

**A SURVEY  
OF CALIFORNIA JURISDICTIONS  
USING THE COMMISSION MODEL  
OF POLICE OVERSIGHT  
  
FOR THE CITY OF PASADENA**

**Kathryn Olson**  
**Change Integration Consulting, LLC**  
<http://www.change-integration.com>  
[kathryn.olson@change-integration.com](mailto:kathryn.olson@change-integration.com)  
**206.890.5932**

**November 2, 2020**

## **A SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA JURISDICTIONS USING THE COMMISSION MODEL OF POLICE OVERSIGHT**

As summarized in an Agenda Report dated October 19, 2020, from Mayor Tornek and Councilmember Kennedy to the City of Pasadena City Council (City Council), on October 12<sup>th</sup>, the City Council adopted an Ordinance to establish a Community Police Oversight Commission (Commission or CPOC) and an Independent Police Auditor. The Ordinance provides that the Commission will be comprised of 11 members appointed by the City Council:

- Each of the seven Councilmembers and the Mayor shall nominate one member for a total of eight.
- Three members shall be nominated representing community-based organizations.
- Each member shall be a resident of Pasadena.
- All nominations will be subject to ratification by City Council.
- At least 50 percent of the filled positions on the Commission shall be women, if feasible.

The Ordinance also provides that Commission members shall be appointed for a term of three years, except for the initial group who will be appointed to terms of one, two, and three years, in order to establish staggered terms. Four of the initial members shall be appointed to serve a three-year term; four members will serve a two-year term; and the remaining three members shall be appointed for a one-year term.

The Ordinance requires that City Council adopt a resolution establishing a policy for appointment of the 11 Commission members. The issue of a process for making appointments was discussed at the October 7, 2020, Public Safety Committee and the Committee considered ways to maximize community engagement in the appointment process. For nominees from the City Council and Mayor, one approach discussed is for each Councilmember to conduct applicant interviews in a public meeting prior to selection. The October 19<sup>th</sup> Agenda Report also noted that Council might consider selecting a panel of community-based organizations to recommend a slate of six potential appointees for the City Council's consideration, from which the Council would select three.

The Committee did not take action at the October 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, but the October 19, 2020, Agenda Report from Mayor Tornek and Councilmember Kennedy recommended that City Council direct the City Attorney to prepare a resolution setting forth the appointment process for Commission members. To that end, City Council directed staff to prepare a comprehensive report providing information



from other cities and civilian oversight models regarding the criteria and process for making appointments to serve on a Commission, including information on the experience/background of members considered to be beneficial to a successful Commission.

In support of staff responding to this directive, a survey was conducted of California jurisdictions using the commission model of police oversight, or a similar model, to gather information on approaches used in commission appointments and selection criteria that jurisdictions identify as contributing to the success of the commission. The following is a summary of the information that was collected.

#### A. Methodology

At the outset, it is important to emphasize that no two oversight entities are identical, even if they are both called “Commission” or “Office of Inspector General,” or some other labeling term is used. Regardless of what an oversight entity is named, there is great variation in the range of functions performed and with regards to other factors, such as size and reporting structure. For purpose of this survey, if an oversight agency in California included the term “Commission” in its title, it was included in the review. Three other entities that use a term such as “Review Board” were also included, as they appeared to have functions similar to others called “Commission.”

The California jurisdictions using a commission model of police oversight were identified by referencing previous studies on alternative oversight models, including a 2016 report for the City of Pasadena,<sup>1</sup> and by consulting the most recent published list of U.S. oversight agencies maintained by the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE).<sup>2</sup> Various news articles also offered relevant information about initiatives on the November 2020 ballot to alter or expand certain oversight agencies’ authority, including several included in this study. Ultimately, seventeen (17) agencies in California were identified as using a commission model of police oversight (or a similar approach, though called a “Review Board”).

Internet searches provided information about the member selection process used by most of the oversight agencies included in this report. However, while some commissions have a significant on-line presence, smaller agencies often offered less

---

<sup>1</sup> Kathryn Olson and Barbara Attard, *Analysis of Police Oversight Models for the City of Pasadena*, Appendix B (April 18, 2016).

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.nacole.org/police\\_oversight\\_by\\_jurisdiction\\_usa](https://www.nacole.org/police_oversight_by_jurisdiction_usa)



information and municipal codes and other sources did not always offer more relevant detail. Attempts were made to reach out to many of the commissions under review to verify and expand on publically available information, but it was difficult to make some connections, in part because many of the groups do not have paid staff readily available to respond to inquiries. Nonetheless, four individuals were interviewed who have experience with one or more of the specific commissions under review and a fifth person provided some contextual information.

