversight agency in the world because nobody can make that claim. But one of the things that they did right when they created that agency is that they put principal staff person for the commission directly underneath and reportable to the mayor and the city council. Not the police chief, not the city manager, who is the police chief's boss, but the mayor and the city council who set the policy and the direction for the city.

Office space. When we first started out in civilian oversight in the City and County of San Francisco, I can recall walking in the door and -- with other civilian investigators and being -- we were to be trained by the outgoing component of civilian -- or, I'm sorry, of Internal Affairs investigators. They were going to train us. And they pretty much said, "Here are the files," and there was some light training and we began working in an office on the fifth floor of the police department.

And I think that the commission realized that



there was a concern in that area and granted office space away from the police department for the Office of Citizens' Complaints.

And I say that as an example because I think it is important that if you talk about creating an atmosphere where citizens can come in and independently file complaints and have it investigated away from the police department, then the office space is critical as well.

I think it is important for the civilian oversight agency to be in a position to conduct independent investigations. That is to say, many times, like in our agency, a citizen may have a complaint, has to come forward, sign a complaint form and that sort of thing, and that is fine. But I do think that it is important that the civilian oversight agency be able to initiate investigations into certain areas of policemen's conduct.

If something happens in the media and it's a principal concern, the agency should not have to sit and wait for somebody to come forward to file a complaint and perhaps be in a position to conduct and to initiate its own investigations.

The power to compel police officer testimony. How can one or how can an agency conduct an independent, objective, fair and thorough investigation if there is no participation from the police department or the sheriff's office?

I can recall when we started out in the business of civilian oversight in the City of Richmond, there was nothing in that city ordinance that said anything about police officers being compelled to testify. And when I raised the issue, being the first staff person, and I raised the issue with the city attorney and the city manager at that point, the response was very simple. "The police chief will order all officers in his department or her department to participate in your investigations."

1.9

.25

and the authority to issue subpoenas, we have never had to issue a subpoena because we have 100 percent cooperation from witness police officers, from subject or accused police officers. They are compelled to participate in the process. And it is critical. It is critical that they be part of the process.

The authority to review police department policy, I think, is very important. Many times when you talk about civilian review, you talk about responding to citizens' complaints of police misconduct. But I think you can really have an impact on the actions and on the -- how a police department or sheriff's department has its officers do the business of policing if you could impact these department or sheriff's department policies. So I think it is important that civilian review agencies have that type of authority.

And there needs to be some sort of an appeals



process. If there is a recommendation that comes forward from this particular agency and it comes to the police chief and the chief rejects it, whether it be for discipline or whether it be for policy, there needs to be some process whereby another authority can review that recommendation and go forward.

People have asked me in the past what type of a police commission is the strongest? And some people would say we'd like a commission that can mandate policy change or we'd like a commission that can direct the police chief to do this or that. It's my opinion, and it's just based on my experience and perhaps my makeup, that a police department should not be an agency that is governed by -- or I should say run by a committee.

I think you need to have a strong executive police manager who is sensitive to the community, who is not intimidated by citizens who want to have some impact on police department policy, who is not afraid to change and make modifications and to hear what the people want, and to create the kind of police agency that the community can be proud of.

In closing, let me say this: I believe that citizens can objectively and fairly impact police services. One of the biggest things that I hear in terms of why we shouldn't have police oversight is that, "Well, they don't know what we do and we're the professionals." As I said

before, my background is in law enforcement, and I fully believe that if you select the right people to staff your review agency, if you will, or oversight agency, and you select the right staff to do the work and to gather the information, and it's done fairly and objectively, you can have an impact.

The bottom line is this: Police-community relationships, whether it's with the sheriff's department in Sonoma County, whether it's with the police department in Santa Rosa, has to have positive and ongoing and improving, ever-improving relationships with the citizens that are served by the police department.

There has to be accountability mechanisms that are set up, that people have confidence in, that people are aware of, that people are comfortable with. So that if there is a concern, whether it's a complaint about a particular act of misconduct, a question about a police department policy or procedure, or just a general inquiry about we -- you know, a question about our police department, there needs to be some place where people can go, not feel intimidated and get a fair shot at getting the answers that they deserve. It may not be what that want to hear, but they certainly deserve to get the appropriate answers.

Lastly, just some keys to success. Some keys to success. When you get the right people in terms of civilian



19.

oversight -- let me back up. When there's consensus to have some sort of civilian oversight agency, when it's been determined what type of an agency you have or will have, when you determine who your staff will be, who your commissioners will be, training is important.

I believe that citizens, your average citizen -and we're based here, I think the DA would agree with me, on
a reasonable person concept. That's what our criminal
justice system is based on. And I would like to look at
civil oversight as based on the same concept.

If you take a reasonable individual from the community, not brought in for some political reason or with some political bent or concern, and you take that person and you provide that person with training — and I think one of the previous panelists, a gentleman who deals with training of law enforcement officers talked about a citizens' academy.

There are different ways that you can train citizens so that they can get a pretty good grasp of the police culture, the police environment in that community, the police department in particular, the sheriff's office, can understand policies, procedures well enough to make an informed judgment on an issue of whether or not too much force was used. Or on an issue of whether or not a policy is appropriate enough or inappropriate and there's a need for revision of policy or change. So training is important

there.

about just a one-time deal in terms of training the folks who will monitor police. We're talking about something that is ongoing. Involvement in a police ride-along program.

Involvement in walk-throughs of County facilities.

Understanding what is going on in the DA's Office. What the procedures are. Understanding all of that and then being in a position to impact police services or sheriff's services in a particular community.

Lastly, I'll close by saying this: Many times we talk and we hear about a "them versus us" mentality. When I switched from law enforcement as a sworn officer to civilian oversight, I had police officers come up to me and say, "Why did you change sides? What are you doing over there?" And my response was, "We're not talking about sides here.

Okay? We're talking about taking the them and the us, bringing them together, and making it a we. A community. People who are proud of their police services. People who have confidence in their law enforcement agencies. People who aren't afraid to call the police."

When I first started working in the City of Richmond, I polled the community and I got two basic responses. One was: "We're very proud of our police, they're doing a heck of a job. Give them more money. Give them what they need." The other side was: "We don't call



21.

the police because when we call the police, we wind up going to jail for something else." So it's not them and us, it's we.

citizen oversight, some people say there's a dollar sign attached to it. It depends on how valuable the community wants to make the services. I personally think I'd rather invest, as a citizen, money in a mechanism that's a good government kind of mechanism and ensures balances, checks and balances, than to pay money out on the other side on lawsuits and also deal with concerns about mistrust that might exist in the community or lack of confidence.

So therefore, I think we should hopefully kind of frame this whole debate as a good government type of concern. It's good business.

And I thank you very much for your time. And at the conclusion of the presentations by my other distinguished panelists, I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. That was very, very informative.

Penny Harrington, Director of the National Center for Women in Policing. Would you please state your name for the record and your title.

MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you, Dr. Hernandez. My name is Penny Harrington. I'm the Director of the National Center for Women in Policing, which is a division of the

Feminist Majority Foundation.

. 25

Oregon. I was the first woman chief of police in the United States of a major city. I served 23 years in Portland as a police officer. And after I left Portland, I worked for the California State Bar for seven years in the Attorney Ethics Division as the Assistant Director of Investigations in an oversight capacity on the legal profession.

And now I run the National Center for Women in Policing, which has as its goal to educate the public about the benefits of women in policing, to increase the numbers of women in policing at all levels, and to hopefully provide assistance to police agencies on better ways to respond to crimes of violence in the community.

So I was asked to speak not only about citizens' oversight but to talk to you on a couple of these other areas that I have some expertise in.

what it appears to me from what I've seen reading the newspapers and some articles and listening today to most of the testimony is that we have a real lack of communication and trust between the police and some segments of the community. Not all of the community, not all the police. But it's also not unusual.

And I think what we're seeing is a community that is going through tremendous growing pains, changing, and

trying to decide how to deal with the changing culture.

Δ

22.

One of the things that I think is very important for any police agency today is to look at utilizing more women in policing. I have testified before the U.S. Civil Rights Commission on two other occasions and presented testimony and evidence on research that shows that women do a very good job of policing.

They have a tendency to de-escalate violence; they have very good communication skills. And they tend to take crimes against women, such as domestic violence and sexual assault, much more seriously to see them through to get a better result for what happens.

The status nationally of women in policing is that police departments, municipal police agencies, the average is about 10 percent women nationwide. On sheriffs' offices, the average is about 14 percent nationwide. On state police agencies, it's only about 5 percent. And the numbers are not growing very quickly.

The only place that we see large numbers of women in policing are cities like Detroit, Chicago, New York.

Cities that have been under consent decrees. So most major cities in the United States, Los Angeles and some of those, are up around 16 or 18 percent. Cities like Detroit,

Washington, D.C., Pittsburgh, that have been under consent decrees are at 30 percent. And you know what? They're still providing good police service. They haven't fallen

apart from having a larger percentage of women.
Relationships with the community are great.

12.

All of the studies that have been done on women in policing show that women do the job just as well as men, they make as many arrests, they're just as effective. They just do policing in a different style. And sometimes that style is not seen by some of the men in policing as real police work.

It's not seen as a value to be able to go into a very tense situation and get it all calmed down. Where nobody gets hit, nobody gets shot, nobody maybe even goes to jail. That is seen as soft, not real police work. But in my opinion, that's what police work is all about, is trying to the solve problems, de-escalate violence and hopefully resolve things so that you don't have to keep going back to the same place over and over again.

I think that more women bring a balance to policing, and I think that that's one of the things that is needed in these communities here.

I heard some people earlier talking about recruiting and saying, "Well, gee; we've sent out fliers to all of these places and we hold job fairs for teens."

That's not good enough. Sending out fliers to an organization is not going to get you very much in the way of recruiting. Some of those organizations will put it in their newsletter and you might get some help.

But if you're really serious about increasing the numbers of women and minorities in communities, you have to go out and work in the communities, find those women and minorities, explain to them why you want them to join you. You have to do a sales job on that. You can't just send out a bunch of fliers and think that people are going to beat down your door. Especially if you have a reputation for being brutal, for being hostile to women, for being not a welcome place for minorities to come. So you have to really put some effort and some money into recruiting.

Job fairs for teens are great, but what are you going to with them between the time they're 18 and they're 21? You have to have a program that you can either hire them or keep them involved with your agency so that when they're old enough to be hired as police officers, they'll come on. It doesn't do a lot of good to go out to a high school, get a bunch kids all excited about policing and walk away and not talk to them for three years. You're not going to have them.

Sexual harassment policy I heard about earlier and I read it. My personal opinion, the policy is illegal. The reason I believe that that's true is that it mandates that the woman must report to the agency if she's being sexually harassed. Way at the very end of the policy, in the last paragraph or something, it says of course the woman — the person being harassed can go to the Department of Fair

Employment and Housing or EEOC and they don't have to report it to the police department. But the first page and the first page and a half are all about how you must report.

What I have seen happen in other agencies -- and I'm not saying it's happening in this one because I don't know. But what I have seen happen in other agencies with a policy that reads that way is that if a woman doesn't report and then later on something happens and someone finds out or she makes some outside complaint to EEOC, she's then brought up on charges for failing to obey the policy.

And that has been used in police departments across these United States, I get calls every day in my office about women who are facing charges because they didn't report sexual harassment under a similar policy. The truth is a woman doesn't have to report it to her agency if she doesn't want to. She can go straight outside. And I know all of you know that, but I'm saying that for the other people in the room.

On domestic violence. Domestic violence is a problem in this nation — in the world, as a matter of fact — that all of us are struggling with. It used to be that we didn't even look at it as a crime. It was considered to be a family problem and it's been only been recently with the passage of the Violence Against Women Act and some of the other things that have happened on a national level that have forced states and local agencies to

take domestic violence seriously and treat it as a crime.

Some agencies -- In fact, in San Diego,

Sgt. Ann O'Dell is known as the woman in the United States

who developed the best investigative system for domestic

violence and it's taught in police agencies across the

nation. Where you investigate it as a crime and as if the

woman weren't going to testify in court. Because frequently

she won't or can't. But you can go ahead without her

testimony anyway.

Police departments across the nation are going to that kind of training. I don't know if these police departments are using those resources that are available or not. But if they're not, they should look at that.

The real problem in domestic violence today is that police officers themselves participate in domestic violence at an extremely high rate. There have been three national studies done that show that the level of domestic violence in police families is 40 percent. 40 percent.

If that's true, and as I say it's three separate studies that have showed that -- and these were all, by the way, self-reporting studies, where the police officers themselves reported on whether or not they had used violence in their family in the last six to twelve months.

40 percent reported that they had.

If that's true, what are the chances of a woman in this community who calls the police for domestic violence

getting a batterer answering her call? Pretty high. And yet, we hear earlier testimony that says there was one, I think, police officer that was fired because he was convicted of domestic violence.

That's not unusual around the country because police officers don't get convicted of domestic violence because they don't get arrested for domestic violence because their buddies cover up for them.

And so you have to have policies in the department that say, "If you get a call on domestic violence at a police officer's house you, will report it. You will call a commander or a supervisor to the scene. It will be documented and set forward just as any other domestic violence call is handled." And that officers that are — where you receive complaints on domestic violence will be treated as any other person in the community. These complaints don't go to Internal Affairs and get buried there.

Los Angeles did a big audit earlier -- last year on 270-some cases of police domestic violence and found that hardly any of them were referred to the District Attorney's Office for prosecution. I read the synopsis. They had each case -- a synopsis of each case. Some of those the woman had been raped, brutally beaten, a pregnant woman thrown down on a table and beaten severely. And that was not handled as a crime, it was handled by Internal Affairs. In

12.

fact, it had found that 29 percent of the men on the department who committed domestic violence were promoted after they committed domestic violence.

It's a serious problem in police agencies and it plays out on the way we deal with domestic violence in the larger community, on the attitude that police officers have towards domestic violence.

officers need to be taught on excessive force besides how to defend themselves -- because none of us want our police officers getting injured. Our police officers are important to us to keep order in our communities, to protect us from people who want to do us harm. We spend a lot of money getting them trained and putting them out on the street. They're individuals, they're human beings and we care with them.

Besides teaching them how to use different weapons of force, we must teach them how to de-escalate violence, how to mediate some of these situations. Because they may have a legal right to kill and take a life, but is it always necessary is the real question.

The District Attorney says he hasn't taken any action on police officers, brought any charges against police officers. Probably because they were within their legal right to take a life. But the real question that this community has to look at was: Were they morally right in

what they did? Considering the circumstances, were there other things they could have done first, things they could have attempted before they had to get that far?

19.

on citizens' review. What are we afraid of? What is it that we're trying to hide that we want to stonewall the citizenry and not let them look at our reports, look at what we do? Why should we be afraid? If we're doing the right things, the community will support us.

I heard earlier someone talk about one advisory board that the sheriffs and the Chiefs' Association wanted to set up where every community would have members that would come forward and be on it. I hope that that's not followed through on because that's going to just separate and just fractionalize everything.

Each community needs its own citizen group to look at what the police are doing. And if you're part of a big countywide that's dealing with a whole bunch of agencies, I'm afraid individual issues in individual communities will get diluted by that.

The Grand Jury. The reason it doesn't work as a citizens' oversight group is that it's secret. The citizens can't go in and hear what's going on. Frequently, you just get the results and you don't get the reasoning and it just fosters more problems.

And so somehow we have to have a way where there's an outside review of death or serious injury that the police



have caused or have participated in. We need a review -- an outside place, a review of police family violence. Because where does a family of a police officer go to report that that police officer is brutal? Where do they go? To Internal Affairs where nothing happens? Do they go to the District Attorney who probably is a friend of the police officer involved? It's a huge problem.

We also need someplace for women who -- and anybody who feels that they're being discriminated against or harassed where they can report rather than to the very organization that is being involved in the discrimination r harassment.

oversight group can play. And on citizen panels we have to make certain, also, how are they appointed? Do the police appoint them? That's one of the things that they tried in Los Angeles and caused a huge uproar because the police were appointing people that they felt were their friends and that would say what they wanted them to say instead of appointing some of the real critics of the police departments so that they could get all of those issues out on the table.

So how are they appointed and how representative are they is very important.

And these panels should be able to ensure that complete investigations are being done on whatever the issue is, that it also -- They also should have some review over

what the District Attorney is doing. Because it's much, much too easy for the police to say, "Oh, gosh; we want to do that but the DA wouldn't prosecute." So you have to look at tying that arm of the law enforcement system into it.

And there also has to be, as a part of all of this, to make sure that there are adequate services provided to the police and to the citizens whenever you have death or serious injuries involved. I believe there should be a mandatory policy that if an officer is involved in a deadly force situation, they are immediately put an administrative leave, sent to counseling, because frequently they don't want to seek them out themselves. It's not the macho thing to do. There's a peer pressure within the department that if you go for counseling, you're seen as weak. And so I think it's up to the agency to mandate that they go for counseling.

and I also think it's up to the police department and the community to look at the services to families of people who are killed by the police. Not only by the police but in any kind of situation. Portland has put in a wonderful response team for gang violence where if a child is killed in a gang drive-by shooting or something like that, they have a response team of volunteers, ministers, police, members of the community that respond to the scene that help make funeral arrangements, that go to the school, deal with the children who are involved in knowing that

child. And it's a communitywide response to these types of serious incidents.

And last of all. We just have to have public accountability. You cannot have police agencies today that don't have public accountability and oversight. And we have to always keep in mind this is who we serve. We're not here to serve the police, we're here to serve the community.

Thank you.

21.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Mr. Parker.

MR. PARKER: Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Please state your name and affiliation for the record.

MR. PARKER: My name is John Parker. I am the Executive Officer of the of the San Diego County Citizens Law Enforcement Review Board.

The Review Board in San Diego County monitors citizen complaints against the Sheriff's Department and the Probation Department as well as Sheriff's Corrections.

There's six corrections facilities that are run by the County Sheriff as well in San Diego County.

I'll talk -- Frankly, Don really covered the full realm of civilian review, and what I'm going to do is I'm going to kind of fill in between the pages here. Let me talk a little bit about my board model because it has been billed as one of the, quote, Cadillacs of the civilian

review field.

Our board is comprised of 11 members who are appointed by supervisory districts. In other words, there are five members of the board of supervisors for the County of San Diego. Each member has two appointments to the board and then one of the five members has a third person on the board by virtue of the 11 members on this board.

We have independent investigative power, civilian staffed. I am the top civilian employee of the board. I have now an authorized strength of two investigators and a secretary for the role of receiving and investigating complaints. We have charter-mandated cooperation of all County employees, we have independent -- I'm sorry. We have subpoena power, which has been validated by the Supreme Court of the state.

It was challenged -- in fact, the entire prospect of civilian review was challenged in court in San Diego step by step. And the last piece of it was the California Supreme Court affirming our subpoena power for members of the Sheriff's Department.

