

**City of Richmond - Reimagining Public Safety Community Task Force**  
Meeting held via Zoom: [https://richmond.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=38](https://richmond.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=38)

**MINUTES**  
**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2020, 5:30 PM**

*\*video recording available*

**I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL - AGENDA REVIEW**

Meeting called to order by Johann Fragd at 5:33 PM.

PRESENT: M. Cantú, E. Chacon, L. Chacon, D. Gosney, R. Joseph, K. Kilian-Lobos, A. Lee, L. Mangels, M. Njissang, J. Schlemmer, D. Small, N. Syon, B. Therriault, D. Tucker, T. Walker, L. Whitmore

ABSENT: D. Joseph, J. Lee, S. Leslie, A. Soto, B.K. Williams,

**II. MEETING PROCEDURES**

**III. APPROVE JANUARY 13, 2021 AND JANUARY 27, 2021 MEETING MINUTES**

Motion to approve the January 13, 2021 minutes by Whitmore; seconded by E. Chacon; approved by the following vote:

**Ayes:** M. Cantú, E. Chacon, L. Chacon, R. Joseph, K. Kilian-Lobos, A. Lee, M. Njissang, D. Small, N. Syon, B. Therriault, L. Whitmore,

**Noes:**

**Abstain:** L. Mangels, J. Schlemmer

**Absent:** D. Gosney, D. Joseph, J. Lee, S. Leslie, A. Soto, D. Tucker, T. Walker, B.K. Williams

Motion to approve the January 27, 2021 minutes by R. Joseph; seconded by E. Chacon; approved by the following vote:

**Ayes:** M. Cantú, E. Chacon, L. Chacon, R. Joseph, K. Kilian-Lobos, A. Lee, M. Njissang, D. Small, N. Syon, B. Therriault, L. Whitmore,

**Noes:**

**Abstain:** L. Mangels, J. Schlemmer

**Absent:** D. Gosney, D. Joseph, J. Lee, S. Leslie, A. Soto, D. Tucker, T. Walker, B.K. Williams

**IV. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No written or oral public comment was submitted or made.

**V. STAFF REPORTS**

1. Michelle Milam provided a staff report. Milam provided the Task Force with an update regarding the Safe Parking Program approved by the Richmond City Council the previous night with HEAP funding with a location set for the Civic Center Plaza as well as other options for scattered sites throughout the City.
  - a. D. Small asked a question regarding the impact of nimbyism in different residential areas in allowing the program to be implemented and how Milam is understanding that.

- a) Milam responded that the motion approved did not require any community outreach but will still be implemented. Milam read the entirety of the motion to clarify details.
  - b. R. Joseph commented on how nimbyism is a sad part of the City and how it is taken with celebration. He further added an experience with an aggressive phone caller regarding his opinions on homelessness.
    - a) Milam responded that this is one of the most divisive projects she's worked on in the City. She further added that it has many challenges.
    - b) L. Whitmore added that the City Council was being swayed by a small group of people. Her concern is that the City Council does not know what they are doing and neighborhoods should be contacted and have more thoughtful input.
2. Johann Fragd introduced Bert Jones, Budget Analyst, as the new interdepartmental staff contact from the Finance Department.
  3. Fragd also updated the Task Force that the budget presentation with Police Chief Bisa French and the Finance Department was moved up to the March 10 meeting.
  4. Jim Nantell shared information on the City Attorney's returned Request for Legal Opinion on A. Soto's request of Brown Act compliance with subcommittee meetings. Fragd further confirmed that subcommittee meetings are not subject to the Brown Act as long as they do not meet quorum. Nantell added that staff is available to attend subcommittee meetings to assist with the process of recommendations. Staff reports must be submitted two weeks prior to a City Council meeting. He wants to create a path forward.

## **VI. PRESENTATIONS, DISCUSSIONS, & ACTION ITEMS**

### Sub-Group Committee Reports and Recommendation Discussions

1. Smart Budget & Resource Allocations
  - a. M. Cantú stated that D. Small will present a funding formula but they are waiting for a meeting with Chief French and Finance Director Belinda Brown. They want to look at reallocations in collaboration with other subgroups. They want to explore the CAHOOTS policing model, increasing or doubling ONS's funding and/or SOS! Richmond's funding, contracting with other community-based organizations like Familias Unidas for undocumented people, and a better participatory budgeting process with the community.
  - b. D. Small recommended two processes. The first is to extend the life of the Reimagining Public Safety Taskforce until next fiscal year to have more in-depth proposals for alternative policing models. The second is a suggested funding formula instead of specific funding amounts for reallocation. She recommends that the first \$5 million that would be reallocated be funded 50% from the public safety budget and the other 50% would be funding that comes from surplus funds that the City has. The next \$5-\$10 million reallocation would come from the public safety budget, professional services such as risk management, overtime, and other City funds that are accessible such as the pension annuity funds.
    - i. J. Schlemmer mentioned that he interprets the public safety budget as Police and Fire budgets but perhaps D. Small meant strictly the police budget. D. Small clarified that she meant Police and Fire.
    - ii. R. Joseph asked why they chose \$5-\$10 million specifically. D. Small stated that when the Task Force was created, the number mentioned for reallocation was \$14 million so they wanted to work with that.