The commissions included in this review are primarily staffed by volunteers and have a purpose of involving community members in doing one or more of the following: evaluating police policies and practices, reviewing misconduct investigations and critical incidents, and/or holding public meetings to facilitate and improve police-community communications. While the focus of the survey was not on comparing and contrasting functions among the agencies considered, the scope of duties among commissions surveyed range from those primarily acting as liaisons between the community and police department/political representatives to commissions with the power to enact policies, determine the outcome on misconduct complaints, and hire and fire police chiefs. Also, there are commission model oversight agencies included in the survey that have relatively broad authority, but are provided inadequate resources and cannot and do not actualize their oversight power.

Attached to this report as Appendix 1 is a table with the seventeen police commissions (or review boards) included in the study listed, along with a summary of information collected for each, including selection criteria and notes about the selection process used in each jurisdiction.

#### B. Commission Member Numbers

The number of authorized members in the seventeen oversight agencies included in this review range from five (5) to twenty-three (23) members, with some providing for alternate or non-voting members. The most common number of commission members is nine (9), with eleven (11) and then seven (7) member commissions the next most frequently observed. Many of the jurisdictions use a consistent number of members across all commissions and boards within the jurisdiction, including the police oversight commission. One city enacted a commission with 9 members, but for the sake of consistency is currently considering reducing that number to 7, which would be in line with other commissions and boards in the jurisdiction.



### C. Selecting Authority

The Mayor and City Council are involved in some way in nominating, conferring on, and/or selecting commission members in most of the 17 jurisdictions considered in this report. However, a few of the jurisdictions stand out as to who has authority to be involved in the nomination and confirmation process.

In Anaheim, members of the Police Review Board are selected by lottery from each of Anaheim's districts, plus one member selected at large. The City Manager has discretion and final authority on each appointment, however.

The BART Police Citizen Review Board includes one member jointly selected by the BART Police Managers Association and BART Police Officers Association. The City of Inglewood's Municipal Code provides that the Police Chief selects one of the eleven members on the Citizen Police Oversight Commission (CPOC). Though some might assume the Chief would select an officer, the Chief recently selected an active community member to join CPOC.

The Davis' Police Accountability Commission (PAC) has nine members, including one student appointed by the Associated Students, UC Davis (ASUCD), without the requirement of City Council confirmation. Davis is currently considering a number of changes to the structure and purpose of the PAC, including the encouragement of student involvement on the Commission, without reserving a spot for appointment by the ASUCD. Apparently, it has been difficult to work with the UCD academic schedule and the ASUCD's natural turnover to identify a student to serve for a length of time on the Commission.<sup>3</sup>

Some practitioners with extensive experience in a variety of police oversight agencies observed that oversight commissions with limited authority, those that serve in more of an advisory capacity, tend to function for the purpose of providing a mechanism or venue for adding community voice to law enforcement. Administrative staff likely have much more involvement in selecting commission members, acting on behalf of the Mayor, City Council, or Board of Supervisors, and may look for volunteers who align politically with those leaders. The Police Advisory and Review Commission (PARC) in Novato might represent this model, given the active role played by the Assistant City Manager in directing PARC's work.

---

<sup>3</sup> Someone associated with the Berkeley Police Review Commission noted that students in that jurisdiction have made valuable contributions to the Commission's work.



In contrast, other jurisdictions that grant commissions more direct, quasi-judicial authority over law enforcement experience more success when there is independence from the Mayor, City Council, and administrative staff. These commissions and other oversight entities have decision-making space between the oversight body and political leaders and staff, including with regards to selection of commission members. For example, in Oakland, the Mayor and City Council appoint a Selection Panel that, in turn, helps manage information to be provided in applications to the Police Commission and determines the successful candidates. The Oakland Police Commission has broad authority over the Oakland Police Department and this model for selecting members contributes to both actual and perceived political independence in the work of the Police Commission, which is furthered by the availability of independent legal counsel and staff.

It also was observed that City Mayors, Councilmembers, or individuals serving on a Board of Supervisors can use their political power to negatively impact the work of a police commission by indefinitely delaying the naming of their own appointment or avoiding consideration and confirmation of nominations from others in a timely manner. An example of this approach having been used recently in one of the jurisdictions reviewed was shared by a source close to the situation.

