



Commission on Police Practices

COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES

Wednesday, February 4, 2026

5:00pm-8:00pm

REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

Southeastern Live Well Center

**5101 Market Street,
San Diego, CA 92114**

The link to join the meeting by computer, tablet, or smartphone at 5:00pm is:

[Microsoft Teams Link](#)

Meeting ID: 254 568 570 464 55

Passcode: C2SU67eA

**Downloading the latest version of Microsoft Teams is required.*

PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES

The purpose of the Commission on Police Practices (CPP or Commission) is to provide independent community oversight of SDPD, directed at increasing community trust in SDPD & increasing safety for community and officers. The purpose of the Commission is also to perform independent investigations of officer-involved shootings, in-custody deaths and other significant incidents, and an unbiased evaluation of all complaints against members of SDPD and its personnel in a process that will be transparent and accountable to the community. Lastly, the Commission also evaluates the review of all SDPD policies, practices, trainings, and protocols and represents the community in making recommendations for changes.

The Commission on Police Practices (Commission) meetings will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code Section 54953 (a), as amended by Assembly Bill 2249.

The Commission business meetings will be in person, and the meeting will be open for in-person testimony. Additionally, we are continuing to provide alternatives to in-person attendance for participating in our meetings. In lieu of in-person attendance, members of the public may also participate via telephone/Teams.

I. CALL TO ORDER/PUBLIC COMMENT INSTRUCTIONS (Chair Ada Rodriguez)

II. ROLL CALL (Executive Assistant Alina Conde)

NON-AGENDA ITEMS (Items are listed under Public Notices as a matter of public record only. These items do not require Commission deliberation/action and there is no public comment.)

NON-AGENDA COMMUNICATIONS FROM CHAIR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHIEF OF STAFF/POLICY MANAGER, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT (Direct Community Engagement & Internship Programs Yasmeen Obeid)

NON-AGENDA COMMUNICATIONS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES – EXECUTIVE (Chair Ada Rodriguez), RULES (1st Vice Chair Bonnie Benitez), COMMUNITY OUTREACH (Direct Community Engagement & Internship Programs Yasmeen Obeid), POLICY (Commissioner Imani Robinson), RECRUITMENT (Commissioner Doug Case), TRAINING (Commissioner Darlanne Mulmat)

NON AGENDA COMMUNICATIONS FROM COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Committee Positions (Chair Ada Rodriguez)
- B. Appointment of Commissioner Armando Flores as Outreach Chair (Chair Ada Rodriguez)
- C. Case Review Reference Sheet (Commissioner Darlanne Mulmat)
- D. Recruitment Nomination Plan (Commissioner Doug Case)

IV. INFORMATIONAL ITEM

- A. Meeting Location Requirements and Guide

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT (Direct Community Engagement & Internship Programs Obeid)

V. ADJOURNMENT

Materials Provided:

- January 7, 2026 Regular Business Meeting minutes
- January 21, 2026 Regular Business Meeting minutes
- Case Review Reference Sheet
- Recruitment Nomination Plan
- Meeting Location Requirements and Guide

In-Person Public Comment on an Agenda Item: If you wish to address the Commission on an item on today's agenda, please complete and submit a speaker slip before the Commission hears the agenda item. You will be called at the time the item is heard. Each speaker must file a speaker slip with the Executive Director at the meeting at which the speaker wishes to speak indicating which item they wish to speak on. Speaker slips may not be turned in prior to the day of the meeting or after completion of in-person testimony. In-person public comment will conclude before virtual testimony begins. Each speaker who wishes to address the Commission must state who they are representing if they represent an organization or another person.

For discussion and information items each speaker may speak up to three (3) minutes, subject to the Chair's determination of the time available for meeting management purposes, in addition to any time ceded by other members of the public who are present at the meeting and have submitted a speaker slip ceding their time. These speaker slips should be submitted together at one time to the Executive Director. The Chair may also limit organized group presentations of five or more people to 15 minutes or less.

In-Person Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda: You may address the Commission on any matter not listed on today's agenda. Please complete and submit a speaker slip. However, California's open meeting laws do not permit the Commission to discuss or take any action on the matter at today's meeting. At its discretion, the Commission may add the item to a future meeting agenda or refer the matter to staff or committee. Public comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. At the discretion of the Chair, if a large number of people wish to speak on the same item, comments may be limited to a set period of time per item to appropriately manage the meeting and ensure the Commission has time to consider all the agenda items. A member of the public may only make one Non-Agenda Public Comment per meeting. In-person public comment on items not on the agenda will conclude before virtual testimony begins.

Speakers may not allocate their time to other speakers. If there are eight or more speakers on a single issue, the maximum time for the issue will be 16 minutes. The order of speaking generally will be determined on a first-come, first-served basis. A member of the public may only provide one non-agenda comment per agenda.

We welcome all viewpoints and encourage open participation. However, to ensure everyone has a chance to be heard and that we can complete our work, we ask that speakers respect time limits and refrain from disruptive behavior. Continued disruption after warning may result in removal as permitted under state law.

Virtual Platform Public Comment to a Particular Item or Matters Not on the Agenda: When the item you would like to comment on is introduced (or it is indicated that it is time for Non-Agenda Public Comment), raise your hand by tapping on the "Raise Your Hand" button on your computer or tablet. To raise your hand in a Microsoft Teams meeting on your smartphone (iOS or Android), tap the three-dot menu, then select the "Raise Hand" option. You will be taken in the order in which you raised your hand. You may only speak once on a particular item. When it is indicated that it is your turn to speak, click the unmute prompt that will appear on your computer, tablet or Smartphone.

Written Comment through Webform: Comment on agenda items and non-agenda public comment may also be submitted using the [webform](#). If using the webform, indicate the agenda item number you wish to submit a comment for. All webform comments are limited to 200 words. On the [webform](#), members of the public should select Commission on Police Practices (even if the public comment is for a Commission on Police Practices Committee meeting).