Unfortunately, we don't have a sheriff who has seen fit to compel his deputies to cooperate with our process even though the charter does that. So the use of subpoena has been tried in the past and challenged and we're still in the place where we're trying to find a way of operating without having to resort to subpoenas. And that's

mainly what I've been doing down there.

1.2

22.

We have open hearings. That's essential.

Citizens have a right to know what is going on within their police department. It's essential that the hearings be open. We make public reports of our investigations and the results of those investigations.

We have authority to recommend policy changes or to recommend new policies when there is a lack of policy.

We have a mandate to review all death cases at the hands of County law enforcement and the Sheriff's Department and the Probation Department.

Civilian review has, at least in my mind, has some goals. Professional, humane policing, fully accountable to the public. Civilian review is not a place for people that are anti-police. It's also not a place for police apologists. In my view, civilian review is a necessary check and balance for the power, the great deal of power that we hand law enforcement. The power to take away a person's life, to take away their freedom.

Now, within all this, I think we also have to be respectful. We want a mandate of cooperation with these kinds of words, but we also have to be respectful of the mandated rights of police officers in performing these functions, and we don't forget that.

The benefits of civilian review. Effective civilian review partnered with response from police

management can benefit officers at all levels to enhance training. We can recommend things that — when we find a deficiency in training or equipment, civilian review can bring those things to the public.

When a law enforcement agency is struggling, how do we give weapons to our officers that are non-lethal that they're not afraid to use, that would preclude the unnecessary deaths of our citizens. And I think that civilian review can help bring those things to them. I think it's a partnership in that respect.

In my mind -- and I think Don touched on it -- the big dollar sign. Significant risk exposure reduction is a result of effective civilian review. And I think that Los Angeles County, through Merrick Bob down there has proven that there is a significant reduction in risk liability exposure when you follow officers and you deal effectively through civilian review and resulting issues of policy recommendations and follow through.

That's about all I have.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'd like to open it to the panel. Who would like to go first?

Ms. Fua.

MS. FUA: Q Let me first say that your remarks were entirely informative, and I had wished that more of the press were here as well as the chiefs to hear what you had to say because I would love to hear what their comments were

and their response to you.

. 25

And one thing that really informed your comments is that you have both been in the law enforcement field and now are reviewing it, and I totally understand that it's coming — that you guys are kind of like the culmination of we. Instead of they and us, it's we. You guys represent the we in the best sense of the theme.

But I guess my big question for all of you is:
Have there been studies conducted showing the effect of
civilian review boards on police forces, you know, both
before and then after? You know, whether it has shown that
it's really been effective.

The other thing is, you know, what would you say to these chiefs of police and other chiefs of police who are reluctant to have civilian review forces?

When you were chief of police of Oregon, did you feel like you would want, you know, somebody overlooking you? And how do we convince people that this is the right course? Because it sounds like it is because it's not an "us-them" thing; it's a partnership which seems to be effective.

MS. HARRINGTON: When I was Chief of Police in Portland, we had a citizens' review board. It was called the Police Internal Affairs Audit Committee. They had the authority to review any Internal Affairs investigation, police shootings -- I don't remember the entire mandate.

And they could send -- if they felt an investigation was incomplete, they could send it back for further investigation and outline what they felt needed to be done. They could make recommendations on policy changes.

And they reported to the city council. Each city council person appointed a member of the citizens Internal Affairs Audit Committee. And so they would make recommendations as they came up with them to the city council, but they would also make an annual report to the city council and on how many cases they reviewed and overall what they found.

When I took over as Chief of Police there had been a tremendously polarized relationship between the Citizen Audit Panel and the police department. The police department was refusing to cooperate, they were threatening to subpoena. They were in court against each other -- which is the craziest thing I ever saw.

And so when I took over, I just ordered that the department would cooperate with them totally. That if they wanted reports, they would get reports. Whatever they — that the officers would go testify, I mandated that the officers go testify. And we managed to get a very smooth working relationship.

The other thing that I also did is that we had -unfortunately, as soon as I took over as chief, we had the
death of a citizen at the hands of the police through the

18.

use of a carotid hold. I immediately suspended that, and then I set up a citizens' committee to look at the use of force and what should be allowed. What should the police be allowed to do? What types of weapons should they be allowed to use?

I found that when I would bring the citizens in and make sure that I had a diverse panel of people whose interests were really -- maybe their voices weren't heard because they were such a small segment of the community. But when you get them all together -- and I put police on these panels, and I put DAs on these panels, and I put coroners on these panels.

They would recommend far more things that the police should be allowed to do than I ever would have approved as a chief. Because they would get in, they would look at the issue, they would understand the problem, they would make reasonable recommendations.

And so I'm a big proponent as a chief of police of getting the community involved because I see it as nothing but positive. As far as studies, I know that he referred to one that Merrick Bob did. And it's an excellent study.

There are actually two that Merrick Bob did. One in the Kultz (phonetic) Commission which was set up to review the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office and their use of force. And it was a pretty wide-ranging study. And Merrick Bob is the person who goes in and reports on that

quarterly, I believe. Or it might be semiannually.

And there is no doubt that because of the changes that have been made as a result of the Kultz Commission, which was the citizens' commission that was set up to look, that the costs of excessive force lawsuits have just gone through the basement in LA County, that their procedures have been entirely changed for the better. And I know that you could take a look at that and see that that was a pretty dramatic change.

MR. CASIMERE: May I respond, too?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, please.

MR. CASIMERE: Thank you. In response to that -it's a two-part question. The measures of effectiveness,
which are clearly very important, people want to know what
they're getting for their buck in their communities. And
more importantly than that, we need to know how the civilian
oversight impacts policing.

I think John mentioned the business of public reports. It is important that there be periodic public reports to the city council to the Board of Supervisors and to the community at large, to the constituents. Those who receive police services.

In those public reports, there are certain things that you can measure. Citizens' complaints filed, dispositions of those complaints, numbers of police policies reviewed, policy recommendations made, implemented. We even

wanted to take it a step further, as we're preparing our annual report, we wanted to track complaints and we wanted to take a complaint and say: Yes, it was filed. In this case, it was substantiated. Yes, a recommendation was made to the police chief. Here's what the police chief did with it. And then it goes to the city manager. What did the city manager do with it? If it's a policy concern, it goes to the city council and here's what they did with it. And there you can track what happened with a particular complaint.

· 13

19.

It is important, too, I think, to document not only disciplinary recommendations or policy recommendations but the number of times you conduct investigations and it results in an officer or officers being trained or counseled or called in and dealt with in that regard. I think that those are important.

The number of claims filed. The number of claims paid out. How much is paid out? I think if you track those types of issues, you will see that in most communities, there is a definite impact.

And then how you measure the community and its respect or confidence in the police department. We measure it because the big concern is community policing. Our community policing program is a success. It's a success because the city council is pleased with it, the community is pleased with it, the police department is pleased with

it. Everybody likes it.

So how do you measure if you impact a strategy or put a strategy into place that brings the police department and the various communities closer together? It is a way that you can kind of look and see whether or not there is effectiveness.

The second part of that question, if I can just briefly address that talks about what do you say to police chiefs? And I have addressed public forums across the country; and many times you'll have police chiefs that have this or that concern. Chief Harrington made the comment that alluded to it. You tell them, "Don't be afraid of this thing. If it looks like there's going to be debate in your community about civilian oversight or accountability mechanisms, don't line up the troops and prepare to ward off any kind of an attack. Don't look it at as an attack. Look at it as an opportunity to improve police services in the community."

And one of the things that I do is when I can, I like to take my police chief along or at least have him make some comment about how it is to work in a cooperative, true partnership fashion with the community groups. And I think that if we do that, we can arrive where we want to.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. Commissioner Lee.

MS. LEE: Chief Harrington, I was struck by your comment of a legally justified but morally wrong use of

2.2

excessive force.

In earlier panels, the police chief has mentioned it was up to the officers to determine the level of force he or she could use. And you also mentioned female officers tend to have a better ability to de-escalate dangerous situations.

Since it's going to take them awhile to get more female officers in the force and we're still dealing with 80-plus percent of male officers in this force, do you think it's possible to train current officers to be a little bit — to be a lot more sensitive in dealing with these situations in terms of use of force?

MS. HARRINGTON: 'Yes, I do. And if the chief or sheriff or whoever is doing it is sincere and absolutely committed to doing this, then it will. If it's lip service, it's not going to work. They'll go sit through the training, they'll complain about the training, they'll leave and keep doing what they've been doing.

But, frequently, if you can train your officers -I heard somebody here today on the panel, I don't know who
it was, say something about we have a continuum of use of
force and most police agencies have this in their manuals.
And it starts out with verbal force and then it escalates
all the way up to firearms.

And I heard them say the first thing you do is say in a very loud voice, you know, "Stop what you're doing."

Sometimes you can speak in a very soft voice and calm everything down and then you can -- and that doesn't mean you lose control.

And it's just a matter of training to teach them how to use these various techniques. Businesses across the nation pay big money to send their people to classes on mediation because they know that if they can do that not only for labor negotiations but for negotiating business deals and all that, it's the same thing in policing.

You get out to the scene, you have two or three people screaming, carrying on and all that. The first thing you want to do is try to calm everybody down and find out what's going on before you do anything.

Yes, I definitely think that can be taught.

There's always going to be those situations where a police officer responds, you get there, somebody pulls a gun and it's over. That's going to happen.

But I think in a lot of instances — I tried to read all of the press reports on the shootings up in this area. And who knows how accurate any of it is. It's hard to say. You can read what one side says and what the other side says. But I think that there were some opportunities there in some of those situations where some things could have been tried to de-escalate the situation instead of immediately resorting to deadly force.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Buitrago and then Mr. Carney.

2İ

MS. BUITRAGO: Kind of related to the question that Commissioner Lee just asked is whether a mental response team might also be helpful? Because that's what San Francisco actually does in some instances with certain kinds of calls. You can read into that call what may be happening and maybe with that kind of call, you can send in a mental health response team to accompany the police.

Obviously, there may also be circumstances where that's not possible, but I'm wondering whether could be an alternative that might work.

MS. HARRINGTON: Yes, I am absolutely a supporter of that. I started that in Portland when I was there. We had a situation where we had a person who was mentally unstable and it wound up that the police killed him and it was justified. Was it necessary? Probably not.

And so as a result of that, we got a panel of mental health practitioners together and did a lot of brainstorming over what could the police do to better handle these kinds of situations? And we came up with a mental health response team.

Again, they were all volunteers but there were a enough of them around so that there was always somebody there. So that if a call came out and it sounded like one of those kinds of calls where you could use them. They would respond to the scene, also. They would stay back until the police were sure\_it was safe for them to be there,

there wasn't going to be shooting. But then they would immediately step in and help take over.

Another thing that we found quite successful was what we called a Volunteer Chaplains Corps we're we had religious figures from all different religions across the city who would respond with the police officer on domestic violence calls.

And when the police officers would leave, the chaplains would stay and see if they could do something to help. You could get, you know, counseling if that's what was needed. Get the woman to a shelter. Whatever had to happen. That was a tremendously successful program, also.

So, yes, I do believe that there is a place. And even in a small community, even if you don't have the budget for you it, I think you probably have enough volunteer resources to provide those kinds of services.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Carney.

MR. CARNEY: Thank you.

Well, I join my colleague in indicating to you that I find your remarks incredibly refreshing and your suggestions to be equally refreshing.

As I was listening to all of you speak regarding your particular positions, current positions, I was thinking back to when I was a little kid back in a small New England town where we had the typical Irish cop with the big brass buttons on his blue jacket and -- Mike Murphy was his



22.

name -- and everybody knew him. He was a friend. And I'm sitting here saying to myself, as Mr. Casimere said, it's the "we" -- it should be the "we," not "them and us."

Where have we departed from the police officer being a member of the community and being our friend and not the enemy? And I think the communication, as in any kind of a relationship, communication is an absent element here.

And we can have community forums -- and I'm going to address two questions to you folks. And whoever wants to answer, may do so. In community forums, who do you get? You get the people that are activists. You get the people that are willing to participate. You don't reach out to the people who are kind of the laybacks, the laissez-faire type individuals. You obviously don't get the criminals.

And how do you -- What do you suggest to reach more of the community through those types of channels of communication?

and then the other question I have, and I guess I would direct it more towards Ms. Harrington involving the police domestic violence situations. Do you feel that in a community as Sonoma County, probably could be considered as a community, being a small county, that an agency other than the District Attorney should be involved because of the uniqueness, of its closeness, if you will in prosecuting police officers for domestic violence?

Again, the deputies, I think it's like 36 deputies

are prosecuting cases in the criminal court and they're dealing with these police officers on a fairly regular basis. They become friendly with them. They're almost pals, so to speak. So it becomes a difficult choice for them to prosecute -- even to file and then to further prosecute.

And my question is: Do you have any suggestions as to how to overcome that type of situation that may exist? And then is there any type of implementation, if you will, to secure insurance for the follow-up of the police officers who have been convicted and now can no longer carry a firearm? What suggestions do you have to see that that is being carried through?

MS. HARRINGTON: On the police domestic violence situation, I think there needs to be some type of a coalition within every community of the police department, the District Attorney's Office, and the domestic violence advocates in the community where -- The very biggest problem we have in the police family violence is getting any of the victims to come forward because they're terrified because their husbands or -- and I say husband' because 90 percent of the domestic violence is the husband against the wife and not vice versa.

But the spouse says, "Nobody is going to believe you. It's my buddy that is going to investigate this in Internal Affairs. If you do this I'm going to lose my job



.25

and then you're really going to be in trouble. And besides the DA is a buddy of mine. Have you ever seen a police officer be arrested for domestic violence?" You know, that kind of thing.

So even getting to -- to find the victims is a really serious problem. And the only place that I noticed they has done any kind of outreach is Chicago. Chicago has what they call an Office of Professional Standards, which is all civilian. It's their Internal Affairs Department, except there are no -- the civilians run it. A woman named Gail Shines is in charge of it.

And they set up a special unit. Of course, they're a huge department. They set up a special unit within the Office of Professional Standards that just does police family violence cases.

They sent letters out to the families of police officers and said, "Look, we understand this is a problem. We assure you, if you come forward, we'll do everything we can to help you solve these problems." They do training among the police officers. They do training in the academy with the spouses.

They do take -- they don't take enough cases forward, in my opinion. I think that they try to do a lot through counseling and that kind of thing rather than actually prosecute. And I've talked to them about that.

But at least they're doing something to reach out to the

families and try and get those women to come forward and file complaints.

The other problem that we see in police family violence is frequently the police officers do not live in the community that they police, which is another reason why they become estranged from the community, because they don't even live in that community.

So maybe in this example, you have a Santa Rosa police officer that lives in the county. And so when the call on domestic violence comes out, it's a County deputy that responds, it's not a Santa Rosa cop. And so maybe the Santa Rosa Police Department doesn't find out through any official channels that their police officer has been arrested or that there have been calls to the home on domestic violence.

Baltimore, Maryland has gone to the point where they have cooperative agreements between all of the law enforcement agencies within the county and now they're trying to spread out to the state. They're trying to make it a state law. That is, a police officer is the subject of a domestic violence call, that that department must report it to the department where that person works. Plus having the mandatory arrest.

So there are a lot of different -- The

International Association of Chiefs of Police is coming out
model policy on police family violence that includes

mandatory reporting, mandatory arrest, this kind of thing.

So far as I know, nobody does anything with police officers that get convicted of domestic violence except fire them. I haven't seen agencies try to make special positions for them to put them into some civilian mode.

On the other question that you had on the -- you had a question on coalitions?

MR. CARNEY: The community forums. How do we get more involvement?

MS. HARRINGTON: How do we get more involvement?

These communities here are small enough that it should be not that difficult to reach out and identify the segments of the community that maybe aren't being heard.

In my experience in Portland, I serviced a community of about half a million people. And we had precincts and each precinct commander had what was called a Citizen Advisory Panel. And that panel -- Portland is kind of unique because it's set up on neighborhood lines and they act -- the whole city responds to things based on neighborhoods.

And so every year they do a survey of this -- they mail it out to your home. If you live in the City of Portland, you get a survey mailed to you asking you a million questions about city services. And among them are how do you rate the police? Did you call for police service? Were you satisfied with the service? What were

the bad things? Those kinds of things.

But beyond -- So that's one way, is doing some kind of a mail survey. But the other way is that each precinct commander had for the neighborhoods in their precinct, that neighborhood would appoint one or two people to come in and be a part of a Neighborhood Advisory Committee that would usually meet once a month at the police station and talk about whatever the issues were in that neighborhood going on at that time.

But we also made them expand it and not just do neighborhoods. He made them put youth representatives on, representatives of the elder, representatives of the gay and lesbian community and to make sure that they were racially diverse.

and it was -- as a precinct commander, I thought it was a wonderful tool because I always knew what was going on out there. I knew where my officers were doing really good work, I knew where they were kind of falling down. I knew what the community wanted my priorities to be. I may have thought that the big problem was burglary and they may have thought it was car theft.

And so it was a good tool to me. And I think that once the police agencies start doing this, they will realize it's a benefit not a problem.

MR. CARNEY: Do you think there are ways of, say, implementing more in the neighborhood contact? Not by just

the police on the street but I mean by the administrators?

At the break I was talking to the sheriff about what do you do to talk and communicate with the deputies on the streets? And he's indicated a program that he just instituted where the supervisors are going to work with the deputies every so often and — because he has a fairly small department, they can do that.

Do you think that there are ways that can be practically implemented where the administrators as well as the police on the street get to the community and talk with them and become friends?

I mean, that's -- it's a communication issue. And I think that's really where we're coming from, even involving the shootings. People appear to me, from what I've read and what I've heard today, it appears to me that there is that distrust, there is that secret situation going on that they feel left out of something. There's something missing.

And we here sit and listen and read these documents, and we try to formulate an opinion about what's going on. And we've talked about some of the things that we read before this hearing. And we say, "Well, why is there a gap here? What's missing?"

And, again, I think it's a communication -- it seems to me to be a communication gap. And that's what I'm looking to see what there could be to get more of the

community involved, to get that "we" business, as

Mr. Casimere stated it, back into, focus back into reality.

MR. CASIMERE: I'd like to make a couple of comments in response to yours, sir. And that would be this. I think that we have to be concerned about getting the word out to people in the community about how they can impact policing if there's a concern or a question or whatever.

When the District Attorney was here earlier, he talked about a process, a house process, that was established. But a house process -- and this is no slight to him or anyone else -- but a house process is no good unless people understand out on the street who can use it how it works.

What we try to do in our community is we look at who's coming in to file complaints? Who is coming in with the concern? Then we try to target certain groups. Yes, we try to hit the whole community with our message, but we do try to target certain groups.