#### D. Experience/Background Required or Preferred for Commission Members

Many of the commissions included in this study require that members be at least 18-years old and most have a city or county residency requirement. The commissions in National City and Novato allow for 1-2 nonresident appointments. The BART Police Citizen Review Board does not require U.S. citizenship for Board membership, while other agencies appeared to be silent on this point. At a time when law enforcement is struggling to maintain good police/community relations among undocumented populations, allowing for non-citizens to participate in police oversight could be a significant step towards helping to build trust.

Inglewood requires city residency or that the Commission member be an owner/operator of a business in Inglewood. Long Beach includes “business affiliation” in its list of diverse criteria to consider in making appointments. Allowing for a business owner/operator, whether resident or not, to participate in police oversight would undoubtedly bring a useful viewpoint to the work of a commission, perhaps facilitating discussion and expanding perspectives on how different stakeholders are impacted by police operations.



Many of the jurisdictions stated a goal to appoint commission members representative of the diverse communities served. However, there was virtually no direction on how to encourage interest in volunteering on a police oversight commission with these diverse groups and no guidance on how political leaders and administrative staff should coordinate to improve diversity in representation on police commissions.

Members appointed to the Berkeley Police Review Commission (PRC) are considered in isolation, without an opportunity to compare the strengths and weaknesses of a pool of applicants. Furthermore, members are appointed for a two-year term and cannot be removed for any reason. A November 2020 ballot initiative, Measure II, would change the process so that all PRC members are selected from a pool of applicants, with a goal of increasing the quality of candidates and positively impacting the process and PRC's work and stature in the community.

Several oversight agencies in this review took unique approaches to prioritizing selection criteria in appointing commission members. For example, in addition to looking for individuals who are fair, impartial, unbiased, and committed to community service, Anaheim seeks volunteers who are able to build working relationships and communicate effectively with diverse communities, highly valuable attributes in police oversight work.

Davis' Police Accountability Commission (PAC) has nine members, two of whom must demonstrate previous adverse interactions with the Davis Police Department (DPD). A resolution is being considered to make a number of changes to Davis' oversight system, including changing the requirement from adverse interactions with DPD to adverse interactions with peace officers/law enforcement in general. Requiring this sort of perspective on oversight bodies has been encouraged in a number of jurisdictions and could help build legitimacy in oversight work with the very communities that have the most interactions with law enforcement.

There is one non-voting member of the Community and Police Relations Commission in National City who represents the National City Police Officers' Association. Similarly, BART provides that the Police Management Association and the Police Officers' Association jointly name one member of the Police Citizen Review Board. While many commissions surveyed for this report expressly prohibit law enforcement members from serving, there is some anecdotal evidence that including sworn personnel on an oversight body can help educate other members about police work and facilitate constructive dialogue between community members and the police.

Other criteria that is considered desirable in commission members as noted in enabling legislation, commission by-laws, or elsewhere include:

- The ability to give generously of one's time (Claremont).
- Knowledge or experience in human resources, management, policy development, auditing, law, investigations, law enforcement, youth representation, civil rights and civil liberties, and experience in communities with the most police contact (Oakland).
- Diverse social, economic, and political interests (Richmond).
- Computer skills (Riverside).
- Solid research, speaking, and listening skills (San Diego).
- Skills as a retired judge or attorney with trial experience (San Francisco).

#### E. Experience/Background Prohibited for Commission Members

Many of the jurisdictions reviewed in this report prohibit consideration of current city/county employees and current or past employees (sworn or civilian) of a law enforcement agency, particularly the police department in the jurisdiction at issue (Anaheim, BART, Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, Oakland, Sacramento, and San Diego). Oakland also forbids consideration of individuals who are current or former representatives of a police officer labor union.

Other individuals commonly prohibited from serving on a commission include those with pending claims or litigation involvement with the jurisdiction and people with felony convictions.

#### F. Conclusion

Just as no two oversight entities are identical, the commission member selection criteria and process that works well in one jurisdiction might not be as effective in another. However, a few themes emerge from studying the oversight agencies included in this review.

First, consideration should be given to ways to increase the distance between Pasadena political leaders and the Community Police Oversight Commission (Commission or CPOC), to enhance the actual and perceived independence of CPOC members once the Commission is up and running. The October 19<sup>th</sup> Agenda Report notes that the City Council might consider using a panel of community-based organizations to recommend a slate of six potential CPOC appointees, from which



Council would then select three. This approach is similar to the Selection Panel method used in Oakland and might contribute to a sense of independence for those candidates and appointees involved.