The public may attend a meeting when scheduled by following the attendee meeting link provided above. To view a meeting archive video, click [here](#). Video footage of each Commission meeting is posted online [here](#) within 72 hours of the conclusion of the meeting.

Comments received no later than 8am on the day of the meeting will be distributed to the Commission on Police Practices. Comments received after the deadline described above but before the item is called will be submitted into the written record for the relevant item.

Written Materials: You may alternatively submit via U.S. Mail to Attn: Office of the Commission on Police Practices, 525 B Street, Suite 1725, San Diego, CA 92101. Materials submitted via U.S. Mail must be received the business day prior to the meeting to be distributed to the Commission on Police Practices.

If you attach any documents to your comment, they will be distributed to the Commission or Committee in accordance with the deadlines described above.

Late-Arriving Materials: This paragraph relates to those documents received after the agenda is publicly noticed and during the 72 hours prior to the start of, or during, the meeting. Pursuant to the Brown Act, (California Government Code Section 54957.5(b)) late-arriving documents, related to the Commission on Police Practices' ("CPP") meeting agenda items, which are distributed to the legislative body prior to and/or during the CPP meeting are available for public review by appointment in the Office of the CPP located at Procopio Towers, 525 B Street, Suite 1725, San Diego, CA 92101. Appointments for public review may be made by calling (619) 533-5304 and coordinating with CPP staff before visiting the office. Late-arriving documents may also be obtained by email request to CPP staff at commissiononpolicepractices@sandiego.gov. Late-arriving materials received prior to the CPP meeting will also be available for review, at the CPP public meeting, by making a verbal request of CPP staff located in the CPP meeting. Late-arriving materials received during the CPP meeting will be available for reviewing the following workday at the CPP offices noted above or by email request to CPP staff.

Access for People with Disabilities: As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), requests for agenda information to be made available in alternative formats, and any requests for disability-related modifications or accommodations required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for alternatives to observing meetings and offering public comment as noted above, may be made by contacting the Commission at (619) 533-5304 or commissiononpolicepractices@sandiego.gov.

Requests for disability-related modifications or accommodation required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for auxiliary aids, services, or interpreters require different lead times, ranging from five business days to two weeks. Please keep this in mind and provide as much advance notice as possible to ensure availability. The city is committed to resolving accessibility requests swiftly.



COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES
REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING
Wednesday, January 7 2026

Balboa Park – Santa Fe Room
2144 Pan American Rd.,
San Diego, CA 92101

Click <https://youtu.be/rEe8rx1ikf4> to view this meeting on YouTube.

CPP Commissioners' Present:

Chair Ada Rodriguez
1st Vice Chair Bonnie Benitez
John Armantrout
Doug Case
Steve Chatzky
Lupe Diaz
Armando Flores
Dwayne Harvey

Elizabeth Inpyn
Dan Lawton
Darlanne Mulmat
Imani Robinson
Chenyang Rickard
Walter Sener
Daniel Torres

Excused:

2nd Vice Chair Clovis Honoré
David Burton
Kriby Knipp

Absent:

Cheryl Canson
Michael Major

CPP Staff Present:

Olga Golub, Chief Investigator
Aaron Burgess, Policy Manager
Ethan Waterman, Investigator
Ching-Yun Li, Investigator
Jon’Nae McFarland, Complaint Coordinator
Yasmeen Obeid, Community Engagement Coordinator

- I. CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME: Chair Ada Rodriguez called the meeting to order at 5:00pm.
- II. ROLL CALL: Policy Manager Aaron Burgess conducted the roll call for the Commission and established quorum.
- III. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
 - A. CPP Regular Meeting Minutes of December 3, 2025

Motion: Commissioner Imani Robinson moved for approval of the amended CPP Regular Meeting Minutes of December 3, 2025. Commissioner Steve Chatzky seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 11-0-1.
Yea: Benitez, Case, Chatzky, Harvey, Inpyn, Lawton, Mulmat, Rickard, Sener, Torres, Robinson
Nay: None
Abstained: Armantrout

NON-AGENDA ITEMS (Items are listed under Public Notices as a matter of public record only. These items do not require Commission deliberation/action and there is no public comment.)

NON-AGENDA COMMUNICATIONS FROM CHAIR, CHIEF OF STAFF, INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

A. CHAIR REPORT – *(Timestamp 16:50)*

1. **Proactive Posture:** The Commission is moving forward with a proactive approach, addressing difficult issues without waiting for perfect conditions.
2. **Commissioner Conduct:** Commissioners are reminded to remain impartial, evaluate cases based on evidence, and avoid public commentary on specific incidents until the review process is complete.
3. **Complaint Process Documentation:** Efforts are made to document the complaint and case process to ensure clarity and transparency for the public.
4. **Community Concerns:** The community has raised concerns about policing practices, response times, and the lack of visible internal accountability. The Commission will continue to push for transparency and accountability.
5. **Leadership Transition:** The interim Executive Director and General Counsel has resigned, and a new Executive Director is expected to be appointed within the month. The Commission's work will continue without interruption.
6. **Chair's Commitment:** Jon'nae emphasized their commitment to truth, transparency, and serving the community with intention and integrity

B. Chief of Staff- No Report

C. Interim Executive Director- No Report

D. Director of Community Engagement and Internship Program- No report

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT (Direct Community Engagement & Internship Programs Obeid)

In person Public Comment - Francine Maxwell *(Timestamp 07:06)*: Spoke in regard to urging the Commission to demand a meeting with the Mayor of San Diego to address community concerns and accountability, especially in light of significant settlements related to police misconduct. Requested proactive measures from the Commission to build trust and hold leadership accountable.