Let me give you an example. I, as the head of our staff office, do a lot of public outreach. And I'll go anywhere and talk about police accountability. And I don't mind doing it. But there's one thing to go to the Sons in Retirement and talk to them about how to file a complaint or what some of these issues are, or to the Lions Club as opposed to going down to the familia, house, in the Hispanic

area of town or the Laotion organizational meetings in the Laotian communities or to the neighborhood house in North Richmond where these are people that are out there dealing with what's going on in the street. You have to reach them. Those people that are disenfranchised or feel that nobody wants to hear what I have to say anyway have to be reached.

This thing is all about communication. You cannot underscore the importance of communication of people in the community knowing what the limits are.

Here's another thing that civilian oversight can do. People need to know what when the limits of law enforcement officers are. What they can do. What they can't do. They need to know what their rights are. What's appropriate and what's not.

I go into the YMCA and talk to young people or the neighborhood houses in Richmond and people ask me, "Well, this cop stopped me. What should we have done?" So we do a whole session on "Listen, if the police officer stops you, here's what the officer has the right to do. And we're not encouraging you to do this or that, but here's what you should probably respond by doing. If an officer asks you to show your hands, or whatever, show him. I mean, here's the reason why."

So I think it is important to identify those areas where people feel disenfranchised, draw them into the

process. As you indicated, it does you no good to have a community forum when you've only got those people that are jumping up and down and will always jump and down -- I'm from Berkeley, by the way. And those people that will not attend those meetings.

So whatever we can do to bring them in and make them part of the process, that's what it about.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I have one question.

It hasn't been addressed and it's come up a couple of times here today. And that is that it's been interesting that all of you that have been involved with civilian police review boards.

What's the role of the media in all of this? We haven't addressed that one. And I see a smile on your faces. What's the role of the media in all of this? Do they have a role to play in any of this? Is there something that needs to be kept in mind by members of the community and police departments?

MR. PARKER: Let me go first. I've had some experience. I've also been the Officer Murphy that you talked about for 22 years in Oakland and it didn't work. There's no control over that anymore. Officer Murphy didn't look like his community and that's why it's changed.

To answer your question, the media can sink or promote this into a very successful existence. In San Francisco you have a very community-oriented media

1.8

that's followed issues within the community and the various communities within San Francisco, I should add. And never let an issue go until it was resolved by somebody. Some official had to resolve that issue before the media was going to let go. They were like the junkyard dog that wouldn't let go of your pants leg.

In San Diego the media is somewhat different. And without chastising them, they're a more conservative media that is unwilling to speak ill of the County Sheriff or the County law enforcement. They're unwilling to take those kinds of issues on. And as a result, you have a problem of civilian review sort of struggling. And which is one of the reasons why I went down there, was to try to create a new life for the civilian reviews in the County of San Diego.

So the media plays an important role. It's whether they report accurately incidents and then the follow-up of those incidents.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Anybody else have a comment on that?

MR. CASIMERE: Media obviously plays an important role. But I think in civilian oversight, many times the media, since you are from the civilian oversight point of view and not the police, they want you to give everything. What's going on? Open up the process completely.

And I think one of the concerns is that you want to release information that shows that, yes, the

investigation is taking place, it's objective, it's fair, it's open. But you also have to be mindful, particularly in this state; there's a thing called AB-301, Assembly bill, Peace Officers Bill of Rights. And there are certain things that cannot be released and can be.

But I think it is important that people want more than just putting a complaint into a process, sitting back, not hearing anything for months, and then waiting for a letter to come in the mail. You know what I'm talking about?

I think there is a need to be as open as possible.

But, again, being concerned about those rights and responsibilities that police officers have.

I have never, in all of my years as a civilian oversight, come across a police association or union or sheriffs' union that supports civilian oversight. And you better believe me. If there is a slip in the media of information that is released that should not be, that it is deemed confidential or the identity of an officer is put forth and it should not be because that information is prohibited to go out, you're going to hear from your association.

And not only are you going to hear from them, it's going to damage your ability to have an ongoing professional relationship in the future.

So I would say this: The media is definitely

important. They can be critically important in getting the information out, the word out, the outreach portion in terms of organizing community forums and so forth. But there are limits that have to be spelled out as well.

MR. CARNEY: In Los Angeles, they had that bank episode with the body armor, et cetera. And recently, they had a -- the community in the immediate area of the bank had what they called a kind of a graduated block party for the police officers involved and to show their appreciation. And I happened to -- at the time I was looking at the news accounts of that and I thought it was a pretty neat deal.

And I also thought to myself, "Why don't the police reach out and have a similar kind of a situation in those neighborhoods," as Mr. Casimere has pointed out, the areas of need are those that seem to be in need, if you will.

I realize there's a cost factor involved. But the community can get involved by getting — And, again, this is just an off the top of my head kind of thing. The community can get involved by the merchants participating in something like that. And, again, getting the communication with the community, the police officers and the citizenry. And that being the citizens that don't participate in these kinds of programs.

MS. HARRINGTON: \_It doesn't cost a whole lot to do

citizen outreach. It really doesn't. It just takes a little bit of your time. And an example I'd like to give you is when we first had a lot of the Vietnamese and Laotian and Cambodian people coming to the United States, most of them that came couldn't speak English and they were terrified of the police because in their countries the police killed you. They'd take you away and you'd never be seen again.

19.

And we were hearing that there were a whole bunch of home robberies that were taking place in one of these communities in Portland. And yet, no one was complaining. But we kept hearing it, sort of through this grapevine.

So finally -- We thought we had established some pretty good relationships with some of the leaders in the different Asian communities. And we went back out to them and said, "We keep hearing this, but we can't get people to talk to us." And they said, "We know. They hate you."

They're terrified of you, they're not going to talk to you."

And I said, "What can we do? How can we get them to come into the police department talk to us and tell us what's going on? They're being victimized; we want to help." And they said, "Have an open house." I said, "Oh, that's crazy. This is just a police department. It's just offices. What am I going to show them? There's nothing here." And he said, "That's what they have to see. They have to see that there are no cages that you put people in,

· 25

that you never let them out. They have to see that there's just ordinary people working there.

so we did. We went out to the merchants, we asked them to give us a little bit of money to buy some food. They did. They catered some hors d'oeuvres and things and we invited people in. We made sure we had plenty of interpreters there and we kept them in very small groups of about five or six people and gave them a tour of the police department.

And, all of a sudden, that was all it look. We started getting all of these reports in then of what was going on. We were able to go out and arrest the gang that was doing it.

It doesn't cost anything. It just takes the willingness and the desire to go out and build these bridges and build these relationships and you can do it. It's nothing magic.

MR. CARNEY: Is there any type --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Carney -- I hate to interrupt -- Okay, make it short.

MR. CARNEY: Is there any type of state program available to further your particular pursuits, if you will?

MS. HARRINGTON: Through the Bureau of Justice
Assistance, there are all kinds of federal funds that are
available. For example, on the domestic violence, under the
Violence Against Women Act, there is a Violence Against

Women Grants Office that gives quite a bit of money to local areas that want to develop community-coordinated programs.

Anybody that wants to develop a community-coordinated program in law enforcement is going to be able to find some grant money to do it. Either under the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Violence Against Women, the Victims of Crime Groups. It's out there.

And so, as I say, I don't think it takes a lot of money. But there's also technical assistance available. The COPS Program, which is the Community Oriented Policing Services got billions of dollars from Congress to put the extra cops on the street. But they also got millions of dollars in training and technical assistance moneys. So all you'd have to do is make a phone all back there and they could send people out that could help start training right away.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Final question to Commissioner Reynoso.

MR. REYNOSO: You have read some of the materials and heard some of the testimony previously to your panel. And I don't -- I hope that I'm not calling on you to be presumptuous in asking you my question but at least preliminarily what recommendations would you have to this community in terms of the process? Because I was interested in the notion that this has to be a community discussion even if you're thinking of having an independent review

board or authority.

So I just wonder, based on what you've heard today and what you've read before here or read have today, what recommendations would you have for the 11 police departments and the governing bodies and, of course, the concerned citizens?

MR. CASIMERE: I'll go ahead and initiate that response and I'll say this. It is clear that there is a need for ongoing and open ways of communication for all of the communities that are involved. Anytime there are folks in the community that feel that there's a problem with the police department or sheriff's department they cannot resolve and feel that the sheriff's department or police department does not want to hear what you're trying to say, then you have a problem. And it's a problem that has to be overcome.

Secondly, I think it's one of training. Once you establish avenues of communication, you sit down and talk, you might be intimidated but willing to express ideas, then it's one of training folks involved. And you can talk about the community that needs to be trained, if you will, in terms of what limits and some of the mystique surrounding police are. And there are the police officers that need to be trained.

One area that immediately comes to mind, based on some of the news accounts that I have read about incidents

up here is that there is a need for officers to be trained on ranges of options in a given situation.

And I think Chief Harrington adequately hit upon it earlier, but I would be remiss if I didn't make one comment about it. And that is to say that what is justified for an officer to do legally may not be the most appropriate action. And one inappropriate action, although it's justified and although the DA can't file charges, can inflame a community or set you back months or years in your community relations aspects.

so the comment would be or my response would be communication and then training. Let your police officers know, yes, you might be in a position where you're justified to pull out a gun and shoot. But once that trigger is squeezed and that bullet goes off and hits its target, you can't change what has happened. And that can really set you back.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'd like to thank the panel. This has been one of the most informative aspects of the entire hearing. It has really added, I think, one of the finishing touches. And I can't tell you how much we all appreciate it. I know that everybody on the panel really enjoyed this part.

And we wish you a very successful continued experience in all of the things that you do and thank you again very much.



I'm going to take a break for five minutes. We'll clear the room to get the next group of people and then we will have our public comment.

MR. MONTEZ: The public comment is the next step they have them downstairs.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. So the people that are going to be making public comments will be invited up. So we'll take a five-minute break.

(Break taken at 4:15 p.m. until 4:30 p.m.)

MR. HERNANDEZ: All right. I'm going to reconvene the meeting.

The way we're going to do this is I'm going to call people who want to give their input to the open session in groups of 10. Now, I've asked the Highway Patrol to let as many people as we can possibly accommodate, using standing room only, into this part of the hearing. And then I'm going to call people in groups of ten.

The people that are going to be giving testimony will be asked to limit their remarks to one minute. Now, I understand that that's not a whole lot of time but you can submit for the record written responses.

The record will stay open for 30 days. So if you feel you haven't had your say, then you can write the rest of what you have to say and we will put it in the record.

The other thing that I want to caution all of the speakers on is the defame and degrade issues. The panel

will not tolerate anybody being vilified or insulted or called names or defamed and degraded in any way.

I want you to speak directly to the issues without getting into personalities and name-calling and that kind of stuff. Anybody who starts any of that kind of stuff, I'm going to have the mike shut down and I'll have you removed.

So those are the ground rules. We just want to keep a sense of decorum in the hearing. There will be no questions from the panel. We want just the final input.

There are 60 people that are waiting to make statements. At a minute apiece, that's about 60 minutes. And so I'm going to ask you to forgive me. When I tell you your minute is up, it's up. And we're going to move on.

So I appreciate, your cooperation.

I have the rabbi here and then the following people I'd like them to come forward and be admitted Anthony Ferrari, James Carlson, Jaime Gutierrez, Eric Goldschlag, Mary Moore, Ken Davenport, Todd Mendoza, Patrick Figari, William P. Adams, and Darlene Grainger.

Rabbi, your minute starts now.

RABBI MICHAEL ROBINSON: I'm Rabbi Michael
Robinson, Rabbi Emeritus, Temple Shomrei Torah in
Santa Rosa, five years president of Sonoma County Task Force
on the Homeless.

I'm here because I've been disturbed by the violence in Sonoma County since I moved here nine years ago,

disturbed by the driveway shootings, by the high speed police chases, disturbed by the atmosphere of distrust in this county, disturbed by the eight police shootings between January of '96 and November of '97.

I am not reassured by in-house reviews by the District Attorney, the sheriff oversight of the police department and vice versa.

I am disturbed by the necessity for these hearings that we have here today that were absolutely mandatory to this community. I'm glad it's taking place. I'm disturbed the police department feels so defensive and has to. I'm disturbed by the polarization. I walked in here, somebody gave me a ribbon. I had it on. I saw other people with yellow badges. I asked for a yellow badge, I couldn't get one.

I don't like to see the room divided by the yellow badges and the ribbons. I don't like this kind of polarization.

I think that there is an absolute demonstration of the need for an independent civilian police review board to stand by and support the police, to reassure the police.

Independent, affirmative to reassure the community that there is true oversight of the police to work together on policy and to improve relationships between the police and the community.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. Very well

said.

. 12

RABBI ROBINSON: I have something here -MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, you can submit the statement.
Could you state your name for the record.

JAMES CARLSON: James Carlson. I have two points to make. I can't possibly cover what I wanted in one minute but I will state two things.

One is that it's clear to me that it is obvious that everyone has missed the point about who is at fault in these violent acts. People are refusing to disarm and refusing to comply with the commands of the police, forcing us into these situations in self-defense.

The other thing I would like to state for the record is if there eight dead police officers as a result of these incidents, there would be no hearings today. Thank you very much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Jaime Gutierrez? Is he here?
You're next.

JAIME GUTIERREZ: Good afternoon, Commission.

It's unfortunate that you have to be here for this reason,

Honorable Cruz Reynoso.

I'm with the Salomon Hernandez Justice Committee, and I just wanted to say that the police report was very extremely biased in this case. The character witness was diagnosed with schizophrenia. Not in any of the -- There was a surveillance camera at the police station. Not at any

time was this film subpoenaed by the police department or asked for it.

The press made Mr. Salomon Hernandez out as a violent person, a bad person. An illegal alien.

Mrs. Hernandez was taped without her permission and information was obscured and they took information as they selected it. We can go on and on about Mr. Hernandez's case.

The one witness that was there has been intimidated into exclusion. He's in hiding right now because he's scared for his life. They were rattling his cage a month after -- you know, for a whole month after the killing.

But my big question here today is why was the hearing being held during working and school hours when the community, our working class community, could not be here? Why is the Mexicano Chicano popular community not represented her on any of the community panels?

And I would ask that this Commission make a real effort to hear the Mexican Chicano community's grievances about police enforcement abuses, preferably in their communities. For example --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Time. I'm sorry, but I'm going to have to leave it at that. So go ahead and make the last statement.

MR. GUTIERREZ: That would be Roseland, Graton,

**)** 

Windsor, at Our Lady Guadalupe, and Sonoma, as well as Healdsburg and the small barrios throughout Sonoma County which is predominantly agriculture.

MR. REYNOSO: Just a reminder that, unfortunately, the Chair is limiting remarks to just one minute because we have 60 people. But please submit your full remarks. I notice you had them written out for the record. Okay?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Your full remarks can get into the record and will be part of the record.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay Mr. Eric Goldschlag. Is Mr. Goldschlag here?

MR. CARNEY: The address is on the board right up here behind us.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Right behind -- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; 3660 Wilshire Boulevard; Suite 810; Los Angeles, California; 90010. And there's the phone number; 213-894-3437.

Mr. Goldschlag.

ERIC GOLDSCHLAG: My name is Eric Goldschlag.

I've been a police officer 11 years, nine of which with the Santa Rosa Police Department.

February 15th, 1997, a tragic event occurred which changed my life forever. I was investigating and incident and spoke with a gas station attendant who told me the person had threatened him with a screwdriver. Spoke with that person, Mr. Hernandez, who denied threatening the

attendant. He denied having a screwdriver.

I asked Mr. Hernandez to take his hands out of his pocket. (Three bangs on table with hand.) The sound of the first snap represents me asking Mr. Hernandez to take his hands out of his pocket.

The time between the first snap and the second snap was how long it took for Mr. Hernandez to remove his hand from his pocket and strike me in the head as hard as he could with pointed end of the screw driver.

The time between the second snap and the third snap is how long it took me to realize Mr. Hernandez was trying to kill me. That he poised and was threatening and was ready to strike me again in the head. I was forced by Mr. Hernandez's actions to defend myself.

On the way from me being rushed to the hospital to treat my severe injuries, I telephoned my loved ones, including my mom, who is here today, to tell her that I would be okay, that I would be coming home at the end of my shift, as I had promised her.

I don't understand why were Mr. Hernandez felt it was necessary to try and kill me. I don't understand why he didn't think about the consequences of his actions before he committed them. I don't understand why Mr. Hernandez didn't think about his children and his wife before acting so violently against me. I don't understand why he didn't think about my loved ones before trying to kill me.

And, again, I'm trying to edit what I wanted to speak about.

7.

I've been accused by a few people of provoking this incident, of overreacting, of being racist and of violating Mr. Hernandez's civil rights. What about my rights? Mr. Hernandez violated my civil rights when he criminally attacked me with a screwdriver and used it as a deadly weapon.

Sergeant Carlson's civil rights were violated when was criminally attacked with a metal club. Officer Stevens' civil rights were violated when he was criminally attacked with a metal pipe. Officer Shields' civil rights were violated when he was criminally attacked with a staff. Officer Wojcik's civil rights were violated when we was attacked with a gun.

I hope these violent acts being committed against our law enforcement community end soon. I hope these spouses, children, families and friends of the law enforcement officers, some of which you see here today, will some day be able to sleep easier at night knowing we are safer in this community.

We all want to work together within our community to make this county a better place to live and a better place to raise our children.

Thank you for your time today and thank you for everyone for coming here and showing this panel your

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

interest in this matter.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Mary Moore.

MARY MOORE: My name is Mary Moore and I'm very conflicted now about what to talk to because I've been working for the Salomon Hernandez Committee for quite some time and, believe me, there is another side to the story that you just heard. This man also was responsible for killing in 1989, the man that just spoke to you.

I want to give up my minute and submit something to you in writing. I came here prepared to deal with the alleged gang situations here which I could tell you a lot about. But I'm, instead, going to use my minute because I want to respond.

And I was in the back, I could not see who said that -- something about how to get the community more involved. I want you all to know you've been up here in this room all day. The community has been downstairs, standing in line, trying to get into this room. And I need to let you know that we tried when we first knew that we were going to be doing this, we tried to get the venue changed. Because we live in the community; the person who made these arrangements does not.

We wanted to have it at the Vet's Building, where there was space, where they was parking, where people could

get in and be heard. Instead, people have been insulted. We have had nothing but a police state downstairs and a near rebellion a lot of people have gone home in disgust because they couldn't get in.

The other thing is we were told -- I'm one of the organizers of this event. We were told that we would have until -- you would stay until we needed to go. There's so much in this community, so many people that want to be heard. We were told you would stay and that this has happened in other communities and that you have stayed to listen. When we got here this morning we were told it is going to be cut off at 5:30. Now we have one minute. You can't say a lot in one minute.

I just think if you want the community involved, you've got to quit insulting them. Even today, it was stacked by the people with the yellow buttons, and you must all know that by now. They all got word to stand by the elevator and to come up in the elevator and then they would not leave after the two hours when we were supposed to be rotated in.

