```
Pages 1 - 51
 1
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                     NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
     Before The Honorable William H. Orrick, Judge
 4
 5
     DELPHINE ALLEN, et al.,
                Plaintiffs,
 6
       VS.
                                        NO. C 00-04599 WHO
 7
 8
     CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,
 9
                Defendants.
10
                                 San Francisco, California
                                 Tuesday, April 11, 2023
11
                     TRANSCRIPT OF HYBRID PROCEEDINGS
12
13
     APPEARANCES:
14
15
     For the Plaintiffs:
                            BURRIS NISENBAUM CURRY & LACY
16
                            Airport Corporate Centre
                             7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1120
17
                            Oakland, California 94621
                       BY: JOHN L. BURRIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW
18
19
                            LAW OFFICES OF JAMES B. CHANIN
                             3050 Shattuck Avenue
20
                            Berkeley, California 94705
                       BY: JAMES B. CHANIN, ATTORNEY AT LAW
21
22
23
               (APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)
24
     REPORTED BY: Ana Dub, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR, CRG, CCG
                   CSR No. 7445, Official U.S. Reporter
25
```

| 1 | APPEARANCES: (CONTINUE | ED) |
|----|------------------------|---|
| 2 | For the Defendants: | OFFICE OF OAKLAND CITY ATTORNEY |
| 3 | | One Frank Ogawa Plaza, Sixth Floor Oakland, California 94612 |
| 4 | BY: | · |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | For the Intervenor Oak | land Police Officers Association: RAINS LUCIA STERN |
| 7 | | ST. PHALLE & SILVER, PC 2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Suite 500 |
| 8 | BY: | Pleasant Hill, California 94523 ROCKNE A. LUCIA, JR., ATTORNEY AT LAW |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | Also Present: | Mayor Sheng Thao |
| 11 | | Interim City Administrator Steven Falk |
| 12 | | Interim Police Chief Darren Allison |
| 13 | | Dr. Tyfahra Milele (Via Zoom) Oakland Police Commission Chair |
| 14 | | Retired Superior Court Judge Brenda |
| 15 | | Harbin-Forte Oakland Police Commission Ad Hoc Head |
| 16 | | Michelle Phillips, Inspector General |
| 17 | | Charlotte Jones |
| 18 | | Interim Executive Director Community Police Review Agency |
| 19 | | Deputy Chief James Beere |
| 20 | | Deputy Chief Drennon Lindsey |
| 21 | | Deputy Director Kiona Suttle |
| 22 | | Captain Kevin Kaney, Internal Affairs |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

Tuesday - April 11, 2023 1 3:32 p.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 And we are here in Case Number 00-4599, THE CLERK: 4 5 Allen, et al. vs. City of Oakland, et al. Counsel, if you would please come forward and state your 6 appearance for the record. 7 MR. BURRIS: John Burris for the plaintiff. Good 8 afternoon, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 10 11 MR. BURRIS: Jim? MR. CHANIN: James Chanin for plaintiffs, Your Honor. 12 MS. MARTIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Brigid 13 Martin for the City of Oakland. And I have many esteemed city 14 15 members here with me. 16 I have Mayor Sheng Thao. 17 Interim City Administrator Steven Falk. Interim Police Chief Darren Allison. 18 I also have, virtually, the Oakland Police Commission 19 20 chair, Dr. Tyfahra Milele. 21 Head of the Oakland Police Commission Ad Hoc, Retired Superior Court Judge Brenda Harbin-Forte. 22 From the Office of the Inspector General, the Inspector 23 General, Michelle Phillips. 24 25 The Interim Director of the Community Police Review

Agency, Charlotte Jones. 1 And subject matter experts from the Department, including 2 Deputy Chief James Beere; Deputy Chief Drennon Lindsey; 3 Deputy Director Kiona Suttle; and Internal Affairs Division 4 5 Captain Kevin Kaney, who is also acting right now for Deputy Chief Clifford Wong of the Bureau of Risk Management. 6 7 THE COURT: Great. Well, thank you all for being here. 8 And do I have to -- hello, Mr. Lucia. 9 MR. LUCIA: Just for the record, Your Honor, Rocky 10 11 Lucia for intervenor Oakland POA. Good to see you again. THE COURT: It's good to see you. 12 13 I got a tip from a judge who I admire, a former judge who I admire that I hadn't let you introduce yourself. So, 14 15 thank you. And, Mayor Thao, I'm pleased that you're here. 16 17 Let me welcome everybody. And you can sit down. MS. MARTIN: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 So my focus today, as it has been since I 19 THE COURT: 20 succeeded Judge Henderson on this matter, is how the Court can 21 ensure that the City of Oakland achieves full compliance with 22 the NSA, the Settlement Agreement which was negotiated 20 years

So I'm going to start this afternoon with a few questions

ago with the plaintiffs and establishes constitutional policing

23

24

25

in all aspects of its work.

for Chief Allison. Then I'm going to lay out my thinking based on the joint CMC statement and the Independent Monitor's report.

After that, I'm going to ask for comments from the plaintiffs, from OPOA, from the Police Commission, and then the City and the Mayor.

So, Chief Allison, I'm going to put you on the hot seat, as you have been a fair amount since I succeeded to Judge Henderson.

CHIEF ALLISON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And so you've been on the force for the entire time, I think, of the Court's monitoring of OPD.

Since I've been the judge, I've seen impressive accomplishments, like the dramatic reduction shown by the stop data, both in terms of numbers and now even some impact on racial disparity.

I've seen the risk management meetings become an effective way to support constitutional policing.

I've seen the implementation of technology through vision and through the body-worn cameras.

To the same end, I've seen a lot of policies implemented to shore up the gaps in a myriad of tasks.

But here's the "but." I've also seen what seems to be a cultural inability of OPD to police itself, to hold itself and its officers accountable without fear or favor. And this seems

particularly true in cases involving OPD command staff. And it's this lack of integrity, this culture that plays favorites and protects wrongdoers that undercuts the foundations of constitutional policing. And 20 years of court supervision hasn't solved that problem, which was a major concern with the Riders more than 20 years ago.

So that's my preface to two questions that I have for you.

The first one is: How are you and OPD addressing this cultural problem? And then the second part of that is: What can the Court do to support you in those efforts?

CHIEF ALLISON: Thank you, Your Honor.

As you know, as you've laid out, I've been here for a very long time. I started with the City in 1994. So I've seen the police department before the NSA, and certainly, particularly through my command experience, I've seen almost everything through the NSA, going back to even 2005. I was in the Inspector General's Office as a sergeant, later a young lieutenant. So I've certainly seen everything that you've seen and everything that you've laid out, Your Honor.