In person Public Comment – Darwin Fisher (*Timestamp 10:03*): Spoke in regards to community engagement with the Commission, referencing past initiatives like community bus tours and guest speakers that were beneficial. Emphasized the importance of data requests to understand issues like over-policing and suggested looking at specific times and areas to gather relevant data. Also, recommended holding a town hall to discuss the \$30 million settlement related to police misconduct, as it is a significant issue that needs public attention.

Virtual Public Comment – James Donaghe (*Timestamp 13:37*): Spoke in regards to unlawful citations of legally parked cars and the lack of action on illegally parked and stored vehicles. Also, mentioned the city's significant financial settlements due to police misconduct and questioned the lack of accountability and transparency.

NON-AGENDA COMMUNICATIONS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES – EXECUTIVE (Chair Rodriguez), RULES (1st Vice Chair Benitez), COMMUNITY OUTREACH (Direct Community Engagement & Internship Programs Obeid), POLICY (Commissioner Robinson), RECRUITMENT (Commissioner Case), TRAINING (Commissioner Mulmat)

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

- Executive Committee – No committee report
- Policy Committee – No committee report
- Recruitment Committee – No committee report
- Training and Continuing Education Committee – Investigator Lee is creating a digital version of the Commissioner Handbook, which will be searchable and include links. Current efforts to set up a community bus tour have faced resource challenges, but the committee remains committed to making it happen. Committee is exploring different organizations that could provide Implicit Bias Training, and future sessions for Inside SDPD will be planned for Commissioners to attend. Next committee is scheduled for February 12, 2025 at 5:30pm.

IV. COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION PRESENTATION

Mid- City Community Advocacy Network (CAN) (*Timestamp 29:30*)

1. Non-profit organization based in City Heights, San Diego. Their mission is to create a safe, productive, and healthy community through collaboration, advocacy, and organizing.
2. **Theory of Change:** The organization believes in organizing, collaborating, and advocating to create community change. They involve community members, including young people, multi-generational groups, and multilingual families, to build power and campaigns.
3. **Key Achievements:**
 - A. Established the City Heights Farmers Market and community gardens.
 - B. Implemented a network of farmers markets that accept EBT.
 - C. Advocated for and achieved the Youth Opportunity Pass, providing free public transportation for young people under 18.
 - D. Supported the establishment of the Commission on Police Practices and youth participation in it.
4. **Current Initiatives:**
 - A. Working on a permanent regional no-cost transportation pass for young people up to 24 years old.
 - B. Exploring housing and development issues.
 - C. Protecting cannabis tax revenues for youth development.
 - D. Addressing civic health and providing tools for health access.
 - E. Youth Council: The current Youth Council is working on park revitalization

projects, including Officer Jeremy Henwood Park, and addressing park equity policy issues.

F. Youth Justice Team: Advocating for the Ending Girls Incarceration Initiative in San Diego County and providing alternatives for young people to access the arts.

5. **Momentum Teams:** The organization has three momentum teams focused on transportation, juvenile justice, and the Youth Council. These teams are made up of volunteers from various communities in San Diego.

6. **Programs and Opportunities:** Mid City CAN offers free programs and leadership opportunities, including youth internships, leadership training, summer art programs, and outdoor experiences.

7. **Community Engagement:** The organization emphasizes building a sense of belonging and supporting community members through social outings, listening sessions, and restorative practices.

Virtual Public Comment – James Donaghe (Timestamp 44:20): Spoke in regards to unlawful citations of legally parked cars and the lack of action on illegally parked and stored vehicles. Also, mentioned the city's significant financial settlements due to police misconduct and questioned the lack of accountability and transparency.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Public Safety Committee Meeting on January 21, 2026 (Chair Rodriguez) - Tabled

B. Communication Protocol (Commissioner Case)

Communication with the Chief of Police: Individual Commissioners should not directly communicate with the Chief. Instead, communications should go through the Chair or Executive Director.

Policy or Procedural Matters: These should also be communicated by the Chair or Executive Director, with input from individual Commissioners through meetings or committees.

General Inquiries: Commissioners can make general inquiries through the SDPD Community Liaison, ensuring transparency by copying the Chair and Executive Director.

Requests for Official Records: These should be made through the Chair or Executive Director, not by individual Commissioners.

Communication with Internal Affairs: General correspondence should be handled by the Chair or Executive Director, with specific questions submitted through the CPP investigator.

Communication with City Officials: Official communications with the City Attorney, Mayor, and City Council should be made by the Chair or Executive Director.

Staff Communication: Routine requests can be made directly to staff, but tasks should be assigned through the Executive Director.

Motion: Commissioner Doug Case moved for approval of the amended Communication Protocol. Commissioner Daniel Torres seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 13-0-1.

Yea: Armantrout, Benitez, Chatzky, Diaz, Flores, Harvey, Inpyn, Lawton, Mulmat, Rickard, Sener

Nay: None

Abstained: Robinson

C. Case Review Procedure

- **Formation of Case Review Groups:** The Chief Investigator coordinates the formation of case review groups, ensuring that each Commissioner participates in at least four reviews annually.
- **Investigator's Role:** Each group is led by an investigator who reviews the entire case file, including body-worn camera footage and other relevant materials. The

investigator then summarizes the findings and shares them with the group.

- **Draft Report:** Before the group meeting, each Commissioner drafts a report using suggested revisions. These drafts are discussed and finalized during the group meeting.
- **Closed Session Meeting:** The finalized report is presented at the closed session meeting of the full Commission.
- **Timelines:** The procedure includes specific timelines for sharing information and finalizing reports to ensure a structured and efficient review process.

Motion: 1st Vice Chair, Bonnie Benetiz moved for approval of the Case Review Procedure. Commissioner Darlanne Mulmat seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 14-0-0.