For me, I've been in the lobby all day and that's where the real stuff has been happening. And I'm sorry that you have been up here. I think there have been some good people on the panels, but I wish you could have been in the lobby and heard and seen what I've seen today. There is so much going in Sonoma County; and now you in one minute, I'm



supposed to try to respond to all of this. I can't do it can't be done, none you of. And I talk fast.

So what I need to say to you, and this will be my closing thing, is I do feel that the problems go much deeper than just a citizens' review board. I don't think that's going to do it. Especially, if it's controlled by the government. That's part of the problem.

When we start dealing with the issues of class and race, maybe we will get somewhere. But until class and race and -- and, you know, we hear a lot about race, but when class is dealt with, then we will get somewhere.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Please. I'd like the audience not to participate in that manner, please. This is not --

A VOICE: Why not? Why not?

MR. HERNANDEZ: This is not an advocacy procedure. This is a hearing.

A VOICE: I think it is.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, that's the rules. If you want to remain here, then you're going to follow the rules. And that's all there is to it.

All right. Next, Ken Davenport.

KEN DAVENPORT: Good afternoon. My name is Ken Davenport. A little over a year ago, the Santa Rosa paper carried an article that the Santa Rosa Police Department was beginning a Citizens' Police Academy. This academy was

opened to residents who worked or lived in Santa Rosa. The purpose of the academy was to help citizens obtain a better understanding of how law enforcement works. I applied and was accepted into this 12-week academy.

We had a number of subjects, beginning with the history of law enforcement, community policing, diversity, narcotics, gangs, explosives and many more. All of these classes were taught by officers at the Santa Rosa Police Department. The program was extremely formative and well accepted by the citizens who participated.

Not only did we learn a lot about law enforcement, we were able to get to know some of the men and women of the Santa Rosa Police Department. I can tell you by observing the officers who were instructors in the Santa Rosa Citizens Police Academy, these are profession, competent, dedicated men and women. They work, they live in our community. They worship, they educate their children in our community and in our schools. And they are a part of the Sonoma County community.

Since the graduation from the police academy, I've also been serving as a volunteer with the Santa Rosa Police Department. I don't personally know any other law enforcement personnel in Sonoma County, but I can tell you that if they are the caliber of the Santa Rosa Police Department, we indeed are fortunate in Sonoma County to have such a talented and dedicated men and women in law

enforcement.

.12

Thank you very much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll call forward Anthony Ferrari.

ANTHONY FERRARI: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Anthony Ferrari, I'm a resident of Rohnert Park. I grew up in South Central LA and East LA, not too far from where Mr. Reynoso lived in Whittier. "Peco Nuevo," as we called it on the streets.

This part -- Sonoma County is the best place in California to live because I have lived in areas where -- I have six daughters. And I have lived in areas where I have been in fear of my life and the safety of my family. And it's rough. You people that maybe have been down to South Central LA, I lived at 43rd and Gramercy, know what it's like to be able to step out on the streets, and you worry about especially the women. This is about as good as it gets. This is the best place in California and that's why I moved here from Los Angeles.

I wanted to talk about my neighbor that was killed about a year ago. And my children go to school with his children. And there was -- unfortunately there was more behind the scenes that has come out in the newspapers as to what his personal life was like. There was a crying out to the community for help by members of his family. And I have not read about that in the newspaper, but we in the

neighborhood knew about it.

I thank you for your time. I understand everybody is from everywhere in California. And like I say, my work takes me all over the state. Even now, I've been in everybody's neighborhood. So believe me, I know the State of California very well. This is the best.

And these policemen here are much more conservative than what I would find say, like, in some of the southern -- some of the areas that are very rough. But at least it's safe at night for my wife to go the store with my children. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Mr. Todd Mendoza.

TODD MENDOZA: Hello members of the Commission.

My name as Todd Mendoza and I've been a resident of Sonoma

County for over 35 years, a resident of the southwest area

of Santa Rosa, which is probably the most culturally diverse

area in Sonoma County.

I represent Southwest Area Citizens Group who are kind of like a liaison for the area to get the voice out. We've dealt with the neighborhood community policing and have had the Sheriff's Department work alongside us, our group. They've been on our board. They've created many partnerships in that area. With the annexation from city — from county to city, they created a real smooth transition for us and have asked to be educated and have educated us.

2İ

.23

We have numerous community groups there and they all -- the sheriff and the police department seem to be there at those meetings. So with the help of the Sheriff's Department, they have created a nighttime hoops, basketball, in our community. And now with the support of the Santa Rosa Police Department, have also been involved -- we knew the officers as Steve Thomas and Steve Nick, Sergeant LeGrow.

They're there. They're in our community on a regular basis. So I really support them and they're already out there. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Mr. Patrick Figari. Is Mr. Figari here?

I'll go to the next person. Mr. William P.

Adams. Is Mr. Adams here?

Mr. Adams.

william P. Adams: I'm so disappointed and upset and disgusted. I talked to Dr. Hernandez earlier. This is the worst planned, the very worst planned hearing that I have ever attended as far as getting the people in here. This is awful. There are at least six churches in this town who will seat a thousand. Or more. There's a Veteran's Building. There's the Burbank Center, which will seat 1250 people or better. This is inexcusable. Absolutely inexcusable.

This hearing should be repeated. So that the

21.

people can hear and be heard. There should be time, more than one minute. I appreciate the fact that you're keeping the record open because I'll have some more remarks to make. Many of the remarks that have been made are a good part of what I would have said anyway.

But I live in Rohnert Park. And any one of us here could have told whoever planned this thing that there would be more than 30 or 40 people. That's what I told they believed would be here. This is awful.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Darlene Grainger? Is Darlene Grainger here?

I'll go to Richard Allard.

Oh, Darlene is here? Okay.

DARLENE GRAINGER: First, I want to thank you guys for being here. We appreciate it. Okay. One minute so I'll try to talk fast here.

My brother was Dale Robbins. I'm Darlene
Grainger, my brother was Dale Robbins. He was shot and
killed in the Santa Rosa police station, in the lobby. So
here -- and my sister kind of wrote it out for me, made it
shorter.

Dale went to the police station asking to speak a police officer. What people -- What people weren't told was that when I picked up my brother's vehicle, my brother's vehicle had a slash on the seat covers and mud throughout his truck. My twin brother was -- He was my twin -- was an

. 19

immaculate person and kept everything clean. He went to the police station for help.

Well, we will never really know what happened that day, January 30th, 1996, because the police said there was no videotape. On the police audio tape document, an officer said, "I have a camera on the man."

Dale was shot and killed in the corner of the police station with three officers present. They said Dale had a club in his hand, a steering locking device in his hand. Yet, he's never had any record of any violence or trouble with the law or anything.

I was asked to identify -- No, I asked to identify Dale's body and to say a prayer. I was refused four times. Five hours later, the police searched Dale's home. How can you get a search warrant on a dead person?

The Grand Jury did a report on my brother's shooting and, according to the findings of the Sonoma County Grand Jury, the District Attorney made his decision of justifiable homicide based on the report that contained incorrect information and the backgrounds of two different — mental backgrounds of two different men that were not my brother. And he never went back and reviewed it again.

Our family, we asked for help from Home Hospice.

We were refused because they said because it was a

police-related death, it would put their agency at risk.

Approximately one year before my brother was killed, he showed me a picture of a police officer that had threatened his life. And he put it up in the top of my closet. And I didn't know the police officers name until after he died. This was the same officer that was assigned to the officer that shot him immediately following — that shot and killed my brother, immediately following. So he monitored him. I'm not sure how they do that. They watch over them so they don't talk to other people.

Dale had told me that he had threatened his life.

This is why I think we need a non-biased civilian review

board because Dale might be alive today because we would

have -- we could have had something to go to. We had nobody

to go to.

And I've been getting -- I've gotten threatening calls on my telephone. And I don't know who these people are. They said if I go to the FBI or whatever, I don't even know what they think I know. Except Dale gave me a picture. Maybe they need that. So they said if I go to the FBI, they'd send the local police to my house. And I just think -- I don't even know who those people are. It's kind of a coincidence or what that Dale gives me a Picture of a police officer and then he's the one that covered the police officer that shot him.

And so thank you guys for coming.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ma'am, would you, just for the



record, if you'll write a statement as to the kinds of threats that you've received and how you've received them and characterize them and send them to us, and we'll see that -- that your story gets in the record completely. All right?

MS. GRAINGER: Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I appreciate that. Thank you.

I'm going to ask those that testify if after they finish testifying, if they wouldn't mind exiting so that we can have people fill in so that everybody can get a chance to sit in on the hearings.

So when you finish making your statement in order that other citizens be able to sit in, then they would in essence take your chair.

So I'm not trying to run the community off, by any means. But there's only so many seats and there's a lot of people wanting to get in. So we're going to ask for your help and your cooperation, given the problems that we face today.

And I really appreciate your cooperation and I apologize for all the conveniences that we've caused.

Richard Allard. Is he here.

Okay. I'll ask that the following people -- I'll read 10 more, be shown up so that they can testify.

Jeff Ott, Earl Herr, Rudy Kham, Duane DeWitt, Pia Jensen, Andre Lance Dews, Mike McLoone, Bao Yan Chan, Robert McCarter. That's ten.

All right. Jeff Ott. Is he here? Is Mr. Ott here?

How about Mr. Richard Allard? No?
How about Earl Herr? Yes, Mr. Herr.

If I called your name and you didn't get up here in time, just raise your hand and identify yourself and then I'll give you the next slot.

EARL HERR, M.D.: Thank you for this opportunity.

My name is Earl Herr. I'm a physician in Sonoma County for
the past 25 to 26 years. I've worked during that time in
the Petaluma Valley Emergency Department. And in that role,
I've had very numerous opportunities -- in fact, almost on a
daily basis -- to work with police officers who are there.

My specific reason for talking to you now is about one thing which disappoints me in this particular hearing. That is, that there was a rejection of the request to be subpoenaed and have records subpoenaed. As a professional, I have my records subpoenaed and I am, myself, subpoenaed on a frequent basis to testify on my work, my experience with the patients with whom I deal.

And I consider that the police officers are part of our community. I consider that they are professional people for whom I have respect. And we all want to respect our officers. We want them to be part of our community.

I do believe that this hearing is an opportunity

to help us to do that. I would like to see us pull together as a community and to get beyond the problems that we're dealing with right now.

Thank you all for the opportunity to be here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Dr. Herr. We
appreciate, your remarks.

Is Mr. Richard Allard here.

Mr. Rudy Kham? Mr. Kham.

12.

RUDY KHAM: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Rudy Kham. I'm a resident of Sonoma County for 17 years, and I work for the Cambodian Career Center in Santa Rosa I'm also president of the Cambodian Career Center. And for the last 10 years, I know some of my people, they have problems with the city, with the county because of the customs and the language problems, and some miscommunicate because they don't understand the new system here. And after the time I became the president of the Cambodian Career Center, I tried to work hard with the city, with the county and we learned a lot about the communication networks and they understand.

After they understand, they're getting a lot better. Especially Mr. Steve Thomas, who has helped us a lot to work to work to get all the people here that are not speaking English and they don't understand about the system. They trained them, they get them to (inaudible), they put them in police citizen academy for the citizens.

And right now they understand.

So I hope in the future I would like to work closely with the city and county police because if we understand each other, we not have any problem. And I'd like to support the city police and the county because they saved a lot of my people in the past. If we miscommunicate, it could turn out my people could get killed by the miscommunication. So the basic point we have to understand each other we have to help each other if we want to be a good citizen.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you Mr. Kham.

Mr. Duane DeWitt?

DUANE DeWITT: Hello. My name is Duane DeWitt.

I'm from here from in Santa Rosa. I don't mean to be redundant but I missed most of the hearing downstairs. It's very difficult to hear.

I wanted to have a couple of questions answered, if I may, by the Commission's report. Those questions deal with a shoot to policy. The local newspaper has inferred that whatever an officer is going to shoot a suspect, that they intend to shoot to kill. So I'd like to know: Is there is shoot to kill policy for Sonoma County law enforcement agencies? And if so, I would hope that it would be well advertised so all the citizens would know that that's what the policy is.

Also, the other question is: If there is a shoot

to kill policy, does it violate the civil rights of people who are killed while only suspected of a crime and not convicted of a crime?

Thank you very much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I'll ask the audience, again, to refrain from clapping, please.

Pia Jensen?

PIA JENSEN: I am Pia Jensen, city councilwoman in Cotati resident of Sonoma County since 1973.

I've seen the crime increase in Sonoma County over those years and I personally feel that our police probably aren't ready to deal with the influx of the changes with population growth. I do believe there's training needed.

My experience as a councilwomen and people coming to me in Cotati and complaining about things happening with our police there caused me to go to our city manager and our police. And the only thing that I can do under recommend from them is to refer people to lodge a complaint with the police department. I feel that that disempowers me, and it disempowers the people, and I think a the civil review committee would be a good idea.

As a child of a person who worked for the <a href="Press Democrat">Press Democrat</a> for many years, I can tell you that the local newspaper does not accurately and objectively report on events in Sonoma County. And I think most people would agree with that here.

And then I'll close with the messages we send.

This is actually kind of funny. As I was leaving for lunch the vehicle that was in front of me had a license plate holder around a state or county or city vehicle license plated — it had the "E" on it. The holder said, "I'd rather be shopping at Nordstrom's." The police vehicle that was in front of me that had this on there, I think it was totally inappropriate for that to be.

And that is the kind of message that is put out there to people with the things we wear yellow like yellow buttons and black and white ribbons. And I think that that may be part of the process and the healing to be able to come together as a "we" if we pay attention to the messages that we send to the people. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Councilwomen.

Andre Lance Dews?

ANDRE LANCE DEWS: How are you doing? I missed a lot of it myself. I was here this morning, I didn't even know you had a council going this morning. And it's good to see you in Sonoma County.

I'm a victim of violent crimes, also. I was beaten by the Long Beach Police Department just before the Rodney King incident.

Ever since that tragic event, I went back and complained, back to the Los Angeles, for the treatment I received from the two officers down there where they

hog-tied me, beat me, laid me on the floorboard of the car, took me in an alley -- I lost a lot of time.

And the only thing I can keep asking up here is I've been a resident of this county since 1975. And I had no warrants -- no warrants, no felony convictions, no problems.

And I filed all kinds of complaints. I went to the Internal Affairs. I was wrongly done and put in jail. And my family didn't even know where I was. My mom had family down there where they didn't even know I was in jail for five days. All the pictures were taken but nothing has been done.

I've called Washington, I've called back east, and everything I've got is either kicked out of one house, I've been beaten by gang members. I've been shot at my house. And I've been going through Victims of Violent Crimes and not doing anything. But I wish somebody would do something to find out who it was that they had to go ahead and contact back here to find out that this person, a United States citizen, visiting Christmas holidays in Los Angeles for, those officers to do the actions that they did on myself.

I'm still going through counseling, and my son is going through counseling, and we're trying to pull it together, but I think somebody should take care of the officers and see what they're going to be doing.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think what you might want

to do is talk with one of the staff, and you might want to file a complaint through the Commission of Civil Rights.

MR. DEWS: I have picked up -- I went to
San Francisco before my vehicle was tampered with -- and
then my vehicle has been tampered with, the phone has been
tampered with. All kinds of stuff. It's just like I've
been up here in Sonoma County and I can't get back down
there to finish it. I had people calling up on the phones
saying they're psychics; and did I know if I sue a
government official, I'll be dead within the next six years.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much for your testimony.

MR. DEWS: Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Mr. Mike McLoone? Is Mr. McLoone here?

Mr. Bao Yan Chan? Is Mr. Bao Yan Chan here?

Is Mr. Robert McCarter here? Mr. McCarter, please come forward.

ROBERT McCARTER: Good afternoon.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Good afternoon.

MR. McCARTER: I'm going to try to make this as quick as I can. I was beaten by the local Sheriff's Office who were helped by two Santa Rosa police officers, possibly one two highway patrolman. I've never had trouble with the highway patrol man in my life.

Thirteen years ago, about, my daughter was stopped



by a Santa Rosa police officer who was under the influence of cocaine. He was later fired for that use of cocaine. The officer wrote a phony ticket, the officer committed a sex act in front of my daughter while she sat in the car. My daughter was 16 years old, sitting in a little Mustang.

We complained. 18 days later, the car was rammed by a four-wheel drive truck. They tried to cover all of that up. We finally got the guy convicted. I guess that was my answer of what happens to a complaint, isn't it?

Okay. That's done. A few years later than that -- I'm sorry; my speech is not very good.

MR. HERNANDEZ: That's okay.

MR. McCARTER: A few days -- Rather, a few years later than that, my daughter was surrounded. We used to follow that car. Family members, friends, some highway patrol friends of ours, would follow the car and watch the behavior of the Santa Rosa Police Department.

One night on the way home at 11:30 at night, they surrounded the car with three police cars. One in front slowed her down, one got beside her, one tried to get behind her but unbeknownst to them, I was behind them in my pickup. I wouldn't let that officer in. The officer then pulled up alongside her car and just to the front changed lanes immediately and then slammed on the brakes. They attained speeds of as high as 70 miles an hour on Sonoma Avenue.

When they did an Internal Affairs investigation, finally they admitted during the investigation, talking to us, it was a 245 P.C. That's assault with a deadly weapon; the weapon being the police car. Now, I don't know why they're trying to kill my daughter but that's what they done.

so we tried to make it clear: No more. There was only one more traffic stop after that and it all stopped.

Now, one year later, I'm at my own shop, working late at night again. 12:20. Sheriff gang shows up -- and I say "gang" literally. They drove by first, they found me there, they spotted it three. They deny that but it's a fact. The only Chevrolet driven that night was the first officer.

Okay. She made a U-turn, came back and parked. I thought they had left, thought nothing of it, was pushing a car back toward the body shop. Happens to be -- that's a technicality. As I was pushing the car back, I got spotlighted by this sheriff car that are was sitting across the road.

So I thought: Well, I'll go see what's up. I held my hands out like this (indicating) because I know they're afraid of the dark. I walked over like this, held my hands out, the spotlight shines on my pale white skin. I walked over to the police car. My hands were dirty because I had just fixed a car.

I walked over to the cop car and I got this very rude sheriff deputy who says, "What are you doing here?"

Nasty. Very nasty. I don't want to repeat how she said it.

I said, "I'm working. I belong here."

9.

I thought that was the end of it. So she starts talking on her little lapel thing, telephone thing on her lapel. So I thought: I'm out of the conversation. A few seconds into that I hear two letters, "ID." I thought and I looked -- and I'm deaf in the first place. I looked up and I'm trying to think what would that be for? What is she talking about? What was she doing? So I said "No." I did not have my driver's license on me at the time. Okay. All right; I'm sorry.

Now, subsequently, apparently she was calling backup officers. Numerous backup officers showed up. The little driveway was filled with police cars, as many as 10 now. I don't know how many. I only thought there was six. Pardon me. So I thought: Well, maybe one these people can tell me. Maybe they'd recognize the fact I work late every night. I walked over, kind of facing them. Maybe just a couple of steps.

