

Report from the Community Roundtable Series
CPP Outreach Chair Patrick Anderson
1 February 2021

Throughout the Roundtable Series, the following 10 Guiding Principles were developed for all aspects of the CPP's implementation and function:

1. The Commission should be committed to transparency and accountability to the community it represents. As one community member commented, "everything that *can* be made public (within state law) *must* be made public."
2. The Commission should be prompt and regular in reporting back to complainants and to the community, with accessible updates at *every stage* of the process.
3. The Commission should be *flexible* in its appointment process and priorities according to changing community demographics, and changing needs in the community.
4. The Commission should better represent the diversities of San Diego.
5. The Commission should actively include participation by, and representation of, people with direct experience with policing (and overpolicing).
6. The Commission should maintain strict independence from law enforcement in its investigations, reviews, and audits, and in its deliberative and organizational processes.
7. The Commission's expectations for workload should not make it impossible for working people, and people with childcare/eldercare obligations, to participate.
8. The Commission should engage community members more actively, both for education and for listening sessions.
9. The Commission should establish advisory committees of community members (for example, a Youth Advisory Committee, a Commissioner Nominating Committee, a Faith Communities Committee).
10. The Commission should endeavor to produce and transparently report on data related to policing in San Diego.

In addition to these 10 guiding principles (developed throughout all four Roundtables), the following specific questions were raised at Roundtable #4.

Commission Size and Composition

- How to Ensure Diverse Representation of the Community?: In designing appointment priorities for the Commission, some combination of the following should be used: (1) City Council District Maps; (2) SDPD Division/Beat Maps; (3) Historical data on allegations made against SDPD officers; and (4) Historical data on enforcement stops (and their location). In addition, the Commission should include 2 dedicated Youth Seats.
- Establish Definition of "Youth" for Potential Youth Seats: Widespread consensus for 18-24 years old; some community members expressed a strong desire to include younger community members (13-18 years old); a possible compromise would be to form a Youth Advisory Committee for younger community members. This Committee would not engage in case review, but would advise the Commission on issues of specific concern to youth.

Commissioner Application and Selection Process

- **Who Serves on the Selection Committee?:** Generally speaking, the community expressed broad consensus for the idea that a Selection/Nominating Committee (made up of non-CPP community members) should be established to review applications for membership on the CPP and make recommendations/nominations directly to City Council.
- **What are the Qualifications for Commissioners?:** Generally speaking, the community did not express support for setting qualifications *beyond* “residence in the city of San Diego,” and the exclusion of “current or former law enforcement officers and their close family members.” The community noted that law enforcement officers could be invited to meetings *as consultants or witnesses*; but as law enforcement is already represented by Internal Affairs and the POA, the Commission should be strictly limited to members of the community who do *not* have ties to law enforcement.

Commissioner Service

- **Establish Term Length and Term Limits:** There was no broad consensus on term length/limits; suggestions included 2-year terms (with an 8-year maximum service period); one-year terms (with a 3-year maximum service period); and 3-year terms (with a 3-year maximum service period). There *was* broad consensus that these terms should be staggered so as to ensure institutional stability/continuity for the CPP.
- **What are Reasonable Expectations for Service?:** There was broad community concern that the work of the former CRB included time/availability expectations that made service unfeasible for large portions of the community – including working people, under-resourced people, and people with childcare/eldercare obligations. There was a similar concern that the committee structure of the former CRB expanded time/availability expectations, contributing to the too-heavy workload.
- **Establish “Removal for Cause” Guidelines:** There was broad consensus/approval of the decision to remove “felony or other crime or moral turpitude” from the Interim Bylaws. There was also discussion of ensuring no conflict of interest; selecting Commissioners who were adept at reviewing difficult materials, keeping an open mind, and listening closely to others’ viewpoints; and including continuing support for Implicit Bias (and similar) training.