You know, I think when you look at organizational culture and how do you change it, you know, I think it always begins with hiring folks that are aligned with the value of the organization and values with the community. And for a long time, we didn't have a community oversight body that existed, up until just several years ago.

I think the first step in culture change is really trying to bring in people that you know have those institutional values, and then train those individuals through the academy, through field training to make sure that's inculcated through the organization. And that extends all the way to who you promote, putting the right people in the right places that are making the right decisions.

I have seen us progress over the years when it comes to the culture of the organization. I've seen great innovations, great transparency, great accountability, great community relationships and collaboration.

But I've also seen bad decisions, wrong decisions, missteps, and certainly have experienced several setbacks, times where we're standing in front of Judge Henderson talking about them and now yourself, Your Honor.

And so I always struggle with how do we hold that line.

And I think from the leadership having that heart, looking at one's own heart and examining themselves and seeing that reflected in others, I think, is important.

So that goes back to putting the right people in the right seats to replicate that, and holding account.

I also think that as a business where the biggest asset are people, we know that there's going to be failures; we know that there's going to go wrong decisions; is working very closely with an independent body that can see them -- or see us

independently.

And I know over the last couple of years in particular, we have strengthened our collaboration and our work with our current oversight bodies, with the Police Commission, with the CPRA, with the IG's Office, and especially with the ability to audit us through the IG's Office ramping up over the recent months and year; that for those decisions that are wrong or made in error, that there will be that net that catches those things that get misstepped.

We're obviously -- all the setbacks, I feel them. It frustrates me. I would love to see us just move forward, just in best practices as an organization. And I know that we consistently raise the bar high.

So I think from my perspective, just really institutionalizing that culture; again, reinforcing not only the training -- and I know we've presented on Project Reset, which is a different training than we've ever done before. It talks about organizational culture. It analyzes our own culture and then highlights being change agents of that culture.

And so getting folks to think that way and understand the importance of it and then replicate it and get that courageous followership to be able to bring that forward is going to be a beginning of it; the policies that reinforce it; and then, obviously, putting the right leaders in the right place to hold

account and see it for themselves and be supportive, from the other leadership, to say, "It's okay to make decisions. It's okay to hold accountability. And it's also okay to make mistakes if they are done for the right reasons."

THE COURT: So, and you're always going to make mistakes. You have and the police department has the toughest job I can imagine doing. People are always going to mess up.

Not being honest about the problems that occur; trying to cover up things because it's a little easier, it seems like it's going to be an easier way of sort of alighting the problem; playing favorites with people who either have political sway or they're people that you just kind of like, that's, I think, central to what's going on. And just being able to hold people to account, it's a critical thing. And I hope and I expect that you're doing that.

CHIEF ALLISON: Sure.

THE COURT: And so that's one issue.

How about the second part of my question? What is it that the Court can do, that it hasn't been doing, or whether it can do anything to deal with the cultural problem that has existed from the Riders day and maybe for a lot longer than that?

CHIEF ALLISON: Well, Your Honor, I think that there's been a lot -- I mean, certainly, any tone that hasn't been set within the organization, I've always respected the Court has set the tone for those areas that we need to pay great focus

to.

And I think that maybe helping us as we get to the sustainability period. And I know we are several months into it, and we've had some advantages and some successes, and we've had certainly some setbacks.

Helping us focus in on the things that are remaining, the tasks that really are remaining. I know that, not to get too nuanced, but certainly the IA process, the discipline process, trying to really put all of our energy into that to set the foundation of the cultural expectations, because I do believe that the policies and the training really are going to amplify it.

So I think from the Court's assistance is basically putting all the inertia into those last remaining vestiges of compliance that we really need to get into to have long-lasting compliance.

And I think, also, I would love to see that transition over to community oversight, because I think we are at that point to where that can -- and I'm not going to speak for the Court. That's not what I'm trying to do. But since you asked about how the Court could help --

THE COURT: That's what I'm looking for.

CHIEF ALLISON: -- is that transition into that community oversight, because I think that the infrastructure is there, and just what does that now look forward to, moving

forward into the future beyond the NSA.

THE COURT: Okay. So are you satisfied -- I'm going to move on to a couple of other questions.

Are you satisfied that the policies that were recommended by the Clarence Dyer report and the systemic report, as modified by the City in the case management statement, as well as those that are going through the approval process, are going to ensure accountability and integrity in addressing officer and, especially, supervisor and leadership misconduct?

CHIEF ALLISON: Yes, Your Honor.

And one thing I want to emphasize is, you know, there were issues that were raised out of that report, and it ended up touching 15 policies or forms.

And so we went back and we dove in deep right away. We didn't wait to get it started or wait for direction. We ended up diving into those policies, and figured out one thing that stood out, not only in the public report but in recent monitoring team reports, was taking seriously those serious cases.

Obviously, with an organization that receives numerous complaints -- I think we closed about 1100 complaints last year -- that you can't scrutinize every single one of them. It's just humanly impossible with just the capacity.

But looking at the ones that are serious and holding them to a serious level is important. That's the ones -- those are

the ones that really impact public trust.

And I think the policies put in place a mechanism that balances the workflow capacity with bubbling up to the top those issues that are the highest importance that need the highest scrutiny, bringing in the higher levels of review so it's not left to just one person making all the decisions at a lower level; that it touches the executive team at a higher level where, if there are missteps at that level, then we can start the accounting process at a higher level.

Certainly, with the transparency piece, the better presentations at meetings and documentation of those meetings when key decisions, important decisions of discipline are made is certainly going to reinforce that piece of it.

And really, just, again, creating a greater sense of, if there's disagreements, it can't be hidden in the shadows anymore. It's going to be out there, whether it's going to be highlighted in an executive summary or shown in meeting notes or track changes.

So one thing that, to get rid of organizational cultural issues or threats to organizational cultures, you have to start shining light on shadows. You can't let things hide in the shadows. And I think these policies shine lights on areas and issues that are the right areas and issues to minimize and prevent those issues from hiding again.