Meanwhile, I put my hands in my pocket. I didn't realize that was against the law. I had my hands in my pockets. They said, "Take your hands out of your pockets." I thought to myself: What the hell for? So I said "No." We had a wise guy over here about the third car over says,

"We have a dog." I says, "I'm not afraid of dogs." Which I'm not. At that very instant, they turned the dog lose. They said something that sounded like it had four words, started with B -- four letters with "B."

The dog come at me in a big charge. I've played with dogs all my life. I went to grab the dog. By now, of course, I have my hands out of my pocket. I went to grab the dog. There was another officer I didn't know about on my left side. Hit me with a club on the side of the head.

Now I'm dazed. I didn't know what the hell was going on next. Pardon me; I didn't mean to swear.

As I'm standing like that, I'm kind of dazed. I don't know if I was on my knees or standing up. I have no idea. At least two more officers grabbed me. I didn't have any idea what was going on. They started to pull my hands back. I overpowered them.

Okay. At that stage, an officer standing behind me -- I got this from the police captain -- pulled a flashlight out of the back of his pocket and hit me over the head with the flashlight. Okay. Then I guess I was unconscious. They tied my hands to my feet and they handcuffed me. Somewhere along in there, they beat me quite nicely.

According to a brain surgeon last year, they kicked me in the area of the temple repeatedly while I was on the ground. That's called brain damage. Okay. That's

the system. That's not finished.

22.

Now I woke up. I went to get up. I didn't know I was handcuffed. I didn't know I was hog-tied. And I was on my own place. I knew that. So I said, "I'm getting up now." I thought: Well, maybe they'll figure it out this time. I said, "I'm getting up now." With that, the same guy that was the wise guy early on says, "Oh, no, you won't and stomped on my back."

Someone else or him reached down, picked up my head and bounced it off the pavement. I guess I was supposed to cry or scream. I didn't. Then they took my head and they rubbed it on the pavement like this to take the skin off. Okay. That's done. Now the betting goes on for a few seconds and stops.

Then they started asking questions. And the first question he asked me was my name. Which, honest to God, I couldn't remember my name, they had hit me in the head and it didn't come up. All I could think of was a sheriff deputy I was in the Marine Corps with and I said his name. I said, I know John Schubert. And the wise guy again says, "Never heard of him."

They kept kicking and they kept asking. And they kept kicking in the area of the belt. Somebody hit me on the left side of the back with a baton, somebody kicked me on the back in the area of the kidney with such force it left an imprint of the shoe. Four days later, you could see



I --

it. Looked like they took a picture and stuck it on the back.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Can I ask you to do the following, and it's just because in the interest of time --

MR. McCARTER: I didn't hear what you said.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Could I ask you to please take whatever statement you were going to make before this Committee --

MR. McCARTER: All right; I'll finish it real quick.

I went to the FBI, I went to the sheriff, I went to the police department. The hole think was covered up.

The DA's Office cheated to get a conviction for resisting arrest. That's all I have to say.

MR. HERNANDEZ: The next 10 people I'm going to call forward is Phyllis Rosenfield, Isabel Huie, Claudia Turner, John Husseyn, Virginia Steele, Bill Stirnus and Cindy Pilar, Thomas Twiddy. Are those people here?

Is Phyllis Rosenfield? Could she come forward.

PHYLLIS ROSENFIELD: I'm Phyllis Rosenfield and

MR. HERNANDEZ: I just want to remind the speakers that when they finish, if they wouldn't mind just exiting so we can get more people in.

MS. ROSENFIELD: I'm Chair of the Sonoma County
Human Rights Commission and am representing them today.

The Sonoma County Commission on Human Rights was established by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors to promote better human relations in Sonoma County. The Commission on Human rights believes that healthy, cohesive communities are built for the collaborative efforts of all people. The Commission also believes that positive constructive intergroup relations develop when all segments of the community have a voice in government.

. 25

This takes enormous, often tedious, and difficult effort to engage in authentic cooperative problem solving and avoid interference -- excuse me. Avoid ineffective adversarial procedures. Based on our experience working with schools, community groups, law enforcement professionals, and citizens at large the Commission believes that it can be a bridge among diverse populations and a neutral convenor for productive approaches to resolving differences in our community.

Today this Human Rights Commission has conducted public hearings on hate-motivated incidents and crimes that resulted in the establishment of the Hate Crimes Prevention Network. The network is a collaborative effort among the Commission, law enforcement, and numerous community groups who have responded to hate-motivated behavior in the county. We have responded to complaints of discrimination at public facilities by addressing issues related to staff insensitivities.

We've also taken testimony and community input regarding the INS raids. This is an ongoing issue that the Commission is still working to address. We have provided diversity education training for community groups and school teams.

Last year the Commission on Human Rights created an ad hoc community to specifically address the issues of community-police relations in the county. The Commission made the decision, however, to wait until the FBI and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights completed their reports before convening a local public forum.

On October 16th, 1997 our Commission on Human Rights wrote to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Regional Director Philip Montez, and asked him to keep us informed regarding their investigation. We made this request so that there would be duplication of effort required in public forums. It is unfortunate that a collaborative effort between the U.S. Commission and our own local Sonoma County Human Rights Commission could not be established prior to today's forum.

The Commission on Human Rights ad hoc committee wants to create an ongoing dialogue that will arrive at concrete ideas about how to improve the relationship between law enforcement and the community. We believe it will be the local agencies and organizations and each of us as concerned citizens that will have the greatest impact in



creating the satisfying relationship between law enforcement and the community.

We can continue to create a neutral, fair forum that will ensure this very important process. It does not have to end with this hearing.

The Commission on Human Rights of Sonoma County meets on the fourth Monday of every month at the Permanent and Resource Management Center; 255 Ventura Avenue. The public is always invited to attend and bring concerns to the Commission at any time.

For further information, you can contact our organization at 527-2693.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. What I'm going to do is call three people at a time. We have chairs. So Isabel Huie? Is she there? Claudia Turner? Is Claudia there? And John Husseyn. The three chairs there.

Okay. Isabel Huie? Is that H-u-i?
ISABEL HUIE: H-u-i-e.

I'm a civil rights officer and Chinese for
Affirmative Action in San Francisco. And I am also a member
of the Justice for the Kao Family Coalition.

Questions that were always asked when the shooting death of Mr. Kao was discussed were: Could the officer have fired a warning shot or shoot him in the leg instead? These questions were raised because even though most of us didn't know Mr. Kao, we still value his life as a human being and a

family provider.

His death created a ground swell of outrage in Asian communities throughout the Bay Area because Mr. Kao was killed only because Officer Shields' perception was that an Asian person waving a stick around must be using martial arts, which the officer also presumed to be deadly, and thereby Mr. Kao was shot.

Mr. Kao's civil rights were certainly violated.

Mr. Kao was drunk that night and there was no intention to
go out there and hurt or kill anyone.

The officer was cleared of this killing because he followed correct procedures. Well, I think these correct procedures should be revised and analyzed because these were the very procedures that allowed eight other persons to be killed under questionable circumstances in this community.

Therefore, I'm recommending that there be a two-year action plan on police reform which includes improved training and hiring be developed and implemented; that local community groups be involved in the development of this two-year plan; that a quarterly progress report be presented to you, the Commission; and that federal funds be withheld until there is concrete evidence that all players are involved in the development and implementation of this two-year plan.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Claudia Turner.

CLAUDIA TURNER: Hello. My name is Claudia

Turner, I'm a counselor from Santa Rosa Junior College and

I've been there since 1976. I'm shaking right now because

I'm a police abuse victim.

I believe in human rights, I believe in human dignity, and I teach what's called self-actualization, which means you can have your feelings and you can have your thoughts and you can show your feelings and not be considered strange.

October 19, '95 I'm in my back bedroom. It's broad daylight, 10:30, sunny, hot. And all of a sudden, there's three police officers skulking around my back bushes at my back bedroom window. I live in a very small condo and I could have easily have heard them at the front door and they did not come to the front door. That was my first contact with them.

I happen to know one of them. He dated me many years back. I felt very afraid and very indignant that they were at my back bedroom window. They said to me, "Ms. Turner, can we talk to you?" Those were their exact words. And I said, "No. Put it in writing." And there was a witness at the back of the area where I live that heard me say, "put it in writing."

So I went about my business. It was 10:30 in the afternoon -- 10:30 in the morning after I had been hammering up pictures all morning long in my new house, and I went

about taking a shower. And lo and behold, I'm in my shower and an arm comes through and pulls me out of my shower, throws me right on the floor, splatters blood, throws me on my bed. I'm butt naked, and those three police officers talked over my head for at least 15 minutes about where to do the deed, where to take the body, what do we do with the body; et cetera, et cetera. I had never heard "where to do the deed" or any kind of language like.

·5

They humiliating me and ended up laughing at me.

And at one point, one of the officers, Officer McKinney,
said to me, If you don't shut up, we're going to kill you
right now."

So this is what happens with Santa Rosa Police if they consider you to be strange or different.

When I filed my police complaint, finally investigators came. It was November 21st, '95. Well, the two investigators that came, I also had another witness. And I thought: Oh, boy! They're going to really hear my story and they're going to investigate what's going on. So we sit there for an hour, we hear the whole story, and Mr. Terry Anderson and Mr. Rodell come into my back bedroom, I show them the blood traces that were left in the bedroom.

They look at everything, they take every bit of information from me, and when they left they said, "We were here for a burglary report."

I did not hear anything directly after that

point. I got a letter in writing from Chief Rosano that there was no police misconduct. I then went to the City Manager, Ken Blackwell, I had counseled his daughter, thinking that maybe he'd treat me as a real person, as a real citizen. No, he did not. All he did was rubber stamp the chief of police.

12.

I contacted Sharon Wright over and over repeatedly, thinking maybe a woman, maybe the city council will listen to me. She never returned a call. Finally, one city council member did hear me and he was so appalled he didn't know what to do and he knew it was larger than what he could do.

So I am left with -- I am now in the federal courts. And I also got to watch the City Attorney take a little card that I had received from the Santa Rosa Police Department, remove the card, white it out and give it back, because it would have shown that they had malintent when they came to investigate my original complaint because it was a burglary investigator and my complaint was about sexual and excessive force.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'd like to call to the table Virginia Steele and Bill Stirnus.

Mr. Husseyn, would you state your name for the record and spell it.

JOHN HUSSEYN: It's just like Saddam.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. John Husseyn. Because I had a "Y" in here.

MR. HUSSEYN: That's correct, sir. It's a "Y" instead of an "I."

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. It's H-u-s-s-e-y-n. Is that correct?

MR. HUSSEYN: That's correct.

21.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HUSSEYN: In our newly found millenium values, restructuring of governmental organizations, including ATF, IRS and FBI and others has occurred to accommodate a new set of problems in our society. Positive measures have been taken by the federal government, as evidenced by your presence here today. To eliminate future Wacos, Ruby Ridge and the Oklahoma bombings.

One sector of government that creates problems in our society and has in the past and is still currently deploying its destructive forces against our civil rights and the rights of our children, our future, is the social service system. It is time accountability has to be established for their violations against human rights.

I'll only take a few moments of your time to open up your minds and your hearts and how civil rights violations in Sonoma County so profoundly affect the course of our lives and the lives of our precious resource, our children.

2:1

Georgia Moses' life within the confines of the Sonoma County juvenile justice system is a pivotal example of how our children, under the direction and care and guidance of a misdirected social service system eventually wind up. I have the article here to prove it.

There isn't anything that CPS and its enforcing agency the Superior Court of California, Sonoma County, under the direction of Arnold Rosenfield can add to explain their shortsighted, irresponsible and child endangering directions in caring for our children when their fragile lives are somehow drawn into it as if they were being pulled into a dark hole.

We would, as a society, believe the solution for alternatives to prevent any other children, whether black, Chinese, or Hispanic or even white are fervently pursued by this system and appropriate checks and balances within the system and have been properly and attendedly alerted to prevent any more dead children.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Husseyn, could you kind of wind up your remarks. You're past your time.

MR. HUSSEYN: What I would like to say is that we, as men, are not responsible for the mothers' under drug influenced behavior. When the mothers take directions that aren't proper for her children, the social service system should cease incriminating us criminally as men because of our genitalia that we are not capable of caring for our

children.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you very much. We have your statement for the record. Thank you very much.

Please. This is not a cheering section.

Virginia Steele. Bill Stirnus? Is he here? Cindy Pilar.

Okay. Ms. Steele. Would you state your name for the record, please.

VIRGINIA STEELE: I'm Virginia Steele, a retired teacher of homebound and hospitalized children from Berkeley who retired here in Santa Rosa. Bob McCarter, who just spoke, remade a car, my mobile teaching station for me after I came here. And that car was wrecked by another garage.

I'm going to talk out of both sides of my mouth and I'll try to talk quickly. First, on behalf of the decent, honorable, hard working police officers who work a very hazardous job at times and they carry the double burden of — that comes from their fellow officers and supervisors who are involved in wrongdoing.

An example of that would be the collusive retaliation at a citizen who successfully protested a ticket. Sharing of drugs that they pick up from arrests of people. Single and collusive harassment, and many other examples. That expresses my feelings for the police officers.

Now for the citizens. There is really the subject



2.6

of what I'm speaking about. I came out of the South and the pervasive fear that any black citizen had to live in and the fear of white citizens who even dared to think of trying to do something about it, it's unbelievable what this level of fear is. And that's over those police officers who are trying to do their best job. I left the South for some time and then went back. I was in Mississippi in 1964 when the three students were murdered.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Could you wind up your remarks you're just about -- you're over time, actually.

MS. STEELE: All right. I took an affidavit from a student, a black student I worked with who was handcuffed and thrown into the back of a police car and his head bloodied terribly. And the police officer said to another one, as if he were getting validation of having passed a requirement, "See. That's nigger blood there." He got affirmation of that.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Could you wind up your remarks now.

MS. STEELE: I told that after the Rodney King over the national radio at one time. And I was asked, "Well, that was then. What about now?" And I'm retired now in Santa Rosa. And I have seen some terrible damage done to people.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Could you take the rest of your remarks in written form and provide them to us for the

record. Because I'm going to have to --

MS. STEELE: Fine. That is fair.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

Who is going first here?

BILL STIRNUS: I'm Bill Stirnus.

MR. HERNANDEZ: All right. Now, I just got word that -- and I don't want anybody to get alarmed -- at 5:30, the lights go out. And then they will turn them back on.

So what we'll do is we'll just communicate in the dark. The Commission is used to that kind of stuff every once in a while. There they go.

Okay. So we have Mr. Bill Stirnus. Mr. Stirnus? MR. STIRNUS: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Please try to keep it within the time limit.

MR. STIRNUS: I'll certainly do my best.

Cindy and I are administrators in the Santa Rosa City School system. We serve 16,000 students, K-12, in the City of Santa Rosa. Cindy and I, based on our 14 years of administrative I've experience and working with the police department, have put together a letter that Cindy will share with you, signed by the administrators of Santa Rosa City Schools.

CINDY PILAR: And it's very brief. We come before you today as representatives of the Santa Rosa City Schools to offer our strongest endorsement and support to our Sonoma

County police officers.

12.

We cannot speak highly enough to the exceptional support that they have shown our nearly 1,000 employees and 16,000 students over the past 15 years. In that time, we have developed an outstanding communication system and close working relationship that other Northern California cities have sought to duplicate. Our regular monthly police school meetings are often attended by other citys' agencies to see if what we have can work for them.

It is well known that our community has experienced a dramatic rise in gang activity and juvenile crime over the last several years. Some of this activity spills over into our schools. The police department has met this challenge head on. They respond quickly to problems that arise on our campuses in a decisive, professional and appropriate fashion.

The police department has been exceptionally open to suggestions and ideas from school personnel on ways to effectively curb disruptions that may occur. The degree of mutual trust, respect and ongoing communication between schools and local law enforcement has resulted in safe orderly campuses in our community.

It's very easy to sit in the comfort of our homes, sipping coffee, reading a version of the event in the morning paper and passing judgment on those who are out there doing their job. They do their jobs and they do them

better than we probably have a right to expect.

Our experience have shown these officers in some of the most stressful situations and we are here to tell you that they conduct themselves with skill, compassion and discretion to the extent that each situation dictates.

The police department currently has review processes and structures that effectively monitor police actions and decisions. None of us could do any job well with someone looking over our shoulder and second-guessing every decision we make. These people are trained to make split-second, life or death decisions and we are thankful that we do not have to make those decisions ourselves.

The administrators of the Santa Rosa City Schools thank the Sonoma County police officers for a job well done. We sincerely hope that our relationship currently exists and we believe it is serving the city well.

There are two 22 elementary, middle and high schools in the city and this letter is signed by administrators from all of those schools as well as our Superintendent of Schools and District Office personnel.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. If you'll give me the letter, we'll make sure that it is included in the record.

Thank you very much.

Let the record reflect that we have just received a letter for inclusion in the record from the Santa Rosa City Schools dated February 19, 1998; addressed to the

Honorable Members of the Civil Rights Commission.

Okay. I think we heard from Rabbi Robinson, didn't we?

Okay. Now, next David Weaver, Steve Kim and Daniel Loyal Garcia. Are those three members here?

Are you Mr. Garcia.

DANIEL LOYAL GARCIA: Yes, I am.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Is Steve Kim here?

Is Mr. Weaver here? David Weaver?

Is Mr. Louis Beary here?

LOUIS BEARY: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Please take a seat there, Mr. Beary.

And is Mr. or Ms. -- I don't know if it's -- Chanthol Au? Not here?

Ms. Vicki Vidak-Martinez here. Is she here? She's not? She is. Okay.

Then would you please state your name for the record.

DANIEL LOYAL GARCIA: Yes. My name is Daniel
Garcia, Jr. I'm the nephew of Mark Garcia who was killed in
San Francisco by the San Francisco PD. I'm here in Sonoma
County to show the families down here -- Mrs. Kao, Kevin
Saunders mother and the other individuals that were killed
here officially cruelly by officers down here -- to let them
know that the Garcia family and myself is here to support

them.

And I also wanted to put on record that I feel that it's very disrespectful, when I come into this room in the morning and throughout the whole meeting is filled with mostly cops. Okay. I feel that --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Please. Please.

MR. GARCIA: I feel that the people that should have been let in here first is the families who lost their loved ones.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Order, please.

MR. GARCIA: You ladies and gentlemen are the Civil Rights Committee, okay? And these individuals who lost their loved ones, their rights were violated. Okay? So you should have heard from them first and not from any professional. Because if anyone is a professional at police brutality, it's families like me and the ones in this county. All right?