Yea: Armantrout, Case, Chatzky, Diaz, Flores, Harvey, Inpyn, Lawton, Robinson, Rickard, Sener, Torres

Nays: None

Abstained: None

D. Discussion and Possible Approval of Memorandum to City Leadership Regarding Oversight Limitations, Community Concerns, and Measure B Implementation (Chair Rodriguez)

- Chair Rodriguez explained that the memo addresses systemic issues affecting public trust, transparency, and the effectiveness of oversight. It highlights the lack of timely acknowledgment from city leadership, ongoing limitations restricting independent oversight, and patterns in publicly available incidents raising questions about internal accountability. Chair Rodriguez agreed to take the feedback to the Executive Committee for further refinement and emphasized the importance of having the Commission's support to strengthen the memo.

In Person Public Comment – Patricia Dearman (*Timestamp 1:46:44*): Spoke on the importance of accountability and transparency within the San Diego Police Department. She expressed frustration over the lack of action and accountability for officers involved in misconduct. Patricia also urged the Commissioners to be more involved and vocal about these issues, stressing the need for independent and unbiased reviews. She also called for the inclusion of impacted families and advocates in the Commission's work.

In Person Public Comment – Sena (*Timestamp 1:50:09*): Spoke in regards to the need for better community engagement and education about the Commission's role and responsibilities. They mentioned that many community members are unaware of the Commission's existence and its functions. She also urged the Commission to prioritize underserved communities like Barrio Logan and Southeastern San Diego, which face significant issues and have been historically neglected.

In Person Public Comment – Tasha Williamson (*Timestamp 1:52:29*): Advocated the representation from the City Mayor's office, District Attorney's, and Chief's office when there is any incident with extreme use of force by officers. Urged the Commission to send the memo.

Virtual Public Comment – James Donaghe (*Timestamp 1:56:07*): Spoke about the need for better police accountability, addressing historical and ongoing discrimination, and ensuring inclusive support for all community members.

E. Request for SDPD Traffic Division Presentation on SoToxa Deployment, Procedures, and Oversight Considerations.

- **Purpose of Request:** The Commission seeks a comprehensive presentation from the SDPD Traffic Division on the deployment and use of the SoToxa oral fluid testing device during traffic stops.

- **Procedures and Training:** Understanding the written procedures, training materials, and deployment guidelines for SoToxa.
- **Consent and Refusal Protocols:** Clarification on what officers are instructed to do when a driver consents or refuses the test.
- **Accuracy and Limitations:** Information on the device's accuracy, limitations, and any safeguards to prevent misuse.
- **Community Impact:** Ensuring that the community is informed about the use of SoToxa and its implications for civil liberties and privacy.

Motion: Commissioner Imani Robinson moved to request SDPD Traffic Division to present the SoToxa Deployment Procedure, and oversight consideration. Commissioner Daniel Torres seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 14-0-0.

Yea: Armantrout, Benitez, Case, Chatzky, Diaz, Flores, Harvey, Inpyn, Lawton, Mulmat, Rickard, Sener, Torres

Nay: None

Abstained: None

In Person Public Comment – Dave Dearman (*Timestamp 2:02:57*): Expressed concerns about the accuracy of SoToxa, noting that it indicates the presence of a drug above a certain level but does not measure actual impairment. He also mentioned the potential for false positives and the invasion of privacy, leading to unreasonable search and seizure. He pointed out the high cost of the devices (\$5000 each) and suggested that funds should be used for training officers in de-escalation techniques and proper responses to mental health crises.

In Person Public Comment – Tasha Williamson (*Timestamp 2:04:39*): Emphasized the importance of educating the community about the consequences of refusing tests like SoToxa, as refusal can lead to license suspension. She stressed the need for clear communication about the legal requirements and expectations from the police department

F. Community Roundtable Debrief (Direct Community Engagement & Internship Programs Obeid)

1. Held on December 8, 2025 at Malcolm X Library with a total of 54 attendees including 44 community members and 10 staff and commissioners
2. Objective: Gather community experiences with SDPD, identify the top priority of the CPP in 2026, and educate the community on the role and scope of CPP.
3. Key Themes from Community Feedback: Complaints about SDPD, including issues with transparency and body cam footage access; Concerns about pretext stops, use of force, and medical aid intervention; Issues related to youth contact, immigration enforcement, and CPP visibility and trust-building; Discussions on SDPD budget allocation, surveillance technology, and civil liberties.
4. Next Steps: The feedback will be used to inform the CPP's priorities and actions in 2026, and a detailed report will be published.

In Person Public Comment – Tasha Williamson (*Timestamp 2:32:45*): Expressed appreciation for the roundtable and emphasized the need for more such meetings, both in-person and online, to accommodate all community members, including elders and those unable to attend in person. She stressed the importance of educating the community about the Commission's role to ensure that discussions remain relevant and focused.

In Person Public Comment – Sena (*Timestamp 2:34:24*): Emphasized the need for virtual attendance options for future meetings to accommodate those with scheduling conflicts. She also highlighted the importance of prioritizing underserved

communities like Barrio Logan and Southeast San Diego, which face significant

issues.

Non- Agenda Public Comment:

In Person Public Comment – Dave Dearman (*Timestamp 2:39:28*): Expressed concerns about the City Mayor and Chief of Police not attending the Community Roundtable, and frustration regarding the lack of non-lethal practice within SDPD.

In Person Public Comment – Patricia Dearman (*Timestamp 2:41:32*): Spoke in regards to over policing and exaggerated enforcement in Barrio Logan.

In Person Public Comment – Sena (*Timestamp 2:43:47*): Spoke in regard to SoTaoxa and lack of community education on their rights. Sena also mentioned reducing the harm and racial profiling from SDPD.

In Person Public Comment – Tasha Williamson (*Timestamp 2:47:30*): Spoke in regards to the community's frustration with the lack of accountability and the continued presence of officers involved in misconduct. Tasha mentioned that the community is tired of excessive force, false arrests, and the promotion of officers who have committed serious offenses.