And then, certainly, the collaboration -- which I know

```
wasn't necessarily one of the recommendations -- but the
 1
     collaboration and the notification to our oversight bodies --
 2
     CPRA and the Commission -- will also give what I mentioned
 3
     earlier, that redundancy and that safety net for those issues
 4
     that might slip through the cracks or may be the product of a
 5
     wrong decision, an improper decision or a bad decision.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: So as best you can tell, these policies,
     if they're in force, should solve the problem?
 8
              CHIEF ALLISON: I think it will shore up the process.
 9
     I don't think a policy in and of itself solves a culture
10
    problem.
11
              THE COURT: I couldn't agree more. That is up to the
12
13
     individuals who are responsible for the policy; right?
                              That's correct. And that's where --
14
              CHIEF ALLISON:
              THE COURT:
                          So --
15
16
              CHIEF ALLISON: I'm sorry to cut you off.
17
              THE COURT: Yeah.
                                 No, no. Go ahead.
              CHIEF ALLISON:
                              I was saying, that's where it comes to
18
     putting the right people in the right chairs to make those
19
     decisions.
20
                          And on that point, I think particularly in
21
              THE COURT:
     the last several years, OPD has done a good job of recruiting a
22
23
    more diverse force.
                          The people that I met a few years ago when
     I went to the seminar over in Berkeley, the officers who were
24
25
     there, just very impressive people. And it's not -- I'm much
```

less concerned at this stage about the force in general than I am about the leadership making everything else work for the Department. And that's really -- that's what's got to happen.

Let me switch gears for a second.

I'm most heartened by the review and use of the stop data and the way that risk management meetings are working. I think they're at the core of whatever success OPD has had in implementing the NSA.

And so can you assure me that these are central to OPD's work today and on a going-forward basis?

CHIEF ALLISON: Absolutely, Your Honor.

The work and the outcomes of those risk management meetings, I think, does show us in a highlighted, shining star in the profession. I have a lot of counterparts -- chiefs, assistant chiefs, executives -- in other organizations that they don't do this. In fact, I asked one executive of a major police department what they do with their risk management data, and it wasn't anything; it wasn't anything stellar whatsoever.

And when I think back on our risk management policy and what it's -- our meetings and what it's produced, either in the forms of policy -- parole, probation, handcuffing policies -- or in the form of practices and training -- recognizing supervisor promotion deficiencies in the sense of not giving them field experience, so it birthed the field training program for our sergeants -- the analysis into outliers or increase in

disparity. We had the report that we produced on Hispanic disparity stops. And just the intentionality and focus of issues and concerns that have driven down risk. And I can talk about ECW or Taser use that has dropped, disparities, pursuits.

And so I think that has to be a core staple of not only our organization, but any organization, because when you pay attention to something, it absolutely modifies or changes what you pay attention to. And so it has to be a core function, and I will commit to ensuring that that stays as part of our Department.

THE COURT: Okay. So just to let you know, I'm thinking of no longer requiring the Monitor to attend the risk management meetings. I will require that OPD provide slides and the stop data to the Monitor. And you may, of course, request the Monitor's presence or the Monitor may, at his discretion, choose to attend.

CHIEF ALLISON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So here's my final question. The City has suggested that I narrow the scope of the Independent Monitor's work to Task 2, 5, and 45. I'm inclined to add Tasks 24 and 25 to that list, simply because, at a high level, the failure of IAD and the command staff, as documented by Clarence Dyer, was about addressing officer misconduct, as is the analysis of uses of force.

What's your perspective on the City's suggestion and on

Task 24 and 25?

CHIEF ALLISON: Thank you, Your Honor.

I think one of the things that has been done well with Task 24 and 25, and use of force in particular, is creating capacity internal within the organization. So I've had that task for many years, as you well know, and reported out on it. And we, through intentionality, have focused on areas of concern.

Taking that and then replicating our own kind of internal standing on it has proven to be highly effective. It doesn't always change the potential missteps, whether it's a body-worn camera issue or maybe it's a use of force that wasn't reported properly. But the point that we're seeing is we're catching it now, and we're catching it through our own command reviews.

We're also catching it -- because of the speed at which we're catching it and communicating down, whether it's down through an accountability measure, NIA, or communicated down "Well, maybe it's not a misconduct issue but maybe is a training point issue," it's causing it to course-correct pretty rapidly.

So I think from a capacity standpoint, my intention is to keep those command reviews going; that I don't see a reason to stop them, even -- whether those tasks are monitored or not, I think we need to keep that going because it's been proven effective in not only catching the issues, but catching it

ourselves and training the new supervisors to catch it themselves.

And so from my perspective, having that capacity and, certainly, working closer with our community oversight bodies, that we can maintain those tasks.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. You can sit down.

CHIEF ALLISON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So let me tell you what I'm thinking, and this is what I want your input on.

Obviously, the City's not in full compliance with the NSA.

The sustainability period is going to be extended.

I'm going to hold another in-person case management conference on September 26th at 3:30 to assess where we are at that time.

What I'm thinking of is, as of June 1st, I would reduce the scope of the Monitorship to Tasks 2, 5, 24, 25, and 45. But I also want to support the City in any reasonable way to attain compliance.

And so I'd like to hear from, first, the plaintiffs and then OPOA and then the Police Commission and then the City -- and I shouldn't separate the Police Commission from the City -- but Ms. Martin, and then the Mayor on what you think about that, as well as any other things you want to tell me.

So, Mr. Chanin.

MR. CHANIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

When I spoke to the Court on April 27th, 2022, nearly one year ago, OPD was on the verge of entering the sustainability period. I congratulated the Department.

But after saying no one is perfect, just like you did -and we are not looking for perfection in the sustainability
period, just like you said -- I also stated what we are looking
for is a department that can and will identify problems and
major scandals when they occur and will not leave that job to
someone else.

All the major scandals in the past have been discovered by someone else, either a reporter, a monitor, a member of the City Council, or the plaintiffs' attorneys, or a combination thereof. Never has it been the Oakland Police Department.

I further stated I am not confident that if a scandal occurs in the future, that it will be brought forward by the OPD.

Today should be a happy day. We should all be agreeing that the OPD has ended the NSA and that federal oversight has ended. However, I cannot agree to this proposition. We have lost another chief who, like Sean Whent, brought us to the very brink of compliance before disaster struck, in his case in the form of the sex scandal.

We also have no resolution to the overuse of findings of

unfounded, which appear to be used to avoid the allegation being discussed at risk management meetings and other areas where an officer's conduct is evaluated.

To end this problem, I propose that the Monitor, the OPD command staff, and the Police Commission, if they so choose, take a sample of the so-called unfounded cases and report if any of these unfounded findings should instead be sustained or not sustained and, thus, go into the risk management process.

I don't agree with the defendants that the Court should remove the affirmative assessment of the tasks they mentioned.

And I note Your Honor has left out Task 31, officer-involved shootings, and Task 34, racial profiling.

They should, instead of being eliminated, remain an active task pursuant to the rules of the Negotiated Settlement Agreement.