Because we could tell you how it feels to experience police brutality. I personally experienced it myself other than losing my uncle. And that's only because of the way I, dress because I'm wearing a Pendleton and jeans and I have them down below my waist. So I get harassed. I get threatened by officers anywhere I go. I wouldn't doubt it, once I leave from this building, I'll probably end up getting harassed. But you know what? That's okay. It comes with the job. Because I'm not

shutting up. All right?

Because its easy for people to stay in their home and say, "Well it ain't happening to me so I shouldn't have to worry about it." Well, I got something to say to those people, that sooner or later it will happen to you unless we put a stop to it. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Mr. Louis Beary. Could you state your name for the record.

LOUIS BEARY: Sure. My name is Louis Beary. I'm a former mayor and councilmen in the City of Rohnert Park.

I served eight years in that body.

In 1985, I lost a 17-year-old daughter under mysterious circumstances in the City of Rohnert Park. The police officers at the scene were friends of mine. The chief of police came to me, assured me that everything would be done properly, there would be a thorough investigation. And the fact is that the police did not do their duty, did not perform their investigation. They, in fact, covered up what was an obvious murder and they called it a suicide. That was 1985.

In 1986, I complained after realizing what the chief had done, I complained to the city manager, nothing was done. I hired a couple of investigators. They substantiated what the police had arrived at and called it a suicide.

In 1992, a couple of community activists from
Rohnert Park approached me about the corruption in
Rohnert Park and informing me that there were several other
mysterious deaths in the city of Rohnert Park. I once again
picked up the gauntlet to try and ascertain what the truth
was about my daughter's case.

In 1993, I had a blood splatter expert tell me that it appeared my daughter's body had been moved. And he said it was very suspicious that she wound up in the position that she was in from where she must have been when the shot was fired. And on and on and on.

Now, there have been other deaths in the City of Rohnert Park that haven't been properly investigated. This body may be the one to solve the problem there.

Now, on two different occasions, I tried to address the city council. In 1993, they refused to allow me to speak under unscheduled public appearances. I have written a number of correspondences to the city to try and get them to take some action. They refused.

In 1995, I had a case before the Ninth Circuit
Court of Appeals, was dismissed by the judge, telling me
that I was too late. I should have found out the facts of
the case sooner.

This year, when I went to again address the City of Rohnert Park concerning the Kuan Kao shooting, I was told by the vice-mayor that I can only say certain things; if I



1.2

said the wrong thing, I would be removed from the council chambers. They had two police officers in the council chambers because of my appearance. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Vicki Vidak-Martinez. And then I'll also call forward Claudia Turner, Cornelius Hall.

VICKI VIDAK-MARTINEZ: I'm Vicki Vidak-Martinez, vice-mayor of the City of Rohnert Park. I'm speaking today as an individual and not on behalf of the city council.

This forum originated to address issues raised by an officer-involved shooting which was the first of its kind in the history of our city. As you know, both the officer and our public safety department have been exonerated by four separate investigations into the incident.

Nevertheless, allegations continue.

One must wonder who benefits from them. Certainly not our community. I strongly suspect that members and associates of this panel have exploited the tragedy which occurred in our town to further their own political ambitions with blocks of voters outside of Sonoma County. It's a cheap shot which leaves the impression that our community is expendable and subordinates of the political aspirations of those individuals.

Meetings and discussions around these incidents have taken on the aspect of a witch hunt reminiscent of McCarthyism. Your presence here clearly indicates a

judgment --

. 22

. 19

MR. HERNANDEZ: Please, please. Order. Order.

MS. VIDAK-MARTINEZ: -- of no confidence in our Sheriff's Department, our District Attorney, the State Attorney General, the FBI, and the United States Justice Department. The facts are in but they don't seem to matter.

Sonoma County law enforcement has demonstrated its responsibility, accountability and capacity for discipline which has earned them little respect or acknowledgment from this panel or from your selected community leaders.

We are assembled here today because in this great nation, anyone can challenge government practices at any time. Government stands accused and guilty until it can prove itself innocent or adapt appropriately. Democracy generally makes us stronger and better. Yet the process is inherently painful.

Beyond the finger pointing, our common interest is a shared desire to ensure sufficient physical and psychological safety for all individuals in Sonoma County. This is a complex task unfortunately made more difficult by the present proceedings. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much for your statement.

Mr. Hall, Cornelius Hall?

Is Ms. Claudia Turner in the audience? Oh, she already spoke. Okay.

18.

21.

Mr. Walt Moreno, Kit Mariah. Are any of those in the audience? Okay. Please come forward.

Please state your name for the record.

CORNELIUS HALL: Okay. I'm Cornelius Hall, retired fire captain, Commission of Human Relations and belonging to many police accountability groups.

And myself, like you, are here to help the people because of the problems in police accountability. I'm not anti-police, but I believe in accountable police in our communities. When our people get killed, they're criminalized instead of somebody coming to support them. Like when a policeman is shot, they've got stress management and so forth. Our families have nothing.

I lost a son. He was shot in the back of the head. The families don't get reports from the police, they can't get -- When they get reports from the DA, that's verbatim police, and the DA is supposed to make an investigation. And as with myself, I got a report from the FBI that was three pages of white out. So that was useless. It was useless.

Their policy of shoot to kill. And I was told one time that when police train, they shoot -- they learn to shoot at torsos. And that's what they do. They kill no matter whether they see people with a gun or not.

I want to mention one thing here. I belong to a lot of groups, national and local. I've got Internet sheets

here showing -- from Chicago police saying that I was in Chicago on October 22nd. And it says this list is in regards to the national day of protest to stop police brutality. Yet, they came her on October 22nd to fan the flames of racism. I'm on the Commission of Human Relations, and that's not me. And it had me underlined in red.

Okay. And they got the whole list of us and this list is going around. It's like a hit list of people who are fighting against police brutality.

MR. HERNANDEZ: If you would like to, you can make that a part of the record.

MR. HALL: I will.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Could you just wind up your remarks because you're slightly over time.

MR. HALL: Okay. The increasing use of force -- and I notice the chief said today he was increasing the use of force. But Mr. Kao didn't have that chance of increasing use of force because within 34 seconds he was shot.

And that should be policy and it should be enforced stringently by all police departments. So I think that we should -- you here today should listen to the people and tell them what we want. Because they're working for us. We're not working for them, just as you're working for us. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

I'll call forward Walt Moreno, Kit Mariah, and

Nancy Wang.

for the record.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

26

Is Walt Moreno here?

Is Kit Mariah here?

Is John Gurney here? Mr. Gurney is here? All right, Ms. Mariah. Could you state your name

KIT MARIAH: My name is Kit Mariah. Seven years ago I participated in a Gulf War protest at the Federal Building next door. And I went there with the intention of doing civil disobedience, of getting arrested for my belief of being against the war. I expected to be arrested. I thought perhaps I even would have to go to jail.

What I did not anticipate is that I would be beat up by the police. And I wasn't beat up by the police for trespassing. I was beat up by the police because I have a hidden disability. I have compound injuries to my back. And when it was time to arrest me, I held my hands out in front of me like this (indicating), and I said, "I'm a person with an injured back. Will you please cuff me in front and not in the back so you will not injure me."

That was construed as resisting arrest. I was lifted off my feet and dangled in the air while my shoulder -- as I was standing in the air, trying to get -- I was in severe pain and trying to get out of pain. My left foot grazed the pants leg of the police officer.

He took that as assaulting a police officer.

was thrown to the floor. I was hurt further. I was injured. I was very badly cuffed behind the back, so tight that I have permanent injury to my hand. I have no feeling here. My neck and shoulder, I've had treatment for ever since.

.25

I tried to complain at the time. At the time of my arrest and shortly thereafter, I was given numbers at the police department to call. I tried -- when I was booked, I tried to complain. I was repeatedly told the same thing.

"Tell the judge."

In order to cover up his misconduct, I was charged with four charges. Not just trespassing. I was charged with resisting arrest, for blocking an entrance, and assault on an officer. I lived with those false charges for a year and a half. And finally, when I was ready to go to trial, they decided to drop them.

I then pursued with a case against the City of Santa Rosa, which finally came up four years after the original incident. And I finally got to tell my story to the judge, who I don't believe heard a word I said. Or anybody else did there, either. At any rate, it was stacked against me, I lost the case.

This has been a very difficult process for me.

I've spent \$20,000 in chiropractic care and psychiatric

care. I'm still afraid of the police. It has been very

difficult for me to be in this building with all these

. 25

police officers and the city attorney who crucified me in this building all day, and I couldn't even come up here.

But I stayed and I waited to make my statement. If I'm ever assaulted by the police again, no matter how unjust it was, I would never take them to court, I would never put myself through that process again.

As it is, I fear daily retaliation because I did take them to court. I'm afraid of getting stopped in traffic or stopped for some thing I didn't do or some minor thing I might have did. Because I'm afraid if they put my name up see I had a suit against the city, then something worse will happen to me than what happened to me the first time. And they know I'm not going to do anything about it this time.

Three months before this officer assaulted me, he shot an unarmed man and killed him. He shot him 12 times. One month after he assaulted me, I witnessed him assault another protester at a demonstration. She never filed complaints; her story was never told. He stood there and hit her and hit her and hit her again with the club and all she was doing was holding a line.

The police had set a line and said, "Do not pass this line," and she was standing at that line. But then they decided they wanted to go back behind that line and so they started hitting them to move them back behind the line that they had set.

In the last year, that same officer has shot another person. A person who was attempting suicide. And that's what they do to you when somebody tries to attempt suicide, they shoot them. They call it suicide by police officer.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry to interrupt you but you're way over your time. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to ask you to make these remarks in a written form and give them to us, you have 30 days, so that this could be part of the written record. It will be recorded officially by our --

MS. MARIAH: The paper I filled out said we have 10 days. Do we really have 30 days?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, the record is open for 30 days. Okay? The record will be open for 30 days.

MS. MARIAH: I'd just like to make one last statement and that is if I were left for dead in the city streets of Santa Rosa in the middle of the night and the only person available to reach out to was a Santa Rosa Police Department officer, I would use what energy I had left to crawl under a car to hide from him. I wouldn't call on him for help.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Nancy Wang.

NANCY WANG: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. My name is Nancy Wang and I'm the president --

MR. HERNANDEZ: It's "Wong," not --

MS. WANG: It's "Wong" with an "A."

MR. HERNANDEZ: With an "A." Okay.

MS. WANG: I'm the president of the Redwood Empire Chinese Association and this is the only Chinese association in Sonoma County. But I want to make this on the record because all of the media never put out the association is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit educational association in Sonoma County. We work close with the Sonoma Education Department, we provide cultural programs, language school open for all of the public participation. I want to make that clear. We are not activists. We are not going after the law enforcement.

Because of the incident on April 29, 1997, Kuan
Chung Kao got killed we feel violated human rights with
Mr. Kao. The officer was the second officer who arrived on
the scene, and he did get -- I went to all of the press
releases, and I listened to all the 9-1-1 tapes, I
participate in everything. The second officer was being
told, "Stay in your car. Code 3." That's more backup. And
he didn't stay in his car. He got out of the car. Somehow
they were counting 34 seconds; I was counting about 30
seconds. And he opened fire.

And in that time, Mr. Kao was intoxicated, was drunk. No one was dangerous. It was so easy. Mrs. Kao was planning on herself, if she just grabbed that stick away

from him, and her three children still have the father today and she still can have her husband alive. With five and a half years old daughter standing upstairs, watching her own father shot by the police, lay on their driveway, with a handcuff behind the back.

And at that time they shot him, the wife was screaming, yelling, begging to help Mr. Kao because he's still breathing. They didn't give him any medical attention until the paramedics arrived 10 to 12 minutes. They say they don't know that Mrs. Kao was a registered nurse. Everybody can do. That even I can do CPR.

If all of these things happened, we don't feel -
I think law enforcement, before this, say he only got 34

seconds, he never had a chance to decide. He had a

split-second decision. I think that this officer, he

created his own problem. If he stayed in the car until more

backup arrived, maybe they can save Mr. Kao's life instead

of death. They left 14-month-old twin boys with five-and-ahalf-year-old daughter.

And we do have the press packet to send to the Commission to let you know how they feel Mrs. Kao was dealing since almost one year right now.

I want to make it really clear we are not activists. We just feel they really violated human rights and civil rights, Mr. Kao's rights.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

19.

21<sub>.</sub> 

MS. WANG: Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'd like to also call forward Charla Greene and Estelle Townsend. Are you in the audience?

Okay. Take the chair.

Is Charla Greene here? Okay.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And is this Mr. John Gurney?

JOHN GURNEY: Yes, it is.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Would you state your name for the record, please.

MR. GURNEY: My name is John Gurney, G-u-r-n-e-y, Chief of Police for the City of Sonoma.

I'm here today to represent not only my law enforcement agency but the City of Sonoma. Wednesday evening, the city council discussed your hearings and had drafted a letter that I will present to you for the record. And I will share with you just a couple of excerpts, if I may.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Please.

MR. GURNEY: I want to ask the Commission to be aware of the fact that you've heard a lot of testimony today, as have I, and I would encourage you to go into the communities and search out the truth. I believe that and I speak, certainly, on behalf of the City of Sonoma, I believe that we have excellent dialogue with our community. We meet in open forum. The police chief is accessible. And

certainly, the city council members are accessible.

12 .

And so what you've heard here today may not be indicative of all of Sonoma County, and I want to stress that and encourage you to really explore.

In my experience as a law enforcement professional, the law enforcement community in Sonoma County is excellent and I can sit here and say to you that -- with comfort, that my colleagues are equally as accessible and concerned about the professionalism and the work that they do in providing public safety services to Sonoma County.

The mayor writes to you with the consent of all five city council members — or four city council members that on behalf of the City of Sonoma and my colleagues on the city council, we welcome the Commission's presence and look forward to participating in this public hearing. Although it's a minute.

The one paragraph that I will share with you is that the measure of the genuine desire to cooperate and participate with citizen inquiry has been placed before you in the letter that I will present. Please afford all of us citizens of Sonoma County your very best efforts and objectively, consistently and fairly reviewing all input from our community. Then if you find that you can provide constructive guidance to support our ongoing efforts, please do so.

Thank you very much.

.23

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Let the record show we'll have a letter from the City of Sonoma directed to Mr. Phillip Montez, Director of the Western Regional Field Office, dated February 18, 1998.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Charla Greene?

CHARLA GREENE: I'm Charla Greene, and I just want to make a very quick comment. I was here at the first part of the session when you introduced the concern address of the Commission to bridge the gap of the polarity of community concerns versus the police action that they consider appropriate.

Today I feel that we saw an example of this versus mentality when, after the first session, the Commission requested several times that the room be cleared and one half of the room sat there as if this request did not apply to them. That half was the group with the yellow buttons. The police and their supporters.

Their actions spoke louder than any words that have been said about the attitudes of the police department towards the community they are supposed to be interacting with. It is a disregard for a request even from this Commission to show consideration for the general public that was waiting downstairs to attend this hearing, also.

I notice now that they have left, again exhibiting their level of interest in community concerns because now the community has been allowed up here to speak.

I'm hoping this will make it obvious that these questions have to be taken to a higher authority that has more power than to make mere recommendations. Because these recommendations will be treated in the same way. They will be ignored.

Thank you.

21.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Estelle Townsend?

Townsend, and I'm 73 years old. And I'm sorry to say, I got picked up for drunk driving. And while in the jail, a deputy lady was talking to me and she asked me some silly —to me, they were just things I didn't want to hear. Like, "Are you a drug adduct?" And are you a this and that. And I answered "yes" to all of them it irated me so bad, no matter how under the influence I might have been.

And so I crossed my legs and sat there and she took my hand and knocked it off and said, "Put your leg down." So I sat there. And so she says, "We've got a violent one over here." Two big deputy cops, sheriffs, huge -- one was huge, the other one wasn't quite as huge as the other one. And came in and jerked me off of my seat. I was handcuffed. Slammed me against the wall, hit me on this side. My shoulders now, I can't sleep on either side of me for very long. They hurt. And this was the 3rd of January and it's still painful.

And just mainly I'm here because of my age and I'm

going to tell this Commission and anybody listening that when they tell you that the police, that the sheriff, is violent and treating in a brutal way, you better believe it. If they can treat me the way they did, think of what the young kids and girls and boys that make a mistake end up there. And that's why I'm here, on their behalf. Because when they get in trouble, they need help. They don't need to be abused in there and get killed.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Was that January 3rd of this year?

MS. TOWNSEND: Yes, sir.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Please come forward. Cathy Harvey, Sean Jones and Wayne Griffith.

Cathy Harvey?

CATHY HARVEY: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Would you state your name for the record, please.

MS. HARVEY: Good evening. My name is Cathy
Harvey. I am the mayor of the City of Healdsburg and I've
been on that city council for -- I'm in my sixth year. I
also spent more than five years on the board of directors
for the Redwood Empire Municipal Insurance Fund. And my
husband teaches defensive tactics to three agencies in
Sonoma County.

I'm not here to represent any organization, just myself. And I wanted you to know that I have that

background so that you can appreciate the fact that I am coming from an informed position.

12.

There were two things I wanted to accomplish by being here today, and I have been here all day with only breakfast, without taking much of a break at all because what you had to listen to today is important to me. As it is to other elected officials, and I will be reporting back to my council.

I wanted to listen to all sides of the story and they certainly have been presented here today, and I thank you for the opportunity of providing the forum so I could do that.

I'm also here today, as can see by the yellow button, to provide support to the law enforcement community in Sonoma County. I believe that our policies, practices and positions are well written, well followed, and certainly not set in stone. I'd like you to remember that they are fluid and they do commonly get changed to reflect the community sentiment and wishes. They're ever evolving and they will always be that way.

It would not surprise me to find that many of the things that I've heard here today and many of the chiefs have been here today are furiously taking notes here today will be implemented as a part of their department policy.

And I want you to remember that not every officer is going to pull out a gun and shoot somebody at every

opportunity. My husband, on duty, was in a position where he was at threat of losing his life. Fortunately, it ended with minor injuries to the man that he had chased down and arrested, and my husband was not killed.

I won't go into the details because you only have a minute, but I want you to know that I also come from that perspective. And had he been in the position where he had to do harm to another human being, it would have been devastating not only to him but our entire family and our family and friends. And that nobody takes that responsibility lightly and nobody takes it as an opportunity to do harm to another human being. So please keep in mind that there are two sides to every story.

And thank you very much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Sean Jones. Please state your name for the record.

SEAN JONES: My name is Sean Jones, and I just want to say, you know, from what I've seen between police and community relations, is daily harassment for anyone on the street over anything. You know, be it youth or hassle people or, you know, any minority groups of any type or whatever, the police kind of just go around and do whatever they want and harass people pretty much for nothing, show no respect at all to anybody for anything.

One incident I'd like to cite that was

particularly disturbing was a couple of years ago. I came out —— I was alerted because I seen on my bedroom wall there this light going up and down the wall there. And I come out to see what it was, and these cops have these guys handcuffed on the ground in this, like, causeway for water to go down, beating them with flashlights, kicking them in the head, these two kids, about 20 or 19. And I go up and I ask for some badge numbers because I want to check this out and see what's going on here. And they threaten me with arrest, and started pushing me back.