VI. CLOSED SESSION (NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

A. Public Comment

In person Public Comment – Tasha Williamson (*Timestamp 2:18:24*): Urged the CPP to ensure that mandated disclosures are made public and to maintain independence from the SDPD. Suggested that the CPP should meet with the POST Commission and the Civil Grand Jury to leverage their support in holding officers accountable.

B. Interim Executive Director/General Counsel led CPP into Closed Session

C. PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE/DISMISAL/RELEASE Discussion & Consideration of Complaints & Reports: Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957 to discuss complaints, charges, investigations, and discipline (unless the employee requests an open public session) involving San Diego Police Department employees, and information deemed confidential under Penal Code Sections 832.5832.8 and Evidence Code Section 1040. Reportable actions for the Closed Session items on the agenda will be posted on the Commission's website at www.sandiego.gov/cpp or stated at the beginning of the Open Session meeting if the meeting is held on the same day.

1. SDPD Feedback on Case-Specific Matters – None
2. Review of Internal Affairs Investigations
 - a. Case 2025-0012 (CATI)
 - b. Case 2025-0064 (CATI)
3. Discipline Memos – None

VII. REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION- (General Counsel Bart Miesfeld) Interim Executive Director Bart Miesfeld reported that there was no reportable action.

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS – None

IX. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 7:46 pm.

Commission on Police Practices (CPP) Case Review Reference Sheet

Case Review Guidelines

Fair and impartial review of the available evidence.

Review should be based solely on the evidence referenced in the Internal Affairs (IA) Investigator's Report and information known to subject officers at the time of the incident.

Ensure that all allegations are included and addressed.

Check thoroughness of IA investigations (e.g., all reasonable efforts to interview parties and obtain evidence have been exhausted; all policy violations are addressed):

- Inconsistencies in the evidence addressed?
- Interview questions appropriate?
- Legal/policy citations relevant and correct? Is analysis appropriately based on those citations?
- Are any relevant facts ignored or misrepresented?
- Did IA provide CPP with all materials that IA reviewed in making their finding(s)?
- Were all policy violations addressed?
- Were all allegations made by complainant addressed?

Category I complaints involve allegations which the San Diego Police Department (SDPD) considers to be more serious:

- Force
- Arrest
- Discrimination
- Criminal conduct
- Detention
- Search

These complaints are investigated by detective sergeants assigned to Internal Affairs and undergo review by ranking officers in their unit.

Category II complaints involve allegations which SDPD considers to be less serious:

- Courtesy
- Procedure
- Conduct
- Service
- Other

Generally, these complaints are investigated at the Division-level; a supervisor in the subject officer's unit investigates the complaint and forwards the findings to the commanding officer of the unit, who then ultimately forwards the completed investigation to IA for approval. IA also has the authority to investigate Category II complaints when there also

Category I allegations, personnel from more than one division are involved, and/or the investigation would be too time-consuming for field supervisors at the division-level.

Officer-Involved Shootings (OIS) and In-Custody Death (ICD) Investigations

All incidents during which an officer discharges their firearm towards someone or during which an individual dies while in the care or custody of a San Diego Police Department (SDPD) officer *are automatically investigated*.

Layers of OIS and ICD investigations review:

1. San Diego Sheriff's Office or Chula Vista PD conduct criminal investigation into SDPD OIS/ICD
2. District Attorney determines whether officers bear criminal liability (usually, based on Penal Code 835a)
 - a. If yes, they prosecute officer
 - i. At conclusion of prosecution, case will be forwarded to SDPD IA
 - b. If no, they forward case to SDPD IA
3. SDPD IA conducts administrative investigation to determine whether officers violated policy
4. CPP reviews SDPD IA administrative investigation

Preponderance of the Evidence – burden of proof in IA administrative investigations and CPP case reviews. Preponderance of the evidence means more likely than not (>50%).

SDPD Investigation Findings for Category I and II Complaints:

1. **Sustained:** The SDPD officer committed all or part of the alleged conduct, and the conduct was out of policy or unlawful.
2. **Not Sustained:** The investigation produced insufficient information to clearly prove or disprove the allegations.
3. **Exonerated:** The alleged act occurred but was justified, legal and proper, or was within policy.
4. **Unfounded:** The alleged conduct did not occur.
5. **Other Finding:** The investigation revealed violations of Department policies/procedures not alleged in the complaint.

SDPD Investigation Findings for OIS and ICD investigations:

- **Within Policy:** The officer's conduct was justified, legal and proper, or was within policy (similar to Exonerated).
- **Not Within Policy:** The officer's conduct was out of policy or unlawful (similar to Sustained).

CPP Recommendations:

1. **Agree with IA Findings:** CPP agrees with IA findings.
2. **Agree with IA Findings with Comment:** CPP agrees with IA findings and additional information from the case review should be noted (comments may include, but are not limited to, the appropriateness of the tactics employed by the subject officer).
3. **Disagree with IA Findings with Comment:** CPP disagrees with IA finding (comments should explain the disagreement and note the recommended finding for IA).