- iii. J. Nantell clarified with D. Small about what constituted the 50/50 split. D. Small stated the 50/50 split would only be the first \$5 million.
  - iv. L. Whitmore asked about where they got their figures from. D. Small stated that the City Council presented \$5 million as surplus funds that they had in revenues this year and could possibly be earmarked for this Task Force. D. Small the Task Force has the responsibility of selecting where to do reallocations, not the amounts.
  - v. B. Therriault raised concerns that the 'surplus' \$5 million keeps changing and is not finalized. D. Small restated why she recommends the funding formula instead of a dollar amount.
  - vi. J. Schlemmer cautioned the group about the number and how it can change from a surplus from day to day to a deficit. D. Small commented that this funding formula recommendation was a suggestion before she knew about the surplus. She stated it is the Council's job to find the funding.
  - vii. Police Captain Timothy Simmons wanted further clarification on the recommendation for the next \$5-\$10 million. D. Small explained how it would come from professional services, overtime, and other sources.
  - viii. J. Schlemmer clarified information from the pension funds mentioned. He stated it came from a ballot measure from 1978 and strictly earmarked for that pension fund. He says the City needs an actuarial for its current status and revenue. This was pension funds prior to CalPERS for the Richmond Pension from the 1960's. D. Small said it can be made as a source of investment.
  - ix. J. Nantell wanted further clarification on the examples of funding given. D. Small restated her intention for a funding formula and also clarified on the examples.
  - x. M. Milam clarified that it would be a process to reallocate the old pension fund and would need to be looked into.
  - xi. B. Therriault asked about the plan to continue the Task Force beyond June. D. Small said she would like a more comprehensive overview of the City and County budgets to provide an informed list of recommendations and also wants to include a participatory budget process as well.
- c. PUBLIC COMMENT
- No written or oral public comment was submitted or made.

## 2. Health & Safety

- a. M. Njissang presented to the group about the sub committee's goals. Goal 1 is to reduce police involvement with mental health calls that do not involve use of force. Recommendations and next steps were provided such as expanding MHET service, implementing a CAHOOTS/mobile crisis model, having a peer-led program, and having additional mental health training for police. Next steps included understanding the problem more, understanding its financial ramifications, researching other programs, and understanding current costs of programs. Goal 2 to provide services for homeless populations in Richmond. Recommendations include a safe parking program, Tiny House on Wheels program, subsidized housing vouchers and options. Goal 3 is to increase access to harm reduction programs, distribute clean needles and other hygienic medical kits, and offer basic food and resources for families. Goal 4 is to support ONS with more funding and staff.

- i. K. Killian-Lobos added that they were impressed with Daniel Barth and the SOS! Program and commended the efforts.
- ii. J. Schlemmer added that San Francisco added a mental health program as suggested focused on the Tenderloin area

**b. PUBLIC COMMENT**

- i. La'Tanya Dandie asked about housing options that are extreme low-income for young homeless moms who cannot get childcare, jobs, etc. M. Njissang responded about looking into more housing vouchers for the population mentioned that only have tenants pay 30% of the rent and largely depend on funding available. L. Dandie stated that unaccompanied minors cannot be employed the same as adults. K. Killian-Lobos mentioned a non-profit in Berkeley that has a youth tiny home village and will look into that. D. Small asked about the harm reduction recommendations with stimulant users vs. opioid users. K. Killian-Lobos mentioned Punks with Lunch in West Oakland and they possibly do work with stimulant users and use of fentanyl.

**3. Accountability as Safety**

- a. R. Joseph presented about the sub committee's goals. Goal 1 is to strengthen the City Police Review Commission. The second goal is to have a police process for police accountability such as better accountability, better hiring process, and having presentations by GARE. The third goal is the improvement and training of police officers. Goal 4 is to make police data more accessible. Goal 5 is to improve the quality of 911 communication systems.
  - i. J. Nantell wanted to clarify about less financial pressure from these recommendations. R. Joseph said only Goal 5 is more directly tied to the budget. L. Whitmore added that they are continuing to discuss it.
  - ii. L. Chacon wanted to review the POST standards. B. Therriault clarified that the POST standards are what each police department is supposed to abide by. L. Chacon wants to get deeper into POST standards. B. Therriault agreed and said they looked at it broadly and they included it with other topics. L. Chacon wants racial bias training to be reviewed more often. B. Therriault agreed. R. Joseph says we can always exceed the goals and will look into it more. L. Mangels said they want more expert input on the training and updated for evidence-based practices.
  - iii. M. Milam mentioned they are still doing the community training module and incorporated some of the suggestions from the Task Force.
  - iv. Capt. Simmons stated they would love more training opportunities but also understand expense and time training involved such as overtime and include it in the analysis.
  - v. M. Cantú asked about an equity officer that can oversee training. R. Joseph they have not explored that in detail yet.
  - vi. J. Schlemmer concurred with Capt. Simmons that trainings are planned annually and additional trainings would require a backfill officer and overtime.