I don't want to be here if, for example, there is a blatant violation of Task 34 or a questionable officer-involved shooting takes place, and then I have to get into the argument -- an argument with the City as to whether I can even talk about this in court or the Monitor can assess this.

I also disagree with the defendants that racial disparity in discipline of black and white officers for unintentionally failing to accept or refer complaints is acceptable somehow because the same disparity occurred previously. That's not all they said, but it is what they said.

I am pleased to see that the Department intends to drill

down on this problem. However, I still feel that looking at the disciplined officers' video would also be helpful. I want to be convinced that this discipline, which by its very nature involves substantial command staff discretion, is not a product of some sort of bias on the part of the supervisor meting out the discipline.

Furthermore, I want to disassociate myself from those who have said, without any evidence but unknown sources, that the Mayor was pressured by the Monitor to terminate the chief. There is no proof whatsoever that this happened. Whatever we may think of the Clarence Dyer & Cohen's personnel decisions, there is no excuse for Chief Armstrong's public comments that the Monitor, an officer of this Court, is disingenuous and only motivated by perpetuating the NSA.

Chief Armstrong's additional claim that the Mayor was forced by the Monitor to terminate him is, as yet, unsupported by a single named witness and, thus, reeks of sexism.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Chanin, I don't want to talk about Chief Armstrong.

MR. CHANIN: Okay.

THE COURT: I appreciate your support of the Monitor, and he has my full support.

I want to talk about what we're doing here, what OPD -- how OPD is going to attain compliance with the NSA and constitutional policing. So let's go to that.

MR. CHANIN: Okay, Your Honor. What you can do is what you have been doing. I, of all people, know how long a process this has been: 23 years, as of December 7th, since we filed this lawsuit. But I do not think that it was not worthwhile. I think it's hard that it takes so long. No one is more frustrated than John and me. We cannot believe we're still here. Every time I hear the case called "00," et cetera, I cringe, and I don't -- I don't like it.

But I also think that your presence here, like

Judge Henderson before you, is extremely important. You help
them toe the line. You really do. And the fact that it's
taken a long time is really hard to digest. It's hard for John
and me to digest. It must be hard for you to digest. You have
other things to do. I respect that.

But the fact is, there are people alive today, there are African Americans who have not been stopped by OPD because of the united efforts of plaintiffs' attorneys, the Defense in some cases, and especially the Court. You're the reason -- a big reason why the number of African Americans stopped has declined so great.

THE COURT: So, and I am in complete agreement that that has been a huge benefit, and I think the Court supervision has been a huge benefit. So I don't disagree with those things.

I'm trying to figure out, and what I'm most interested in,

the one issue that we haven't made a ton of progress in is the cultural rot that existed at the time that you brought this suit 23 years ago and that comes up again and again. And so I want to know what it is that you think is the best way of addressing this.

MR. CHANIN: Well --

THE COURT: And maybe you've just answered it. Maybe it's --

MR. CHANIN: Well, I think I did.

THE COURT: -- just we keep doing what we're doing.

MR. CHANIN: I think I did.

But I want to say that I don't agree that this department is filled with bad people. I recently went on a ride-along in East Oakland; and in one night, the officer dealt with fire on 580, two criminals who drove up and down the street, shooting at each other, an event which ended in one of the cars crashing into a neighbor's fence and destroying most of it; two women who were so disoriented that the officer spent nearly an hour trying to calm them down. And that was just part of how the evening was spent. He got rid of me at 10 o'clock because he had so much paperwork to do.

This officer did an outstanding job. And I was informed that this night was more typical than not. And all the officers I met that night were courteous and trying to do their best.

We often discuss only the bad things. That's what lawyers do sometimes. But this officer was more typical of the Oakland police officers I've met over the years, rather than all the admittedly bad stuff I've reported and litigated over the years. So we can't lose sight of that, and I certainly don't. That's why I go on these ride-alongs.

I want to say something briefly about women officers, if that's okay.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. CHANIN: Yeah. I think that the only thing harder than being a police officer is being a woman police officer.

I've represented many women police officers, including Berkeley and Oakland and San Francisco; and I know that being a woman is a really, really hard job when you're a cop.

And I saw in the poll, however, that there's some good signs that certainly weren't true in the '80s and '90s when I was practicing law and represented women in federal court.

For example, 76 percent feel respected by their supervisors. That's something that wouldn't have been true in Alameda in the 1980s.

There's still bad news. Only 21 percent believe the promotion process is fair. Only 46 percent believes the agency takes claims of harassment seriously.

That's something you could do, frankly, is continue to monitor this, the role of women at OPD; talk about getting

numbers up, because I think women have a really positive role 1 in a department. An all-male department is almost, by 2 definition -- I'm trying to think of a word other than --3 THE COURT: You don't have to go there, Mr. Chanin. 4 5 agree with whatever you were about to say. MR. CHANIN: And I think, you know, calling for the 6 7 progress they're making on hiring women, calling on the progress they're making in having women sergeants, lieutenants, 8 and captains, that would be helpful. So there are many helpful 9 10 things I think you can do, Your Honor. 11 But we do have to end sometime, and I agree with that. just don't agree it's right now. And I don't -- I don't think 12 that's the fault of the plaintiffs' attorneys. We were as 13 shattered by this almost as the cops were. 14 15 Thank you. 16 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Chanin. 17 Mr. Burris, are you going to join in? 18 MR. BURRIS: Absolutely. First off, I would like to thank the Court for cutting off 19 20 the conversation that Mr. Chanin was making about the chief. That was a very -- that could have been a very dark spot to go 21 22 to. And I appreciate the Court letting all of us know that 23 that's not the subject of this particular hearing and so it was important not to continue that line of discussion, and I 24 25 appreciate that.

Now, before this case started, Your Honor, 23 years ago -actually, for me it started before then -- I had written a -co-written a book at the time called Blue vs. Black: Let's End
the Conflict Between Cops and Minorities. And part of the
discussion that I had at the time was about the culture of
policing and, secondly, about can we trust the police to police
itself.

These were fundamental issues that sort of went to the essence of why I was -- why I do the work. It was really important because I understood that the policing component, if not checked and called into question, would have a very adverse impact on the African American communities and other communities of color, which that ultimately was borne out.

So I will say that as a consequence of the work that's taken place, the stop data and even Task 45, there's been some really positive things that have taken place I'm really, really pleased about.

And as the Court knows, I've raised these questions time and time again. And I will only say as an aside, on a project that I'm presently working on, I've had to really look at some of the other departments around the country and where they have been in terms of policing and the challenges they presented.