Typical Evidence in IA Case Files

1. Original complaint
2. Police Officer reports
 - a. Arrest reports
 - b. A-9 reports
 - c. Field interview report
 - d. Citations
3. Criminal history
4. BWC footage
5. Surveillance footage
6. Video recordings made by complainants, witnesses, observers
7. 911 call and radio communications
8. EVENT/CAD information
9. Interview audio recordings
10. Maps
11. Homicide Book (for OIS and ICD investigations)

Examples of Group Concerns

- Policy/procedure violations that occurred but were not addressed in IA investigation
- Observations about incident/conduct that do not necessarily relate to allegations
- Recommendations to the Department related to the incident
- Recommendations to one of the Commission Committees to look at specific Department policies that may need to be revised, created or clarified
- Observations of reoccurring patterns
- Suggestions for handling similar investigations in the future

SDPD Discipline Memo Review

- When IA sustains an allegation, the subject officer may be disciplined. CPP receives Discipline Memorandum from SDPD after discipline is administered to officer
- CPP reviews the discipline imposed, the original incident, and the SDPD Discipline Manual and makes two determinations:
 - Reported discipline is consistent with the SDPD Misconduct Discipline Matrix: Agree/Disagree
 - Discipline imposed is appropriate: Agree/Disagree

Commission on Police Practices

Plan and Procedure for Recruitment and

Nomination of New Commissioners

[Draft – December 4, 2025]

Introduction and Background

This recruitment and nomination plan and procedure is designed to ensure that: (1) the Recruitment Committee initiates and manages the entire process from outreach through preliminary screening; (2) all applicants are thoroughly vetted, interviewed, and discussed confidentially by the Commission; (3) the Commission selects and forwards qualified nominees to the City Council for consideration; (4) candidates with a genuine passion for police oversight are prioritized; (5) every effort is made to recruit a diverse slate of nominees who represent the community and bring relevant expertise or lived experience; and (6) all eligibility criteria from Measure B and related laws are strictly observed.

San Diego Municipal Code §26.1105(a) states “Members are appointed by the Council in accordance with the approved Council rules and policies. In making appointments the Council may consider written nominations made by the public and community-based organizations, as long as nominees accept their nomination in writing prior to Council consideration. **The Council may also consider nominations from the Commission. The Commission must prepare an operating procedure for the nomination process.**” This document represents that operating procedure.

Roles and Responsibilities in the Nomination Process

A successful recruitment and nomination cycle requires coordination between the Commission’s internal committees and the City’s governing bodies. The major roles and their responsibilities are:

- **Recruitment Committee (Commission):** This standing committee leads the nomination process from start to finish. According to the Commission’s bylaws, the Recruitment Committee “shall engage in activities to recruit new members for the Commission, inform interested individuals about the Commission, interview prospective members, and select nominees to recommend to the City Council.” In practice, this means the Recruitment Committee organizes outreach efforts,

accepts and reviews applications, arranges and conducts initial candidate interviews, and ultimately proposes a list of nominees to the full Commission.

- **Full Commission (CPP):** The Commission as a whole participates in the later stages of selection. While the Recruitment Committee may do preliminary interviews and shortlisting, final discussions and decisions on nominees are made by the full Commission in a closed session meeting. The Commission must vote to approve the slate of nominees that will be forwarded to the City Council.
- **City Council:** The San Diego City Council has the chartered authority to appoint Commissioners. In this process, the Council receives the Commission's recommended nominees, conducts any additional vetting, and confirms the appointments by vote at an open City Council meeting. The Council President's office or a committee reviews the qualifications of nominees and ensure they meet all requirements. Councilmembers may also consider nominations submitted by the public (including Councilmembers) or community organizations, but any nominee must have accepted their nomination by submitting an application through the City's Boards and Commission's application portal. Final appointments are made by majority vote of the Council at an open Council meeting.
- **Commission Staff / City Clerk/ Administrative staff (such as the Office of the CPP or Council President's Office):** These staff provide logistical support. They manage the online application platform, track applications, and help the Recruitment Committee schedule interviews. They may also coordinate with the City's Human Resources for conducting background checks on nominees after Council confirmation. Every prospective Commissioner will undergo a criminal background review at the final stage, per City law, to screen for any disqualifying factors (such as recent serious criminal convictions specified in the ordinance).
- **Community Outreach Committee:**
In collaboration with the Recruitment Committee the Community Outreach Committee will
 - Develop and implement targeted outreach strategies to engage residents across all nine council districts, with emphasis on recruiting candidates from low- to moderate-income communities, youth (ages 18–24), and individuals with relevant lived experiences or professional expertise (e.g., civil rights, behavioral health, housing insecurity).

- Coordinate with the City's Communications Department to issue multilingual announcements and social media campaigns promoting open commissioner seats and nomination deadlines.
- Liaise with Council Offices to ensure recruitment efforts align with geographic representation goals and to amplify outreach through local channels.
- Build and sustain partnerships with community-based organizations, advocacy groups, youth-serving institutions, and professional networks to encourage nominations and broaden awareness of the Commission's work.
- Organize and facilitate informational sessions (virtual and in-person) to educate prospective applicants and stakeholders about the role of a Commissioner, the nomination process, and how community members can get involved.
- Develop accessible materials (flyers/brochures, videos, FAQs) to explain the application process and encourage participation from non-traditional candidates.
- Ensure that all outreach and recruitment materials are translated into the primary languages spoken in San Diego's diverse communities (e.g., Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese).
- Monitor outreach metrics to assess which populations are underrepresented and adjust outreach tactics accordingly.
- Assist in identifying promising candidates from underrepresented groups and ensure their nominations are supported with the appropriate information and resources.
- Maintaining a contact list and CRM-style database of outreach partners and nomination leads to support ongoing and future recruitment cycles.

Eligibility and Composition Requirements

The Commission composition and member qualifications are stipulated in San Diego Municipal Code §26.1103. These include age and residency requirements, restrictions on law enforcement affiliation, city employment, and a disqualifying criminal history. (Note that not criminal convictions are disqualifying; individuals with involvement in

the criminal justice system can provide a valuable perspective.) The ordinance includes a list of preferred criteria for the at-large seats.