**b. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No written or oral public comment was submitted or made.

**4. Community-Based Solutions**

- a. E. Chacon updated the Task Force that they are working on data analysis on community needs and if they are being met. They are doing research on programs and solutions in cities like San Francisco for the CAHOOTS model and other similar programs. They also want to extend the life of the Task Force.
- b. T. Walker mentioned she is in both groups (this and Accountability as Safety). They also wanted to look at dispatcher 911 data and look into redirection of calls. These groups are having similar discussions and she recommends having Task Force alignment on similar topics as they make recommendations. J. Fragd reminded the Task Force about the Google Drive folders and for them to continue to work collaboratively.
- c. R. Joseph further added the importance of having cross collaboration within the sub committees and Task Force as a whole.
- d. **PUBLIC COMMENT**  
No written or oral public comment was submitted or made.

## **VII. MEMBER COMMENTS**

1. J. Nantell clarified that he understands the Task Force should have sub committees develop recommendations to be presented to the group as a whole for approval for presentation to the City Council. He mentioned ideas brought up tonight such as extending the time of the Task Force, having a funding formula, 50/50 split, and others and asked how the Task Force would move forward with that. He mentioned involvement of staff and how they can help keep track of the process and asked if the Task Force wants feedback from staff on topics such as budget reallocations and the public safety budget. D. Small clarified about their sub committee. She said that the budget committee recommendations should be based on the programmatic recommendations that are coming out of the other subcommittees, like a funding formula. J. Nantell further asked if she meant the surplus, overtime, and other sources of funds for reallocations were suggestions instead of specified places for funding. D. Small agreed. She added that those specific monetary amounts should come out of a collaboration between the budget subcommittee and the programmatic subcommittees because they do not know how much more money should go towards mental health versus homeless services and so on. They are just making a recommendation specifically to the budget and reaffirming the fact that the subcommittee believes that at least a significant part of whatever funding is being recommended should come out of the public safety budget. J. Nantell wanted clarification on another topic. He asked about how the Health and Safety sub committee plans to recommend the CAHOOTS model and then Council would flush out the cost. He also mentioned having some recommendations ready for this year as items usually take some time to be implemented. D. Small restated that the programs suggested for funding such as SOS! and ONS were assumptions for the Health and Safety group to think about instead of funding something new such as the CAHOOTS model. She further added that these services are underfunded and would help address the reallocation.
2. M. Njissang stated he is not comfortable with specific funding amount suggestions as he is unfamiliar with these numbers. J. Nantell understands the intention to provide a simple recommendation with Council deciding funding amounts or perhaps providing specific amounts. He would like to come back and revisit these questions and options such as the timeframe of the Task Force.
3. R. Joseph made a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes; seconded by E. Chacon; and consensus by Task Force.

4. J. Schlemmer talked about the benefit of having staff present at sub committee meetings for questions by the group but also cautioned the group that there is no reason to extend the Task Force beyond June. He said recommendations will still have to be accepted by Council and recommendations can be done this year or next year.
5. K. Kilian-Lobos stated that it may not be hard to have some concrete numbers for programs such as SOS! Richmond and the CAHOOTS program implementation in Richmond. She said that the Task Force can have recommendations for this budget cycle and also for the next budget cycle with the time extended for the group.
6. M. Cantú wants to do a budget analysis for the reallocation process and wants to give specific recommendations due to the amount of work the group has done to be more comprehensive.
7. D. Small restated that she is not recommending not having specific budget recommendations but that the budget committee did not believe it needed a number to have implementation. She said the charge to the Task Force was not to make recommendations; it was to develop a plan to move the city towards a more equitable form of policing that is less reliant on traditional law enforcement. She provided an example of her work with Prop 35 and Prop 15 and how they had a funding formula to provide resources for harm reduction and other assistance with no specific number in mind.
8. J. Nantell wanted to clarify process questions that need resolution from the whole Task Force.
9. Don Gosney arrived at 7:37 P.M.

#### **VIII. ACTION ITEM RECAP & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

#### **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by R. Joseph to extend by 15 minutes; seconded by E. Chacon; and consensus by Task Force.

**Ayes:** M. Cantú, E. Chacon, L. Chacon, R. Joseph, K. Kilian-Lobos, J. Schlemmer, D. Small, D. Tucker, T. Walker, L. Whitmore,

**Noes:** L. Mangels, M. Njissang, B. Therriault

**Abstain:** A. Lee, N. Syon

**Absent:** D. Gosney, D. Joseph, J. Lee, S. Leslie, A. Soto, B.K. Williams

The meeting was adjourned by Johann Fragd at 7:38 P.M.

#### **X. SCHEDULED MEETINGS**

Reimagining Public Safety Community Task Force Regular Meeting - Wednesday, March 10, 2021 at 5:30 PM via Zoom.

Community Round Table Conversation Series - Police Policies and Alternative Methods - Thursday, March 18, 2021 at 6:00 PM via Zoom.