Particularly, like today we're hearing about Louisville and the courageous acts of the officers; but I can tell you that department is in bad, bad shape and African Americans in

that community are treated poorly. And I read the documents pertaining to them, I thought harkened back to where we started from. Now, I hope that it doesn't take Louisville 25 years to get there, but it's a long haul.

And so a lot of good effort has been made here to that, which we've acknowledged and I think the Court acknowledges and I think everyone acknowledges and which, I've been very, very pleased by some of the progress that has been made.

But I'm still troubled by the cultural issue.

Undercurrent of that is the policing oneself and the leadership questions, because I don't think you can sustain yourself if the leadership isn't there.

And because we've had constant turnover in the last -since we've been involved here, I think that has contributed in
many ways to get a consistency approach to attacking the
cultural issues, because the culture is a function of the
pattern and practices that exist within a department and how -what is carried on from one generation to the next and they
bring those set of values.

And I think that, given that the numbers that we have, in many ways, if you just looked at the technical aspect of it, it's been positive. We don't have the beatings that we used to have; and certainly, we don't have -- the stop data stuff has improved; and certainly, as you know, in terms of the culture, the employment racial issues that I've raised previously around

officers themselves, that issue is better. It's not completely done.

But the question, how do you get to the cultural question, is one. And I know the Court has raised that question. It's one that I've thought about for many, many years. I know that if you don't control the cultural issues, I think, and changing the culture, I don't think sustainability can last, it can be sustained indefinitely, which is the hope, you know.

Rockne and I talk about our kids, just started out together, and now there are grandkids and I got great-grands.

But the future was always about that aspect of it and what does sustainability mean. And for me, it is not me, my generation or the next generation or the generations after that. And I don't know that we're going to get there without resolving this question of cultural change, where it's deeply embedded in the soul of the Department. And I don't have the answer to that.

Now, I do know that probably if you have solid, consistent leadership at the top with accountability, where people are held to answer like -- held to answer, which then we have issues that: Can that be true? Is that true? Can we count on that? Given a couple of issues that have come up more recently. Because those individuals at a time were in a position to demonstrate to all of us that what we put in place in fact sustained itself and does work. But it has not. It

has come up short. And so is that symbolic of what can happen, or is that an aberration or not?

But it is concerning. It is just very concerning.

Because I think that at the end of the day, we've got to deal with the cultural issues; and a lot of that comes, I suppose, from the training, the hiring, who you hire, how you train them, and how you hold people accountable when mistakes are made, because mistakes, as the Court knows -- we all know; we've been in this business a long time -- mistakes are going to happen.

And it would have been a real test if when this particular case arose, that the system that was in place handled it. And the second case that has come up that we're talking about, did the system handle it? And if so, that would have been an indication of sustainability, at least at this stage.

So now we don't know, and I am troubled by that. And hopeful. But we can't stop or decide not to go forward.

But we do have to recognize that the question of culture is an ongoing process. It is not one day, two days, and you stop. It is how do you handled the problems when they developed and whether or not the culture is such that you hold people accountable from beginning to end, regardless of their station within the Department. And those are concerns that I still have, you know, now.

And I think that, as I looked at the list that the Court

indicates that they want to have continue with monitoring, certainly, they are all significant, honestly. We cannot turn a blind eye to some of the areas that have taken place.

Consistency of discipline is very important because how you treat your fellow officers is how you may treat the people in the community, and that's very important. If you don't treat the black officers, the women officers fair, how can we expect the people in the community to be treated fairly? So that's an important one, I think, that should be continued to be monitored.

The others as well. I agree with Jim that 34 is something that that's a perpetual issue that should be included because that goes to the essence of what we're about here, and it's how we treat people on the street and how people can feel safe that they will not be necessarily stopped just because of the color of their skin.

Now, made great progress, but we're not completely done there. The numbers are still pretty high, you know. So, but I think that progress is being made there. I just don't think we ought to take our eye off the ball in that particular area, 45, 34, 2 and 5, of course, and whatever the Court thinks is appropriate.

But I don't want to forget that we have to deal with the question of how do we make consist efforts at effecting the culture that exists here. And at the end of the day, can we

trust the police to police itself?

Now, we're going to have other outside entities to help that down the way, but those are issues that I still have concerns about, even despite the fact that we've done -- there's great work that's been done down through the years.

But that's my feeling about it now.

THE COURT: Well, so you told me -- the last time we saw each other was at Judge Thompson's induction ceremony.

MR. BURRIS: Oh, that's right.

THE COURT: You told me to read When the Riders Come
Out at Night, which I did. I went out and I bought that. And
it includes a number of reports and statements that were made
by all sorts of people that are easy to document. I'm pretty
sure they were accurate.

MR. BURRIS: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: The thing that is striking to me is that the same kind of problem that existed in looking at what the Riders had done internally --

MR. BURRIS: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- is echoed by what happened recently, and we've been doing this for 20 years.

And so my real question is: What do you think the Court can do to assist in this besides -- I agree with what

Mr. Chanin has said. I think a lot of progress has been made on a lot of issues. But the thing that you just kept saying

over and over again, that's what -- that's the -- I'm looking for the answer to that question. What do you think?

MR. BURRIS: Yeah. Well, obviously, the Court's involvement is important.

I do think that constant reporting of things, although I must admit, it may require someone more talented in another discipline to really look at those issues. I mean, I do a lot of reading around these police issues as well. I don't know that they've been solved.

I've asked Mr. Bob Warshaw, who has been involved in a number of these, has there been any one of his cases that he's worked on where the culture has been fundamentally changed in a different way? And he would say: No, there hasn't.

Sure, you can have technical violations -- technical task compliance, which we have here. We have 55 tasks, and most of those tasks -- one or two have not been -- have been in compliance. But has that solved the question of compliance? Has it solved the question of culture change? The answer to that is no. It may have an impact on it, but it hasn't changed it to the way that you feel comfortable.

So I don't know the answer to that, and I don't even know if it's solvable, you get down to. I mean, I've done a lot of reading. I've seen a lot of reports of different cities. And, sure, DOJ has been involved in a lot of those and they've had a lot of technical compliance, just like we have here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But when the problem comes up, you still have the same question of police policing itself, the effort of covering up for one's friends. That still does happen. Or you try to --One of the things we have here, we don't have the level of beatings that we used to have on the streets. That's clear. There's been real progress made from that. And I tell people all the time, the kind of cases that Jim and I used to have years ago, we don't have those cases anymore. And that's a good thing. That means there's some people out there who are not being beaten up, who should not have been beaten up. But the answer to it is, I can't tell you that I have it And I don't know what the Court can do other than what the Court has been doing. But all that really -- the question is: How do you measure the cultural change? We can certainly measure technical compliance. But how do we measure the cultural change? And that is a question that we may not be able to resolve right now, but I don't know that that means we have to stay in the process here indefinitely till that does happen. THE COURT: It is something I'm thinking about. Thank you. MR. BURRIS: Yeah. All right. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: I appreciate it. Mr. Lucia? MR. LUCIA: Your Honor, I'm going to try to keep my

remarks brief, but I feel compelled to play off of what
Mr. Burris just said.