Recruitment Process

- **Announcement of Vacancies:** Early each year (typically in January), the Commission should survey current Commissioners to see who is seeking reappointment in order to determine and announce which seats will be vacated. During the year as vacancies arise, there may be additional application cycles. This announcement can be made via a press release sent to media and community organizations, the Commission's official website and social media, City Council newsletters, and community email lists. The announcement will specify how many seats are open (and which categories of seats are available) and outline the basic qualifications. It should also clearly state the timeline (application deadline, etc.) and provide contact information for questions.
- **Community Outreach:** The Recruitment Committee (with support from the Commission's Community Outreach Committee) will disseminate information widely. Stakeholder organizations such as civil rights/social justice groups, neighborhood councils, youth councils, faith-based organizations, immigrant services groups, LGBTQ+ centers, and organizations in communities where there is a disproportionate number of complaints against the SDPD should be informed and encouraged to nominate candidates.
- **Emphasizing the Mission and Responsibilities:** All outreach materials should clearly explain what the Commission on Police Practices does and the responsibilities of Commissioners. The Recruitment Committee should host information sessions or webinars to educate prospective applicants. In these sessions (virtual or in-person), committee members can describe the Commission's purpose and authorities, the expected time commitment, and the impact Commissioners can have.
- **Targeted Outreach for Diversity:** To fulfill the composition mandates, the Recruitment Committee will conduct targeted outreach to ensure representation from key groups. For example:
 - **Council District Representation:** Coordinate with each City Council member's office to publicize the opportunity in their district. Council offices can help identify community leaders or active residents who might be good candidates, and they can circulate the announcement through their district mailing lists or at community meetings.

- **Youth Candidates:** Reach out to universities, community colleges, youth advisory boards, and organizations serving young adults. Let students and young leaders (ages ~18-24) know about the two youth seats.
- **Low/Moderate Income Communities:** Work with community planning groups or nonprofits in lower income neighborhoods to find voices from those areas.
- **Professionals and Expertise:** Also contact professional or advocacy networks for people with relevant expertise, e.g. public defenders or civil rights attorneys (for legal insight), social workers and mental health professionals (for behavioral health perspectives), homeless services and reentry program staff (for perspectives on homelessness and criminal justice impact).
- **Public Events and Media:** The Recruitment Committee may present at community events or town halls. Local media (newspaper op-eds or radio talk shows should be utilized).
- **Timeline for Recruitment:** The outreach campaign should specify the deadline for nominations/applications. Best practice is to keep the application period open for at least 4 to 6 weeks to allow time for word to spread. Alongside the deadline, provide a tentative timeline for the rest of the process (requires coordinating with the City Council President's office).

Application and Nomination Process

1. Nominations: The City has an online *Commission on Police Practices Nomination Form* for this purpose. Candidates can attach a resume and letter(s) of recommendation. A nomination is not required, but a nominee must submit an application in order to be considered.

2. Application Form (OnBoard System): Candidates must submit a detailed application through the City's boards and commissions portal (the OnBoard system). The application is open year-round on a rolling basis, but there will be a cut-off date for each recruitment cycle to be considered in the upcoming round. Candidates will be asked if they want to be considered for a nomination from the Commission. If so, their application will be forwarded to the Office of the Commission on Police Practices.

3. Managing the Applications: Throughout the application period, the Recruitment Committee (with staff help) should keep track of the number of nominations and applications coming in. If certain seats have few applicants as the deadline nears, the committee might do an extra push of outreach targeted to those needs.

The application form remains open on a rolling basis, so even after the initial deadline, late applicants could potentially be considered for future vacancies or if an extension is needed.

After the deadline, the Recruitment Committee will collect all submitted applications and prepare for the vetting stage.

A Note Regarding District Designated Seats: A Councilmember may nominate a person to represent their district, sometimes after their own vetting process. There is an unofficial tradition that other Councilmembers mutually respect such nominations. It is advisable for the Recruitment Committee Chair to communicate with each Councilmember's office to determine if their office is interested in having the CPP vet applicants for their district-designated seat.

Preliminary Vetting and Shortlisting of Applicants

Review of Qualifications and Statements: Committee members or staff should go through each application to confirm the candidate meets the basic eligibility requirements. After the basic eligibility check, committee members will read each candidate's application responses, resume, and nomination statements in detail. Each committee member (or a sub-group assigned to applications) could score or make notes on each application. It's useful to develop a rating rubric to evaluate the written applications uniformly. The Recruitment Committee can hold a meeting (likely closed to protect applicant privacy) to discuss the applications after individual review. During this meeting, the members compare notes and decide whom to invite for interviews. If there are numerous applicants, the committee might rank them and perhaps pick a top tier to interview. Depending on the number of applications, the committee may decide to interview everyone. It is generally recommended to interview more candidates than the number of available seats, but still keep it manageable.

Interview Protocol and Evaluation

Interview – All interviews will be conducted in a non-public setting (closed session or private meeting) to protect applicant privacy and permit candid discussion.

Scheduling and Panel: The Recruitment Committee should schedule interviews at times convenient for the volunteer applicants, possibly during evenings or weekends. The interviewing panel will consist of Recruitment Committee members and the Chair or designee. Keeping the panel relatively consistent ensures each candidate is evaluated by

the same group, which is fair and uniform. Staff may attend to assist with logistics but are not part of the evaluation process. In-person interviews at the CPP office are recommended. Each candidate should be given roughly the same length of time, commonly 30 to 60 minutes per interview

Question Planning: Prior to the interviews, the Recruitment Committee will develop a list of standard interview questions. Standardizing questions helps ensure fairness and every candidate gets an equal opportunity to address the same core issues. These questions should tie back to the qualities sought in commissioners. The Executive Director should review the questions to ensure they comply with City interview standards.

Evaluation After Interviews: After each interview, the panel might take a few minutes to quietly jot down impressions while fresh. It is often useful to use a simple rating form for each candidate, with categories such as Passion/Commitment, Knowledge/Insight, Communication Skills, Objectivity, etc., rated maybe 1–5, plus space for comments. Final decisions should not be made until all scheduled interviews are completed, to ensure everyone gets equal consideration. Once all interviews are done, the Recruitment Committee should convene to discuss and compare the candidates and come to a consensus on which candidates to recommend to the full Commission. It is advisable to identify alternate choices in case a top candidate withdraws or is not confirmed by Council. The Recruitment Committee should prepare a written report to the full Commission with the recommendations and rationale. The applications and supporting materials should be attached to the report.