And so you know, these guys that's kind of my perspective on community-police relations. They're not -the only community that they're a part of is a community of cops and other upper class folks. And that's basically their whole community they have. They don't work with other folks in working class families, they don't have anything to do with and of the people that they're supposed to be policing.

They just go into these neighborhoods and do what they want to do, and they don't have to answer for it in any way at all. They're just not a part, they're a separate part of the world. And they come down and do their thing and go back to whatever their community of rich cops is or wherever and, you know, review themselves or whatever.

I don't know what they're doing but it's causing a lot of harm to a lot of people that aren't in their little

clique. And so that's my view of police-community relations. I think a citizen review board would be fucking brilliant.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. Wayne Griffith.

Just a second, Mr. Griffith. I'd like to call forward Ralph O'Connell and Sherryl Nives.

WAYNE GRIFFITH: My name is Wayne Griffith, coming from pretty much the same place that the last young gentleman came from here. This is what I grew up with, you know, around this community, being one of the people that hung around, having things to do wasn't -- you know, hey, we're teenagers; we're out there having fun. We grow up, but, you know, our reputations follow us.

I'm not condoning everybody in the police community, and I'd like to thank those who have respected my civil rights over the years. And I'm just saying that we need to take a look at those who do not look at our rights as individuals and respect our personal liberties and our freedoms here.

My mother was a clerk at the DMV. And one time during my youth I was arrested for driving on a suspended license. She was a clerk in the driver's license department. She came to the Santa Rosa Police Department and -- with a printout from the State from that day, stating -- you know, showing that my license was not

suspended. There was no hold, no actions. It was completely valid. But yet, I was still being held on a -- for driving on a suspended.

Anyway, my mother was asked to leave the premises because, you know, she was standing up for my rights, and was subsequently arrested for trespassing on public property where she was jumped by several police officers. And much like the little old lady that was up here before you earlier was brutalized and subsequently has had physical problems for the rest of her life.

My mother was an outspoken person, to say the least. She passed away last year.

But I do have all those things on record from her arrest and to her release. She was subsequently released with no charges after they discovered that she was a diabetic. Needless to say, my mother was a frail, old woman and was very small and -- for her size and could have been easily subdued by even one police officer. The need for, you know, the abuse on her was way out of proportion.

And looking back on my own life and worrying about me and my safety in this community, I fear the police in this community far more than I fear any of the public.

Primarily because of the abuse that I have encountered and have incurred by subsequent police officers in this community.

So thank you very much for hearing me. And if

anybody is interested in paperwork, I have it.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, if you would like to submit it, you can send it to us and it will be made part of the record.

MR. GRIFFITH: Thank you very much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Mr. Ralph O'Connell? Is that you?

RALPH O'CONNELL: Yeah, right here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Would you state your name for the record.

MR. O'CONNELL: My name is Ralph O'Connell; I'm a resident of the Roseland area. And first off, I would say that the way this hearing was conducted was not part of a public hearing; it was a selective hearing. I'm here today to talk about an incident that happened two weeks ago tonight. It's left me devastated. I walked away from this quite shaken and fearing the police and their ability to react in stressful situations.

A neighbor committed suicide and I was over there helping two elderly women when I was confronted by deputies with guns drawn and pointed directly at my head. As I tried to talk to the officers and explain the situation, I was totally blown off and frisked, told I was suspect in a shooting. This is reality.

After the situation was assessed and they frisked me and they told me I was a suspect in the shooting, they

went into the house and found that everything I had said was true.

My fear of the police and their lack of ability to process at a time of need is so deep, I'm now going to need therapy because of it. I have lots -- I have communicated with many police officers before and was able to communicate with them. But at this point, these guys were locked and loaded and ready to fire on a suicide call.

I'm also amazed at the callousness and the lack of compassion that the officers showed towards the victims of the situation. I asked for a total of four hours to see someone about the trauma and to get some help for the victims of it. I was pretty much shunned that night. And when the officers were leaving, they gave me the number to the hospice. In a county this size I find that not acceptable.

I love my country but I fear my police state. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

I'd like to call forward Ms. Barbara Londerville R.D. Wishard.

Are you Sherryl Nives?

SHERRYL NIVES: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Could you state your name for the record, please.

MS. NIVES: I'm Sherryl Nives. Before

February 6th of this year, I had the same opinion of the sheriffs and police that most of the public has. One of trust, respect and safety. I am now more afraid of my local sheriffs than I am of anybody in my neighborhood. Here's what happened that shattered my belief.

On the evening of February 6th, my next-door neighbor committed suicide. His mother came running over, screaming for help. My husband ran back with her and I called 9-1-1. The next thing I know, there's a loud knock at the door, the door is thrown open, and two sheriffs with guns drawn are coming in.

I said, "It's not here. It's next door." They asked, "Where next door?" These deputies seemed so stressed and worked up that they couldn't comprehend what "next door" meant. Furthermore, the neighbor's address is clearly marked.

As the deputies are walking away with guns in hand, I said, "This is a peaceful situation." I find out later that they put guns to my husband's head and told him he was a suspect. A suspect for what? Helping two hysterical women coping with a very intense tragedy?

The deputies' overzealousness with their guns could have killed my four year old had she been maybe dancing in the living room when they opened the door or my husband next door had he moved wrong or sneezed.

I have now had direct contact with our local

sheriffs under an emergency situation, and I come away shocked, appalled, and the worst part is I'm now afraid of these people, especially in a stressful situation, which is when I should be able to rely on them the most.

What I want to know is what happened to our local law enforcement's sense of good judgment? Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

Barbara Londerville.

And then also come forward R.D. Wishard and Barbara Trejo. Is Ms. Trejo here? Ms. Trejo is not here? Is Toni MacDonald here. Okay.

Yes, ma'am. Please state your name for the record.

BARBARA LONDERVILLE: My name is Barbara

Londerville. We have lived in Sonoma County in a retirement

community for the last 10 years.

I work as a volunteer at the Santa Rosa police station and have been for the past 10 months. I graduated from the third citizen police academy. I have worked and spoken to many of our police officers and their employees. I have seen only dedication to their work with the community.

They're courteous, intelligent and knowledgeable about their jobs. I have never seen any evidence of racial discrimination or heard any racial slurs, jokes or remarks. I have never heard or seen any police officer advocate the

use of excessive force.

22 '

Any officer I have ever spoken to about this would rather never have to use a gun or never have to use force. An officer every day, when he goes out on patrol, can encounter anything. Child abuse, domestic violence, accidents, public intoxication, fights, and personal attacks. This is not an easy and safe job.

I have seen and experienced the extensive training that a candidate must experience before he's even considered to be a police officer and a trainee. I know of no other job that has an 18-month probation period during which your trainee is under constant supervision by a training officer, his fellow officers, and all of the supervisors. It is a constant thing and the training continues throughout an officer's life.

I have seen community policing at work in some of our troubled communities and I have seen it work. Some of these communities are still troubled but they're better than they were before. Some of this improvement is due to the dedicated work by our police officers. Many of our police officers give many hours of their time on their own time.

We, as a community, need to help and work with our law enforcement agencies. Many of us are the silent majority, and I'm afraid my husband and I are one of them. Not any longer. I intend to ask all of our friends and neighbors whom I know support our police officers to write

to you and you will be hearing from them.

21.

Thank you very much for listening to me.

MR. HERNANDEZ: We look forward to that. Thank you very much.

Yes, sir. Please state your name for the record.

R.D. WISHARD: Yes. My name is Bob Wishard and I am founder and past president of the Juilliard Park Neighborhood Watch Association.

It has been four years since our beginning. Since that time, we have dealt very closely with the officers, cavalry, patrolmen of the Santa Rosa Police Department. With very few exceptions, it has been a period of time which has been marked with many successes.

Every meeting we hold is attended by a sergeant or patrolman from our zone. We have found the officers of our watch area to be attentive and sensitive to our needs as a neighborhood in transition. As with many inner city neighborhoods, and we are just adjacent to this downtown area, absentee landlords posed a problem. The SRPD helped us to reach these people so they could make a concerted effort in clearing the area of drugs and prostitution.

I can't take your time today to list all of the achievements that we have brought about. But suffice it to say that the goals of the Santa Rosa Police Department and our Neighborhood Watch are one and the same. It is our feeling that the officers of the SRPD receive the training

that is necessary for them to survive. Our streets are not the safest, so the officer have taught us how to spot suspicious activities and how to act on the individual situations as they arise.

Recently we've seen an influx of new, young families buying homes in the area, and this is a great sign for the future.

Recently there was a shooting in our area that resulted in the death of the suspect and the wounding of an officer. If that officer had not acted with total commitment, we feel that the gunman would surely have made it farther into our neighborhood. And I can only guess what might have happened.

Although we only cover eight square blocks of the downtown area, that takes in 146 homes and 31 businesses. Since the police and the Watch started working together, statistical crime spikes have dropped across the board. Lower crime in every category is good for the community.

I need to take this time to tell you that the Watch completely supports the SRPD and their ongoing system of officer training. Without these dedicated men and women, we would not have been able to rebuild this neighborhood.

And I can only extend to the people that stand as parties on both sides of the policy question something that helped us in establishing our Watch. You cannot shake hands with a clenched fist. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. We appreciate those remarks.

Mrs. Barbara Trejo.

TONI MacDONALD: She's not here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: What's your name?

MS. MacDONALD: Toni MacDonald?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, Ms. MacDonald.

MS. MacDONALD: I'm vice-president of COPS,

Concerned Police Survivors.

22.

One statement that was mentioned here, shoot to kill really strikes home with my husband and I, but not on the part of the policemen. When a person pulls a gun on a police officer or anyone else, they are there to shoot and kill. Our son was a police officer, 24 years old. He and his partner both were shot five times for making a routine traffic stop.

I cannot stress enough what has been said about the officers. When they go out in the morning, they have no idea if they're going to come home. A lot of them don't. We lose too many police officer every year. I have the most respect for all of the officers in every town, anywhere around. They go out there, they put their lives on the line to protect the citizens. There are some bad ones. There's bad people in every line of work. You just can't say it's just the policemen. They're not. Most of the majority are good and I think they do a great job. Thank you.

1,2

. 22.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

I'd like to tall forward Michael Viloria, Lisa
Banayat, and Patrick Parks. Are any of those people here?

Is Jan Westphal here? Is Russell Jorgensen here?
Mr. Jorgenson, would you come forward.

Is Irene Hoener here? Ms. Hoener, would you come forward.

Is Virginia McCullough here? Please come forward.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And state your name for the record, please.

RUSSELL JORGENSEN: My name -- Was I first called?
MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. JORGENSEN: My name is Russell Jorgensen; I live here in Santa Rosa.

First of all, I'd like to be associated with the remarks that Kit Mariah made when she sat over here and was telling you about her experience at the Federal Building seven years ago. I found her remarks to be, to the best of my knowledge, accurate and honest.

But I want to tell you about an experience I had.

I was arrested along with the Father Bill O'Connor from

Berkeley. And on our way to the enclosure where we were to

be held, we were handcuffed together, my right arm to his

left, the cop on — the policeman on the right and the

policemen on the left put thumb holds on us and some kind of

leverage on our forearms. There was no incident going. The

reverend did not stumble or show any sign of resistance. I felt nothing. We were in pain but not extraordinary.

. 25

When he arrived at the enclosure with me, his arm was broken. We had conducted ourselves identically. His arm was broken.

My criminal career at this time began with Martin Luther King. And my wife and I were given six months and sentenced to go to Parchman Prison, which was the San Quentin of the south. Only eight years later, six or eight years later, did the prison give up hanging persons who they wanted to correct by their thumbs. We occupied a fourth of all of the cells. The Freedom Riders.

I want to say to this panel that I can only remember four instances in which I was abused. Not at Parchman. In other words, the behavior, despite the stress and — that I helped cause to police officers, the conduct to me was usually exemplary. But there were four. And one of them was not here, although there was excessive pain in the Federal Building after the arrest.

So I'm concerned, as many, I'm sure, are here, perhaps all of us, about the survivors. And I have a simple proposal. It's very brief, and I have copies for the panel. And I appreciate your hearing it. I will take this to an organization, the Center for Peace and Justice to see if they'd like to support it and I'd be happy to have other organizations or persons come forward.



.20

MR. HERNANDEZ: Could you just summarize it for us so that --

MR. JORGENSEN: It's very brief.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. JORGENSEN: In respect for all. Whenever a Sonoma County officer of the law is allegedly killed by a civilian or whenever a Sonoma County civilian is allegedly killed by an officer of the law, then a vigil of remorse will be held for one hour at Santa Rosa's Courthouse Square at 8:00 p.m. on the third evening following the death. Let us all come together as a community in grief to comfort one another and to begin the healing. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: That's a wonderful proposal. Thank you very much.

Irene Hoener.

IRENE HOENER: My name is Irene Hoener and --

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. Is it H-o-e-n-e-r? Is that correct?

MS. HOENER: Yes. I've been a resident of Sonoma County since 1988. Three weeks ago I saw the Stolen Lives Memorial which was dedicated to people who have been killed by law enforcement officers or have died while in police custody.

At that time the last date memorialized for this North Bay Area was June 4th, 1997. My name could have easily have been the next in line because on July 9th, 1997

I tried to commit suicide and somehow ended up having a two-hour standoff with deputies from the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department.

At the time, I was obviously emotionally troubled, despondent and severely depressed over recent sexual abuse and child abuse of my son by my husband, Detective Ed Hoener of the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Unit.

I filed complaints with criminal, administrative and internal divisions of the Sheriff's Department. I've been scoffed at and literally swept under the rug by this department. This is purely a case of the good old boys taking care of their own.

Upon resolution of my ordeal that day, the department saw fit to incarcerate me. Not for just a few hours or a few days, but for four months. I was in desperate need of legal and psychological help. Legal counsel was withheld from me for the first six days. I sought and demanded psychological counseling from day one and denied time and time again.

Without psychological help and support, I continued my downward spiral of despondency. I was met with resistance, arrogance, and condescension by the Sheriff's Department. These attitudes were not helpful. Especially to someone who had just be through a major traumatic event.

Common sense dictates that mental health needs



such as mine don't go unaddressed. Ignoring such needs is inappropriate, ineffective, dangerous and negligent.

Proof of this is the fact that I was still attempting suicide while under the so-called watchful eye of this department.

In September of '97 a court order was issued for my transfer from the jail to the local mental health facility where I could maybe get some help. The Sheriff's Department ignored the order, kept me jailed and isolated until I was eventually released five weeks later.

There is no excuse for such mistreatment. This is not the Dark Ages. And it's high time that department wake up and smell the pepper spray.

Inmates need and deserve better mental health care and intervention. Without it, lives are jeopardized and civil lawsuits are likely.

In closing, I want you to know that I have a very unique perspective. And I don't mean being inside and outside of jail. Because for the past 13 years I have worked for City, County and State law enforcement agencies. I know the policies. I know the procedures. And unfortunately, I know the attitudes as well. All are in need of prompt and serious revision.

Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Virginia McCullough.

VIRGINIA McCULLOUGH: My name is Virginia
McCullough; I live in Alameda County. I'm a freelance
journalist, a radio talk show personality, and I'm in
possession of the largest library on political
assassination,

private library, in the world. The (inaudible) library. I'm the custodian there for.

I came up here three years ago to begin to look at three specific cases of tremendous abuse of women by the Sonoma County law enforcement, but more importantly by Child Protective Services and the Sonoma County court system.

The first case that I looked at I was requested by a daughter of a women that had committed suicide by fire on her exhusband's front lawn. We haven't seen that type of a suicide since the days of the Vietnam War, when the monks burned themselves to death.

The woman surrounded herself with signs when she lit herself on fire testifying to the abuse of the court system, and the judges, and CPS, and social services of her daughter Mary Day. I'd like to let Clair Day speak for herself. This is the woman who died. This was her suicide letter, July 11th, 1994:

"Dear Mary: I just don't have any fight left in me. I love and have tried to help you and Shelley" -- that's the granddaughter -- "as best I could. Even working two full-time jobs and borrowing money wasn't enough to help

you gain justice in the Sonoma County court system. Your father's vengeance and money defeated you and a corrupt court system and has destroyed all the desire I have to live. I hope you get help and support you need. I pray you get justice in a higher court and that Ken and Nancy and their hired henchmen as well as the judges involved in this travesty pay for what they have done to you, to Shelley, and

I will leave this with you for your Commission as well as some very grizzly photographs.

me. I love you, Shelley, and I love you, Mary. Mom."

I also looked at the case of Maria Teresa Macias, and I'd like to leave this with you. This is from the complaint. The complaint on behalf of the family of Ms. Macias. Two paragraphs only.

"After months of nonresponsiveness, disrespect and lack of any effective intervention, Maria Teresa began to despair of being provided with meaningful assistance with or protection from Avalino's abusive behavior. She was worse off than she would have been had he never sought enforcement of the restraining order. Because by merely informing Avalino of her calls and requests and not arresting him even once, the Sheriff's Department increased the risk that the increasingly angry and hostile Avalino would seriously assault or murder Maria Teresa.

"Given a green light to continue with his crimes, emboldened by apparent sympathy and understanding provided

him by Deputy Lopez and the other deputies and becoming increasingly angry and hostile towards Maria Teresa because of her calls to the Sheriff's Department Avalino's harassment continued.

"On April 15th, 1996, when he tracked down Maria
Teresa and Sara Hernandez at a housecleaning job in the town
of Sonoma, he proceeded to shoot her in the head and shoot
Sara Hernandez as well before he turned the gun on himself
and committed suicide. After the shooting, a copy of the
restraining order was found on the seat of Avalino's car,
along with additional bullets for his gun."

The third case that I began to look at I was requested to look at after meeting for two and a half hours with an attorney who had taken the case; a woman by the name of Kate Dixon. She took the case of a woman by the name of Carol Mardeusz whose four-year-old -- five-year-old now later Haley was stolen from her by the Sonoma County court system.

Judge Cerena Wong issued an order that

Ms. Mardeusz could not report sexual and physical abuse of
her child to any police officers or any sheriff's office in
violation of state law, and she's not been allowed to speak
to her child since then. Two and a half years.

Now, the natural father Leo Majors, and his mother, Dr. Betty Majors, were both arrested in the city of Novato for sexual and physical abuse of this child. The

child now resides with the father.

Under penalty of perjury, this man testified that he is a purchaser, distributor, and user of cocaine.

There's declarations in the court file by his two exgirlfriends testifying to their abuse at his hands.

In the last three weeks, I have attended court hearings with Carol Mardeusz because she's been denied a court reporter in the courts under Judge Boyd. They've tried to put her in a mental institution for mental evaluation because she wants to represent herself after having wasted 45,000 on attorneys. And judge Rosenfield wanted to jail her. He has since retracted his order.