You've always addressed us, and Judge Henderson addressed us, about cultural change. I can give you my anecdotal personal experiences with that, but I think what Mr. Burris just said and we've heard repeatedly is that they're not getting the cases they used to get.

And let's be specific. The cases were like the Riders cases, and those were trickling in after they filed the lawsuit. But we haven't seen those cases.

So at one level, when we start talking about cultural change, we can't really get in the heads of every person in the City of Oakland, law enforcement, non-law enforcement; but we can look at objectively a few things. And I think that's super important that the Court take into consideration that we don't see the types of lawsuits that they used to file. I know for a fact because our office was involved in those. We didn't defend the City, but we represented the officers. We don't see that. We hear about Louisville and places like that and Memphis. We don't see that in Oakland.

Our firm is privileged to represent most of the police officers in the San Francisco Bay Area. I represent the police officers in Berkeley and San Francisco and many others. And we don't see the types of cases that we see in other places, especially outside the Bay Area. That's one.

Two, I will tell you, I don't know about anyplace outside California. Our law firm represents cops all over the state. I don't think there's a police department in the state of California that has a structure in place to provide a formula for success. When I say "structure," I mean the NSA-created tasks. And I'm not going to get into whether you should keep control of one, two, or more. But there are tasks in place that have created and spawned a structure of accountability. I mean, there is accountability at multiple levels in this police department, far more than any other police department I have ever been involved with. Ever.

And so with the structure -- you've asked what can the Court do? What the Court has done here and what the parties have done is they've created a structure for accountability. And at some point, we've had -- we've come close to becoming compliant and entering the sustain- -- and then things happen.

Well, I think things happen because we're in the people business. That's what we do. I'm a labor attorney. I deal with people. You deal with people in this courtroom. And I think we have to just accept the fact that people will make mistakes. We are human beings.

But what I think you should expect, what I should expect is -- police officers are held to the highest standards,

I think, in the country in terms of employees. This case is

evidence of that. There are cops in this country that are going to prison for not doing their job right. They've exceeded their authority. If a cop lies, they're fired. Right? If a lawyer lies, well, maybe you'll hold me in contempt and maybe I'll suffer consequences. But every cop, especially in Oakland, if they come close to lying, they're going to get fired. Every cop is held accountable for their behavior.

What I'm going to conclude with is this: I think we have -- I know we have a structure in place now that is far superior to any other police department. And I know from my perspective, being on the other side of all this, I think now we have a structure in the City of Oakland that we didn't have 23 years ago. We've got Inspector Generals. We've got a Police Commission. We've got a CPRA. We've got a whole body of people that, as Chief Allison said, have to reflect the needs and the desires and the expectations of the community. We didn't have that before.

I'm used to working with civilian oversight bodies, and there's a tension between those bodies and law enforcement.

But the reality is, they're here and we need to make it work.

And I think that the structure in place now will make that happen.

No disrespect to the Court, but at some point this has to end; and when it ends, then the Mayor, the City Council,

the City Administrator and, ultimately, the Chief of Police have to be held accountable. By who? Not by a judge, but by the community that they oversee. People in those communities have to hold these people accountable.

I mean, my members, our members know, in a paramilitary organization, if you don't respect chain of command and follow the rules, there are consequences.

And I believe that this city is ready to take on the responsibility of moving forward, because -- I hate to say this, but in the next six to eight months, something could happen; somebody at a certain level in command staff could engage in some behavior.

And I'm going to conclude with this: Our office represented one of the Riders. We were involved in both of those criminal cases. I've had the pleasure and honor to represent Oakland cops for 25, 26 years. This is not the same police department. I'd love to know how many members have been hired since the start of the NSA. By far and away, the majority. This command staff, Chief Allison included, have grown up as managers with expectations changing from this Court, from the plaintiffs' lawyers, from the NSA. So ultimately, I think there has been a cultural change.

And you're in a very untenable position, like I am.

You're a judge; I'm a lawyer. I've never walked in their shoes. Jim Chanin talked about the ride-alongs. That's the

```
reality of an Oakland cop. It's a dangerous job.
 1
                                                        They're
     understaffed, they've overwhelmed, and they're doing their
 2
     darnedest to protect the community. And they're not doing it
 3
    by circumventing people's rights. We don't have wild
 4
 5
     allegations of unconstitutional policing.
          So I've been -- I said this probably 18 years ago. I
 6
 7
     haven't said it since. I'm going to say it now. At some point
     the Court needs to let the Chief be the Chief and be held
 8
     accountable by those above him or her.
 9
10
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
11
              MR. LUCIA: You're welcome.
              THE COURT: It's very rare when somebody tells a judge
12
     that he's in an untenable situation.
13
              MR. LUCIA:
                          I know. I know. I'm in an untenable
14
15
    position for even saying it. You're right.
              THE COURT: I very much appreciate your very
16
17
     well-stated comments, Mr. Lucia.
          So let me go to the Police Commission. And I understand
18
19
     that -- here we are. Please proceed.
20
              DR. MILELE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Good afternoon. I hope you're feeling
21
    better.
22
23
              DR. MILELE:
                           No.
          I am Dr. Tyfahra Milele, Chair of the Oakland Police
24
25
     Commission. Thank you for the invitation here directly from
```

the Commission.

Joining me and present with you is Retired Superior Court

Judge Brenda Harbin-Forte, Commissioner and Chair of our Ad Hoc

Committee for NSA Task 5 and 45. And Judge Harbin-Forte and I

are available to answer any questions you may have after my

remarks.

So briefly, I only have three points to make.

The first is that the citizens of Oakland have repeatedly voted to have citizen oversight of the Oakland Police

Department centered in the Police Commission.

Second, at the January hearing before this Court, the Mayor of Oakland committed to providing the resources needed for effective civilian oversight; and the Police Commission, with its policymaking authority, its community police review agency, and its charter-mandated supervision of the work of the Inspector General, stands ready to assume the Monitor's role in ensuring the Oakland Police Department's accountability to the public.

Lastly, the work of the Monitor has been monumental, and the Commission has spent the majority of its time diligently working on the policies he has identified. However, the Commission is eager to use its valuable volunteer time focusing on the issues the community cares about most; namely, disparate enforcement of the law and racial profiling.