Commission Deliberation and Selection (Closed Session)

After interviews are completed by the Recruitment Committee, the full Commission must deliberate and decide on the final list of nominees to recommend. This typically occurs in a closed session of a Commission meeting, since it involves discussing individual candidates (a confidential personnel matter). The steps in this phase are distribution of the written report with a verbal summary by the Chair of the Recruitment Committee, discussion, and voting.

Preparation of Nomination Package: Once approved, the Commission (with staff help) prepares a nomination package to send to the City Council President. This usually includes:

- A cover letter or memorandum from the Commission Chair to the Council (or Council President) listing the nominees and stating that the

Commission recommends these individuals for appointment to the Commission on Police Practices.

- For each nominee, the package may attach their resume and/or application and letters of recommendation (so the Council has background information). Sometimes a brief bio is included for each nominee, highlighting qualifications and the seat they will fill.
- **Confidentiality:** The content of the closed session discussion remains confidential, but the fact that the Commission voted on nominees can be reported in open session or in meeting minutes (without detailing the deliberation). Once nominees are forwarded to Council, their names become public as part of the Council agenda. The Commission should, out of courtesy, inform each nominee that they have been selected and their name submitted for appointment. Likewise, those interviewed but not selected should be privately informed and thanked for their time (and perhaps encouraged to stay involved or to apply again in the future if they were strong; they could even be considered as alternates if any nominee cannot serve).

City Council Review and Confirmation

- **Council President's Review:** The Council President (or a designated Council committee, such as the Public Safety committee) will first review the nominations. According to Council rules, prospective members are subject to a qualifications review by the Council President or designee. This might involve verifying that the nominations package is complete and that each nominee fulfills the required criteria. The Council President will then place the appointments on the City Council meeting agenda, including application materials for all applicants. Typically, appointments to boards are done via a resolution or docket item that lists the names and terms of each nominee.
- **Background Checks:** Appointments are contingent on the appointee passing a background check conducted by the City's Human Resources Department
- **Council Committee Hearing (if any):** Sometimes appointments go straight to the full Council, or they might be reviewed in a committee meeting first for discussion. If a committee hearing is scheduled, the Recruitment Committee Chair and/or Commission Chair could attend to speak on behalf of the nominees, and nominees themselves might be invited to introduce themselves to council members. The committee would then vote to forward the nominations to the full Council with a recommendation.

- **City Council Meeting Appointment Vote:** The final step is the City Council meeting where the appointments are considered. This is done in open session and is a public vote. Each applicant's name and the seat (e.g. term period, category) will be listed on the agenda materials. The Council will vote to approve the appointments.

It is advisable for the nominees to attend this Council meeting, since they may be asked to make a brief introduction. The Commission's leadership should also be present to show support for its nominees. A majority vote is required to confirm each appointment.

- **Oath of Office:** Once confirmed and after passing the background check, new Commissioners are required to take oath of office administered by the City Clerk. Their term officially begins upon Council appointment (or a specified start date like July 1 if filling a term cycle)
- **Orientation and Training for New Commissioners:** Appointing Commissioners is not the end of the process; proper orientation and training must follow to ensure new members can effectively fulfill their duties. Upon Council confirmation, the Commission (through its Training Committee or via staff) will implement the training program for the incoming Commissioners and track the progress of commissioners.

Commission on Police Practices Meeting Location Requirements and Guidance for Commissioners

Purpose

As the Commission explores hosting meetings in various locations throughout the City of San Diego, it is essential that any proposed venue meets the operational, legal, and accessibility requirements necessary for public meetings. This document outlines the criteria commissioners should use when identifying potential meeting sites, as well as the information required when submitting suggestions.

1. Operating Hours & Availability

- Available on the first and third Wednesdays of the month from 3:00 p.m.–8:30 p.m. (2:00 p.m.–9:00 p.m. with A/V vendor)
- Able to be booked at least three months in advance
- Capacity: 50–75 people (20 tables and 75 chairs)
- Able to support a U-shaped layout

2. Technology & Audio-Visual Requirements

- Reliable Wi-Fi or wired internet access
- Audio amplification (microphones and speakers) suitable for a public meeting
- Projector or screen capability for presentations
- Adequate power outlets for laptops and equipment
- Space for recording equipment, if needed
- A layout that supports both in-person participation and any required hybrid or remote components

3. Cost Considerations

Proposed meeting locations should be low-cost or no-cost whenever possible.

4. Accessibility & Public Participation Requirements

All proposed locations must be fully ADA accessible, including accessible entrances, restrooms, seating areas, and a private lactation room. Venues should provide adequate parking (not street parking only) or be reachable by public transit to ensure broad community access. The space must offer sufficient seating for expected public attendance and support public comment in full compliance with the Brown Act.

5. Safety & Neutrality Considerations

Because CPP meetings must remain neutral and accessible to all community members, proposed locations should be public or community-serving spaces rather than private residences or businesses. Venues should avoid any appearance of bias or affiliation with particular groups or interests. Additionally, locations must have adequate lighting, especially for evening meetings, to ensure a safe environment for commissioners, staff, and the public.

6. Additional Criteria

Facilities must be located within the City of San Diego limits. Commissioners should also consider whether the location is in a district or neighborhood that has expressed interest in hosting a meeting and whether the venue has previously hosted City or other public meetings.

7. Submitting Location Suggestions

Commissioners should submit facility suggestions to Jon’Nae McFarland (mcfarlandj@sandiego.gov and CC Roger Smith Rogers@sandiego.gov) include the name of the facility, address, and contact person (if known). Jon’Nae will connect with the facility administrator to conduct a walkthrough to ensure the site meets all criteria.