

From: 4406vailcat@comcast.net
To: [Regina Jackson](#); [Brenda Harbin-Forte](#); jshieh@oaklandcommission.org
Cc: [Anne Janks](#); [grinage_rashidah](#); [Adwan, Rania](#)
Subject: Anti-discrimination policy/tonight's Ad Hoc Ctee. meeting
Date: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 2:09:34 PM

[EXTERNAL] This email originated outside of the City of Oakland. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expect the message.

I will attend tonight's meeting; these are my general observations:

Most critically, the Instagram case presented numerous posts and 'cartoons' that were Anti-Black anti-woman (and anti-reform), accompanied, unfortunately, by a 'look-away', it's not a problem/ the posters are just joking' response by OPD's middle-management and its former leadership.

The OPD Black Officers Association has raised discrimination claims (unaddressed to date?). OPD has an acknowledged problem with recruiting and retaining female officers. If some members of the OPD workforce are creating a hostile work environment for female officers, why wouldn't women with a desire to join the policing profession choose to seek employment with a less hostile/unfriendly to-women-culture?

As a potential model, too, you might reach out to SFPD leadership/ members of the SF Police Commission as to the extent that SF Officers for Justice (Black officers) and the SF Womens Officers Network were consulted, as employee stakeholders, on the SFPD anti-discrimination, anti-harrasment policy.

So, I urge that this draft policy should not come to the Commission for final; adoption until both the Oakland Black Officers Association input has been invited and received, as well as input from female OPD officers and any association they have.

In addition, these are my smaller-scope comments on your draft:

- 1) I suggest you add the word "expectations" to line two of the opening paragraph (at page one) of the draft policy.
- 2) In the wake of the Instagram case, it is important that the current draft makes clear that race and sex and other protected class "jokes" violate the policy; the current draft appears to me to make that clear;
- 3) It's important that the policy addresses religious/religion-based bias. for several reasons. Given the times we are in, there has been a spike in both anti-Semitic attacks, attacks on other religious minorities amongst the general public. Your policy should and does make that clear.

Additionally, there has and a campaign by some religious groups to impose their religious values in public and private workplaces and employment decisions, on the

grounds that to fail to do so infringes on religious 'liberty' and 'free exercise'. As a public employer operating under the Constitutional mandate for separation of Church and State, OPD should be vigilant in maintaining a workplace free of religious preference, at-work religious exercise and religion-based harrassment.

Thank you,

Mary Vail