There's no question in my mind that the Commission,

reflecting a diversity and lived experience of the community, 1 can and will do a more thoughtful job working on these issues. 2 We believe the Court should now allow the people and their 3 Commission to take the lead. 4 5 So I'll pause there, and I or Commissioner Harbin-Forte can answer any questions if you have any. 6 I actually don't have questions of you. 7 THE COURT: appreciate your expression of readiness to take on these tasks. 8 I have, under the NSA and the agreements that brought the 9 case to the Court in the first place, the responsibility of 10 11 making sure that the NSA -- that the parties achieve full compliance with all of the tasks. There are a couple that 12 13 still remain outstanding. I appreciate that the Police Commission was not in 14 15 existence then, is in existence now, and I am encouraged by 16 that fact. And figuring out how to best ensure that that 17 oversight that you discussed and that I now have continues in a 18 way that is as effective as possible is what I'm thinking 19 about. So I very much appreciate your comments. Thank you. 20 DR. MILELE: Thank you. 21 22 All right. Ms. Martin? THE COURT:

I appreciate Your Honor's consideration to potentially narrow the tasks that are affirmatively reviewed going forward.

MS. MARTIN:

23

24

25

Thank you, Your Honor.

I do think that in addition to 2, 5, and 45, if Your Honor includes Tasks 24 and 25 that involve use of force and use of force reporting, that does make the most sense. I do think that's reasonable.

I do think that in the City's perspective, the more narrow we can have that affirmative assessment focus be, the more resources we'll be able to use to focus where there is greater need.

That's not to say that we're not going to keep doing everything that we are doing to remain in compliance with the other tasks; but there is a non-negligible amount of time and resources that go toward sending document requests and other items on some of the others tasks that we could, frankly, really use any time and resources that we can get to put toward where we really need to use those resources.

So I appreciate that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. You heard the plaintiffs suggest that 34 should be added to that mix. What's your perspective -- do you have an additional perspective besides the one you just shared?

MS. MARTIN: I think that it makes more sense for 24 and 25 to be on the table rather than 34 because most of the issues that will be reviewed in 24 and 25, plus 5, which are essentially all investigations -- use of force investigations, internal affairs investigations -- those form a lot of the

basis of the Task 34 risk management meetings.

And then our stop data reports are now, quarterly, made public so all of that data and information is available.

And if we're still sharing slides from the risk management meeting, I feel that that would give enough information to the Monitor and to plaintiffs' counsel, assuming Jim Chanin will also be getting those slides, to know that things are still in the right place and that we're still maintaining compliance.

Because one of the things that I want to be clear on, to a point that Mr. Chanin made, is that none of these tasks are going away if there's not affirmative assessment. We understand that if something happens or someone notices an irregularity or there is an issue that arises, that any of these tasks could come back on the table for affirmative assessment and we could find ourselves back here on another task.

I am confident and optimistic, given the structures we have in place, that that won't happen. But I understand that these aren't going away. So I want to allay some concerns that I've heard from plaintiffs' counsel.

THE COURT: And just to be clear about this, we're going to be back together at the end of the September. Do you think that you're -- would you prefer to come back without having had the more direct oversight of the Monitor on Task 34

and just see how things have developed; or would it be helpful, in order to ensure compliance, to have the Monitor looking at 34? Entirely up -- I mean, that's --

MS. MARTIN: You know, Your Honor, while we're here and we still have the benefit of Court and Monitor oversight, it makes the most sense to take some of the training wheels off while we still have some of the training wheels on and see how we do. I think the Department and the City are ready for that.

We still plan to present, in our filing, on Task 34. We know that's an area Your Honor is interested in. So we will continue to do that. But I think having as many training wheels off to see how it goes actually makes the most sense for the long run.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. MARTIN: And I want to also just pick up on something that Mr. Lucia said and focus a little bit here on people because, really, at root, that is what we're talking about when we talk about culture.

And the Department has a number of people. It's an organization that necessarily is made up of a constantly changing body of people. And those people -- the sworn officers, the civilian Department members -- they share values and attitudes that have been so critical and continue to be so critical to this Department's undeniable progress.

And while we do have at times, inevitably, setbacks,

errors in judgment, and at those times -- which these times is what I'm talking about -- introspection and change and critical feedback are necessary.

And one of the ways the City has changed to address some of those issues is to provide community oversight. We have the Community Police Review Agency, the Police Commission, the Inspector General. So it's not just trying to have a cultural change from the inside, but we are trying to bring the City's culture from the outside into the Department as guideposts. And I think that that is working. We are seeing progress.

More often than not in this Department, the officers are successful. And too often in life, we focus more on critical feedback and we don't give positive reinforcement when there are good outcomes. And the reality is that people need both. And police officers and Department employees are people, and they need positive reinforcement too.

And we've had a number of successes -- which, Your Honor, thank you for appreciating that and pointing them out -- in the risk management context and some of the implementations that we've brought in through the risk management context, which most notably show themselves in the reduction of racial disparities, in non-dispatched stops, and in lower level uses of force.

We've had success in holding officers accountable for using appropriate force and reporting that force accurately,

and officers are using their de-escalation techniques on a consistent basis and using force reasonably.

One of the reasons that it's important to talk about these successes is because they show that the people in this department are capable and willing to address any problem that they encounter and that they are committed to fairly and thoughtfully serving their community.

Another positive in limiting the tasks that are affirmatively reviewed going forward is that provides positive reinforcement to those officers for that good work that they are doing and continuing to do and for those sworn officers and civilian Department members who every day continually successfully uphold not only the letter of the NSA, but the spirit of the NSA as well.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Martin. I appreciate your thoughts.

Mayor Thao.

MAYOR THAO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. So nice to see you in person.

THE COURT: Very nice to see you. Thank you for being here.

MAYOR THAO: Absolutely. Thank you for having me.

You know, the last time that I was here, the last time I was able to address you, I did share my disappointment in the

findings that had recently taken place, and I made to you three commitments.

First, I promised to make sure that officers who engage in misconduct were held accountable.

Second, I said that the City would address systemic failures by identifying root problems.

And third, I said we would continue to not only fix our current system of police accountability and public safety, but to truly reimagine it, to see how we can really move forward.

And today I am able to say that the City is delivering on those commitments.

In terms of holding officers accountable, my administration and I have made some extremely -- extremely, extremely difficult decisions over the last few months as it played out in the media, of course. And navigating that process has been very difficult, but we were guided by our City's long-term interests. I always say that I will always choose Oakland first and Oakland's residents first.