I'll make it very brief. When I began covering these cases, I contacted J. Michael Mullins after my car was trailed by law enforcement here in Sonoma County. Michael Mullins apparently contacted my sheriff. Because on March the 11th, my home was raided by three Alameda County Sheriff's Department under the authority of Jim Knutson. They took me to the John George Medical Center to try to commit me. But the fix wasn't in with the psychiatrist. And the psychiatrist said, "This is political, isn't it?" I said, "Yes, sir," he released me.

Seven days later, they tried it again. And they had testimony from J. Michael Mullins saying I had his private phone number and used it. I never did.

So the law enforcement officers communicate a lot

better than us citizens. Thank you very much.

21.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'd like to call forward Carol Mardeusz and Claudia Rickman.

CAROL MARDEUSZ: Yes. My name is Carol Mardeusz, and I was referred to in the last person's words. And, first of all, I want to say if you can stand I'd feel a little better.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Sure, that's fine.

MS. MARDEUSZ: I was involved in a -- I lived in Petaluma. I'm a 40-year-old lady; I have two children, a 14-year-old daughter and a seven-year-old daughter. I lived in Petaluma almost where Polly Klass was stolen, and I lived, in fact, a half a block from Polly Klass. And two weeks before Polly Klass' abduction, I called the police because my daughter reported to me that her and her girlfriend were being followed.

And so I made a police report on September 16, 1993. And the police officer, Mr. Mayberry, came to our house and wrote a report. She described the man and the car, the vehicle that followed her and her girlfriend and chased them.

And then about September 25th, 1993, I was coming home from the show not too far away at around 10:30 at night and the man was in my driveway. And I asked my daughter if that's the man that had followed her and if that's his car.

We saw a car, also. And she said, "Yeah, that's the car."

So the man was approaching his car and I had locked -- the children lock the door and I went past our house so I could get in there safely later when I made sure he was gone.

and I went down the street and came back up the street to make sure he was gone and I got part of his license plate number. So I reported this to the police.

And when I called the police that night, it was around 10:30 at night, they told me that there's no one on staff right now to come out. So they took the information and that was it. And I said he had followed my daughter before.

and so then they called back about maybe 40 minutes later and they said, "We'll send somebody out there right now." So I said, "I already gave the information over the telephone and I made a police report about a week and a half ago. So then they said, "Okay." Then that was it for that.

And then the following week, Polly Klass was stolen out of her house. You know, the same side of the street, just a block down. Taken out of her house, and kidnapped and murdered.

My daughter Natalie looks very much like Polly Klass. If you saw the two pictures at the time, you would have thought they were the same child.

After that -- it's a little upsetting after hearing all of the abuse stories. But after that, I made my

reports to the police and, you know, gave them all of the further information that I could think of. And my daughter testified and we both identified Richard Allen Davis. We had a police lineup. And we gave them all the information and they took my daughter's picture off our mantle. And they took my -- I had a little book -- I used to be a court reporter, like the lady here, and they took my book where I had all my notes and what had happened during that week. I had kept a log.

And then they said I was going to be a witness on the case, so I just left it at that. And then during this time, my daughter, the younger daughter, she had been molested by her father and there was an investigation going on. And he was arrested in Novato for molestation of my younger daughter, Haley.

And then when the trial came in the Polly Klass case, I was going to own trial, trying to get my daughter back. They had since took Haley away from me at the start of that trial. And I believe that I'm being retaliated for being a witness in that case because I came forward with the information expecting to be a witness for the prosecution; and now I end up being a witness for Richard Allen Davis. Not that I wanted to be a witness, but this is how it turned out.

And now they have my daughter and she's in the hands of her father, who abused her. When they took her

away, they let me see her some visits when they first took her away to ease her pain because I raised her since she was born. He wasn't there. He left me when I was a month pregnant.

25.

so as I raised her for the five years, he wasn't involved. He was ordered by Sonoma County courts to pay child support and he got some limited visits. And that's where he molested her. And when they took her away and gave her to the father in '95, the Richard Allen Davis trial is the start of it, she came back from one of the visits with a cigarette burn in her beg and bruises. And she said that her father did it. And I reported this and CPS did nothing about it.

And then I continued to fight for my child. And then I was approached by Mark Klass to go after Sonoma County for — to prosecute them for actually being held for the murder of his daughter. And I said I would come forward but I said that they have my child right now and I have to go through my own court case now. So I told him I would come forward but I didn't know that they were, you know, corrupt like this.

I didn't have any idea. Because I worked in law enforcement and I had no idea about this. So then he came back later and he said he was going to work within the system. Okay. I'll finish up.

Anyway, the bottom line is my child is still left

with her abusive father and I'm still being retaliated against. And I have some papers for you gentlemen that they're trying to put me in jail now for going to my daughter's school to do parent participation. And I haven't been able to see my daughter in a year and a half. And her sister, who is 14 now, can't see her sister, either.

And my mom, who has always took care of my daughter -- it's a little emotional, but she passed away last year and she wasn't allowed for a whole half a year to see her granddaughter and she practically helped me raise her because the father wasn't in the picture.

So I believe they're retaliating against me and I believe it's Michael Mullins who is the head DA. And I do have proof of my daughter's abuse with the cigarette burns with pictures. And I have proof of the police reports that I reported the incident.

That's all I have to say. It's a detailed case and it's hard to explain in five minutes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I want to let the court reporter change paper.

(Off the record.)

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Rickman. Please state your name for the record.

CLAUDIA RICKMAN: I'm Claudia Rickman, a resident of Cotati for 14 years and the last two and a half in Rohnert Park. I'm fearful of being in Rohnert Park.

It seems to me that Mr. Kao was intoxicated, he was driven from Cotati Yacht Club by Officer Kellerman of the Cotati Police Department. This is where we get into the need for changes. Mr. Kellerman drove the intoxicated Mr. Kao home and left him in front of his house intoxicated and drove away. This is the Cotati Police Department.

That was a natural setup for him to be executed by the Rohnert Park Police after the intoxicated man disturbs some neighbors. Why could not a little added effort after taking him home? The Cotati police officer, Mr. Kellerman, could have made sure he was inside the house. I know with my children, leave them drunk in front of their house? No. I have to go in and take care of them. We are a "we" with respect.

This is an added additional training to the present time police good time training. Please consider it. We are all evolving in our species, compassion and respect. That's the first part.

My second part quickly is my fear. June 3rd, I answered a knock at my door. "We're the Sonoma County Sheriffs. We have a warrant for your son Jack Rickman's arrest." "Can I see your warrant?" "We have a warrant." "Can you show me your warrant." These did not look like sheriffs. These did not look like police. They looked like Bodega fishermen.

This is called being in, you know -- underground.

They do that kind of thing. But I didn't know that. I asked three times to see a warrant. Did you see -- "Do you have some identification like a badge or an ID?" I was taken by the arms and moved to the side of the door. And I was shown a pair of handcuffs.

About three other officers, men in jeans and knit shirts went upstairs. I turned around to see the last one pull a revolver out of his back of his belt. They were going up with my son.

Now tonight I hear when you pull a gun on someone, it's deadly force. I'm seeing a gun, you're going after, in my household, after my son with a gun? And now I'm learning about deadly force, you can shoot him dead? This is what happens.

All right. They took my son away. That's not all right. This -- he was accused and is accused of home invasion burglary. I'm the criminal. Who do I -- this is my home invasion. You're taking my son away at gunpoint. I'm asking for a little respect. Show me your ID. How do I know you're not a thug, part of the Mafia? You don't look like a policeman. You don't look like a sheriff.

What is my dignity and my rights? This is my home. Who do I complain to about that? Can I talk it over with a lawyer? Can I talk it over with the public defender? Or the district attorney? Who's going to protect me? What did I do?

It's something the police have a right to do. The lady who was robbed has the police to turn to. I'm robbed by the police. Who do I have to turn to? So I think there should be a committee, a review — independent review board within every town. There's a little bit of the different population in each town and perhaps they could all within Sonoma County come together, you know. And that would be helpful to everyone. You're going to have compassion and respect and that's "we" from each of us. Right now there's no one to appeal to. No one.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much for your remarks.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Is it Mr. Twiddy?

THOMAS TWIDDY: Yes, sir.

18.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Please state your name for the record.

MR. TWIDDY: My name is Thomas Twiddy, and I've been involved in an ongoing harassment by the Healdsburg Police Department for over 21 years.

I have been arrested for drunk driving stone sober. I've been to court. I have proof here that the machine at the time they tested me was broke. These copies that they have had no instrument number on them. While the police officer — and I pretty much can prove it — when he was on the witness stand, wrote the number in there to try to make it look like the right one. The jury caught it and

they found me not guilty.

I was sentenced to a year in jail after being found not guilty. I have a subpoena for a police officer which is now the head of the Sonoma County Police Chiefs' Association. He gets a subpoena; it's his day off, he ain't coming to court. He don't want to waste his day in court. That, to me, seems wrong.

I have court documents. I have two copies here.

I have two other ones that are different, too. It says here up at the top TCR number; date of offense, 4/6/84. I have another one here, same TCR number; date of offense, 7/3/84.

I have two other copies with different dates on them.

I'm involved, it's in court right now, finally -I've been waiting 14 months now for the judge's decision but
I guess sooner or later they'll get to me. But, to me, as
far as the Grand Jury goes, I went to the Grand Jury twice.
They went to Mullins to indict the police department. He
refuses to take their indictment. He will not indict them.

And the lady that was head of my committee, she apologized to beat hell -- excuse me. But she said they did everything they possibly could. And this was at the end of the year. She gave me a form to fill out, told me to wait a month, fill out the form, reopen my case.

The person that I got on the phone was one that was held over from the last year, which I believe wasn't at that time not even an American citizen. Now, to me, I call

him up. And he would refuse to talk to me. I'd ask him to send me a form. No, well, you've been here before we're done with your case and you can't go no further. Well, that's wrong.

And, to me, Mullins just hides everything for the police department. The Grand Jury -- and I listened to him when he was talking, I was downstairs, and I was hoping -- somebody asked him a question that if the citizens' committee did indict a police department, if we had one, if he felt that they were wrong, would he overturn it? And he said yes, he would.

Well, I was hoping somebody would ask him if they found the police officer not -- or not guilty if he could find one guilty. He has never found one guilty. Like he says, since he's been there, there's only one police officer that has been -- I don't know what you would call it. Fired or whatever. Reprimanded. Whatever you call it. Do you | know what for?

MR. HERNANDEZ: No. But we're at the end of your time so. . .

MR. CARNEY: Just tell us.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Tell us and --

MR. TWIDDY: Did anybody ever hear about the dead baby found in the pickup truck in the junkyard? There was a girl driving down the street, had a baby. She got scared, she stuck the baby underneath the seat, she had a wreck. A

girl comes up to the wreck before the police got there. She heard a baby crying. She told the officer, "There's a baby in the truck, I heard a baby cry." She told him three times. He told her to get back 50 feet or he was going to lock her up for obstructing justice. Two months later, they find a baby in the junkyard.

20.

The Grand Jury had an indictment on it or an investigation. All of a, sudden he's not a police officer no more, but he's on mental disability with his full paychecks and all his benefits for the rest of his life. And he lied to the Grand Jury because he said that he had never seen the girl before. And there was a witness there that heard him say it.

And, to me, that is -- and the papers won't write about it. I've been in the papers with mine. They say I'm uncredible. I don't care what they think of me. These papers ain't lying. These are out of the DA's Office. The dates don't change. The computer ain't going to change the dates. If it did, it would be useless. So I think somebody has to do something. And I'm not a police editor.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. TWIDDY: I'm sorry. Thank you for your time.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Next. Would you state your name for the record, please.

JANICE KARMAN: My name is Janice Karman, and I'm here because I don't feel that as a women you can get a fair

treatment in child support or visitation cases before the courts in Sonoma County. And I've had three cases before the court.

The first one was a visitation case that should have been easily settled with mediation services. It dragged on for ten months and cost me over \$10,000. Neither parent was accusing the other parent of being a bad parent. It was strictly a case where the father felt that he couldn't do without his child for four weeks while I took him to Montana in the summer to be with all of our extended family on the lake where all relatives come.

That was the first case.

The second case was I had a child support case because after the visitation was settled in October of '96, the father declared he was losing his job and couldn't pay child support. He then filed on the DA case was the DA -- it was the DA on behalf of my child against the father. He filed on that case and said, "I can't pay child support." He quit paying child support.

I continued to pay for my child and support and take care of everything. Every month we went to court. Every month nothing was done. The DA continuously told me that they did not represent me, and they did not represent my child. They represented the State of California.

I am a non-welfare parent and I have never been on welfare. The DA is required by law to collect my child

support and had been collecting it successfully for three and a half years. The father had been paying through the District Attorney's Office and I was getting child support every month for both child care and support.

18.

21.

They gave him not only a reduction after -- the case finally went to trial on June 20th, of '97. He filed February of '97. When it went to court -- we'd been going to court every month, nothing was being done at all. The district attorney -- her husband was also prosecuting the domestic violence case against my ex at the same time concurrently that we were going through the visitation -- excuse me -- through the child support case within the court.

My district attorney, Antonia Agerbek, was making derogatory comments about me because the husband was prosecuting the domestic violence. And she would tell me things while she was supposed to talking to me about my case and hopefully moving it along.

From the beginning, she was not cooperating, not providing discovery, did not file the proper paperwork on the first response. And the first response is that you say what the father's supposed to show as far as his income and expense. And it's required by law that he shows two tax returns. He filed nothing. And was also required to show six months of his salary. He didn't file that either.

And she wrote back -- and because I didn't know

the law and said, "Please, at least get two copies of his most recent pay stub." She wrote back and said, "You're required by law to do this, but since the mother only required two pay stubs, submit two pay stubs.

21·

we went to court. They used my last year's income. I was making \$993. Even on unemployment for the three weeks he was not working, because he worked solidly, he was only three weeks off work they used his current income and made it something like -- excuse me. Not his current, they used his previous three weeks off work, like \$800 or something.

Anyway, it was a reduction in child support. But most damaging to me was they quit collecting my child support. And this was a father who had no history of paying it on his own and had made a big court case of the fact that he had to pay it. They started paying it to my child's school and said they'd no be longer enforcing it and that I didn't have any way to enforce it unless I went back to court and got another judgment. They --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Could you summarize your remarks.

MS. KARMAN: Okay. They also made it end in June. So they essentially gave me about a eight-month child support order, and my child is eight months old. So now they are trying to cover this up. They have got it in appeal in the Ninth District in San Francisco. And they're

trying to get me sign off the case. And had I been on this case at the trial, I would have been able to expose my -- testify. You know, give all the evidence that I had. I had expert witnesses in the audience. And what they did is they refused to let me testify because of the motion in limine. They went into chambers and the judge --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. The --

MS. KARMAN: -- and the DA made their own decision on my child's future.

MR. HERNANDEZ: All right.

MS. KARMAN: And at this point, it's in appeal and they don't know why they're appealing it. They call it a generic appeal --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

MS. KARMAN: -- and a retired Appellate judge says he's never heard of a generic appeal, that it sounds like DA rhetoric that they're making up.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. KARMAN: That's just the one thing.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, your time is up.

Your time is up. I'm sorry.

Okay. This is the last witness.

Please state your name for the record.

KALIA MUSSETTER: My name is Kalia Mussetter.

Thank you so much for being here. Our community really needs you here.

I've lived and worked and gone to school in Santa Rosa for 15 years, and I feel very invested in this community. And I've been watching the situation between law enforcement and the rest of the community evolve here over the last two years. And I've been really, really disturbed by it.

And I have been really discouraged and saddened by the polarization that's happened and that was mentioned this morning. And I even have felt it since I've been here for the last four hours in the audience. This idea that we can either — that if some of us want to bring change to the police, that there's just this incredible sort of hostility between two sides, and I think that that's not helping.

My experience with police in this county, I have several friend who are officers. I've worked for several officers' families before. And I know that there are many police of good heart in this county because I know them.

My experience, also, though on the other hand, is that there is a lack of -- there's often a lack of ethical treatment of people in the community by law enforcement.

I've experienced that personally. So have friends of mine, especially women.

And I feel like there's a lack of understanding in the community about what an incredibly difficult job law enforcement is. I have heard from my friends the assault and violence and craziness that they're exposed to all the

∙25

time. And as a citizen, I would like to see more resources and more training made available to all law enforcement so that they have the choice to be sane and to react effectively in a moment have duress.

I don't think that they have that choice now.

Thank you. I just need to say one more thing since you're here. Since you've flown 300 miles, I'm going to say this one more thing.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Try five.

MS. MUSSETTER: Thank you for your patience.

Also, based on the extensive testimony here today, it's very obvious that there are some officers who are abusing power in this county. And despite what people may think, one person being mistreated in that way is one person too many.

And there's obviously also collusion between the court system that is corrupted in this county. And I would like to really -- I would hope that whatever recommendations that this Commission makes will be binding in our county and that law enforcement will be compelled to act on your recommendations. And I think it's not only important for us, for me as a citizen, I need to feel safe with my local police. And I kind of don't.

I think we also owe it to all of the officers who are of good heart and who are honorable to do this.

Something is not working. Thank you.



\_

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

A VOICE: I have a question.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, ma'am.

A VOICE: Will your deliberations be public?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, everything is on the record.

MR. MONTEZ: The results will be.

MR. HERNANDEZ: The results will be public, yes.

A VOICE: But will your deliberations themselves be public if we want to come to Los Angeles?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, let me just say that -- Let me just wind this up by saying we will -- what I, as chairman, intend to do with the committee, is to form a subcommittee of the California Advisory Committee to the Commission on Civil Rights. And that subcommittee will monitor the situation and look at the situation further.

So we will meet again, and I don't know exactly when, and look at what we have in the way of transcripts.

And I'll set up a subcommittee and we'll be getting back to the community within the next few months. Okay?

Now, it's been a long day for the Committee and I think for all of us. I want to thank everybody, and I want to especially thank our Commissioners who were here with us all day and gave us their time.

And I apologize to the community for the lack of good facilities. But we tried the best we could. And we're

all volunteers here, we don't get paid for this.

And so we will get back -- we heard, we listened.

And we thank you very much for your participation, and this hearing is now adjourned.

(Hearing adjourned at 7:05 p.m.)

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	State of California ) ) ss.
3	County of Sonoma )
4	
5	I, LUEL J. SIMSON, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
6	State of California, No. 4720, do hereby certify:
7	That I was present at the above-mentioned
8	proceedings; that I took down in shorthand notes all
9	proceedings had; that I thereafter transcribed said shorthand
10	notes into longhand typewriting, the above and foregoing
11	being a full, true and correct transcript of all proceedings
12	had.
13	
14	Dated: March 12, 1998.
15	
16	LUEL J. SIMSON, CSR NO. 4720
17	
18	
19	
20	
<b>21</b>	,
22	
23	·
24	
25	
26	· .