At times we had to stare directly into the headwinds in order to stay on course, and it definitely wasn't easy, especially as a younger mayor coming into office right at the very beginning and having to make these hard decisions.

So while I don't take any pleasure in having to hold City employees accountable, I do take seriously the City's responsibility of upholding transparency and excellence. And

this is why I'm in this position. This is why I fought to make sure that I would be Oakland's next mayor. It's for that very reason: transparency and excellence.

And I'm proud that our team, we met the challenge head-on in regards to those difficult situations that we were put in.

I'm also proud to say that the Department and the City have made significant progress toward fixing the problems brought to light in the most recent investigations. And the work has truly been collaborative. The Department, under Chief Allison's stable leadership, played a central role, but it was part of a much greater whole. My office has met weekly with the police department commanders and legal advisors to ensure we were moving forward thoughtfully.

Likewise, our esteemed Police Commission and our esteemed Inspector General, who is here with us today, have worked closely with the Department to also provide input and guidance, as well as our valued partners with Mr. Burris and Mr. Chanin.

And that brings me to the third commitment we made, which was to continue to reimagine police accountability and public safety. The collaboration I've seen over the last few months, including from all the civilian partners I just mentioned, has further proved to me that Oakland is definitely on the right track.

I've thought a lot recently about what it means to really change organizational culture, the topic of today. And I had

to back up and really think about how we should really define the organization we're talking about.

Historically, there's been this tendency to think of police departments as their own organizations with their own cultures. But in Oakland, we've zoomed out and decided that policing must be part of a larger public safety, what I call, community safety and violence prevention system, and that our police officers have to be integrated into a much larger structure. To me, this means that the best way to continue changing the cultural at OPD is by continuing to weave the Department into the fabric of Oakland and Oakland's culture.

The culture of Oakland is a culture of compassion, a culture of service, and, of course, a culture of accountability. Our City is known for having leaders, both in government and in the community, who truly value the fairness and equity values.

Having a police department that is overseen by the community with policies that reflect community values, it is a really great start with the ultimate goal, of course, to be that it is ensuring that the Department is part of the community and that it is truly sharing the community's values.

And so the question becomes: How do we keep moving in that direction? In the near term, my administration is proposing to add a dedicated staff in the City Administrator's Office to be a point person in these efforts. This person will

provide the Chief of Police with a secondary civilian review on any major cases that haven't been investigated by our Community Police Review Agency. And they will work on helping the City move as much as of the investigative work as possible to CPRA, which has a commitment that came out of our Reimagining Public Safety workshops in 2021.

Another initiative my administration fully backs is the City's pledge to increase the percentage of female academy recruits to 30 percent by the year 2030. I, as a woman myself, understand that women lead a little bit differently.

Increasing gender diversity at OPD has been a focus of mine and many other city leaders for years. It's been a focus of mine prior to being a mayor, prior to being a council member, you know, as a baby staffer and, prior to that, just as a citizen and resident.

When Oaklanders chose their public servants at the ballot box, we chose diversity. It benefits us in so many ways and helps shape our identity. We can't fully erase divisions between police services and other City services unless we erase this glaring contrast in who does the work.

These are obviously just a few examples of the work

Oakland currently has ahead of ourselves. And with so many

capable people invested in improving public safety, like the

great people all here in this room, including yourself,

Your Honor, we'll never stop finding areas for improvement. We

know that.

And running the Oakland Police Department involves a level of transparency, criticism, discourse, and collaboration that seems to be somewhat unique in policing. Our City has come to embrace it. It means that policing in Oakland will always be a work in progress, and it means that we have the solidarity of purpose to face new problems head-on because it's who we are now.

This oversight, yes, it's lasted 20 years, going on 21 or however many years; but it has changed the culture. It has changed the culture of Oakland, of how citizenries can actually hold the police department accountable, how the police department holds itself accountable.

As we have heard, many, including Chief Allison, has grown up in the Department under this oversight. So I believe, as I always did, that we are in a space, a unique space where we are creating a new culture for the OPD because we have people like Chief Allison and others who have come up the ranks, many who are in this room with us today who are now the trainers, who are training the trainees under this very culture.

And so I thank you so much for your time and for having us here, and I welcome any questions that you may have.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mayor. I do not have questions for you.

I want to tell you that I appreciate your focus on this

and your action to show what kind of accountability is demanded of any civil servant.

MAYOR THAO: Yeah.

THE COURT: And particularly with the police department, I said it to your predecessor, that this is -- at the end of the day, you're the person who's on the top of the pyramid.

MAYOR THAO: That's right.

THE COURT: And leadership in this issue of culture is everything.

MAYOR THAO: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: And it's not something that the Court -the one thing I know is that court supervision can't do very
much about informing people that they need to own up to
mistakes that they make, be accountable and -- because
everybody makes them. But if you can't address them and then
move forward, if you try to sweep them under the rug, whether
the Court is supervising OPD or not won't make any difference.

And so it is really up to you, and the people who are in the offices that they hold within the City, and the volunteers who have formed -- who are sitting on the Commission, and the Office of the Inspector General, all of you are key to making this work far more than anything that is happening here on Golden Gate Avenue.

MAYOR THAO: Absolutely.

```
So, thank you --
 1
              THE COURT:
 2
              MAYOR THAO: Thank you so much.
              THE COURT:
                          -- for that.
 3
          And I thank you all for being here.
 4
 5
          I will issue an order sometime relatively soon which lays
 6
     out what's going to happen over the next -- until we meet again
 7
     on September 26th.
          I am hopeful that as problems arise -- and they will --
 8
     that they are dealt with transparently and with accountability.
 9
          And at the end of the September, I'm going to look and see
10
11
     where we are.
          We went into this sustainability period without actually
12
     being fully compliant. We did it because everybody was so
13
     anxious to transfer this case into the hands of the City.
14
15
     may have been -- we may have been -- well, it turns out we were
     premature, whether that was a good idea or not.
16
          The City has never actually reached full compliance on all
17
     of the tasks, and I am hopeful, expectant that the City will be
18
     in full compliance when all of these new policies that have
19
     been recommended are implemented. And then we'll see where we
20
     are in September and what kind of further modifications we can
21
22
     make with respect to this.
          So thank you all for being here, and see you in September.
23
                    Thank you, Your Honor.
24
              ALL:
                  (Proceedings adjourned at 4:49 p.m.)
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: Tuesday, May 2, 2023 ana Dub Ana Dub, RMR, RDR, CRR, CCRR, CRG, CCG CSR No. 7445, Official United States Reporter