Another approach discussed in a Public Safety Committee meeting on October 7, 2020, is to interview commission applicants in a public meeting setting. This method serves the goal of transparency and allows all interested stakeholders to assess the candidates, along with City Council and the Mayor. It avoids the problem Berkeley has of not being able to compare the strengths and weaknesses of applicants and would allow Councilmembers to consider individual attributes and the potential make-up of the entire Commission as candidates move through the process.

Finally, while applicants to an oversight commission and screeners might be primarily focused on experience with policing matters, criminal justice, investigations, and the like, it is vitally important to consider other background and skills that can significantly contribute to the quality and efficiency of the Commission's work. As noted above, candidates with skills in such areas as human resources, management, marketing, computers, research, communications, group dynamics, and consensus building are valuable in the creation of a Commission that will successfully meet its purpose in Pasadena's new police oversight system.

---

**Appendix 1**  
**CALIFORNIA JURISDICTIONS**  
**USING A COMMISSION MODEL OF POLICE OVERSIGHT**

	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
1.	<b>Anaheim</b>  <b>Police Review Board (PRB)</b>  <b>Est. 2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selected by lottery from each of Anaheim's 6 districts, plus 1 member selected at large</li> <li>City Manager has discretion and final authority on appointment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City residency requirement</li> <li>18 years old+</li> <li>Background check</li> <li>Fair, impartial, unbiased, committed to community service, able to build working relationships, and communicates effectively with diverse groups</li> <li>Prohibited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ City employees</li> <li>➤ Current law enforcement employees or any existing direct involvement with law enforcement</li> <li>➤ Any employment with Anaheim PD</li> <li>➤ Pending claims/litigation involvement with City</li> <li>➤ Felony conviction</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PRB preceded by Public Safety Board, which was created as 2-year pilot program in 2014 and enhanced in 2017</li> <li>PRB works with police practices advisor, OIR Group</li> <li>Application notes that criminal history, including misdemeanors, could effect eligibility</li> </ul>



	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
2.	<b>BART Police Citizen Review Board (BPCRB)</b>  <b>Est. 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each BART Director appoints 1 member</li> <li>The BART Police Managers Association and the Police Officers Association jointly appoint 1 member</li> <li>The Board appoints 1 public-at-large member</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must reside within Alameda, San Francisco, Contra Costa, or San Mateo County</li> <li>Not required to be U.S. citizens</li> <li>Background check</li> <li>Agree to adhere to the NACOLE Code of Ethics</li> <li>Must be fair-minded and objective with a demonstrated commitment to community service</li> <li>Prohibited:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Currently employed in a law enforcement capacity, either sworn or non-sworn</li> <li>➤ Current or former BPD employee</li> <li>➤ Relative of any current or former BPD employee</li> <li>➤ Person convicted of a felony</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPCRB reports directly to BART Board of Directors.</li> <li>2-year term</li> </ul>

	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
3.	<b>Berkeley</b>  <b>Police Review Commission (PRC)</b>  <b>Est. 1973</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 member appointed by each of 8 Councilmembers and 1 by Mayor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City residency requirement</li> <li>18 years old+</li> <li>No officer or City employee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2-year term and cannot be removed for any reason</li> <li>Council never sees pool of candidates as each Councilmember appoints</li> <li>Turnover has been an issue</li> <li>Some Berkeley commissions use unique selection factors, but not PRC</li> <li>November 2020 ballot initiative Measure II:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Establish Police Board to replace PRC (and create Director of Police Accountability)</li> <li>➤ 9 members nominated by Councilmembers and Mayor from pool of candidates; all must be approved by a majority vote of Council</li> <li>➤ Investigation related changes</li> <li>➤ Require 40 hours training within first 6 months re: Board duties; Constitutional rights and civil liberties; procedures, evidence and due process; Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights; PD operations, polices and practices; and duties of different ranks and assignments</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
4.	<b>Claremont</b>  <b>Police Commission</b>  <b>Est. 2000</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appointed by City Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claremont residency required (with a few exceptions)</li> <li>A strong interest in the community and the subject matter</li> <li>The ability to give generously of one's time</li> <li>Goal to ensure diversity in membership</li> <li>Elected officials cannot serve on the commission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Police Commission is one of 5 commissions whose purpose is to advise and assist City Council by gathering information, hearing arguments, weighing values, and making recommendations to Council</li> <li>On July 28, 2020, the Police Commission voted to increase from 7 to 9 members</li> </ul>

	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
5.	<p><b>Davis</b></p> <p><b>Police Accountability Commission (PAC)</b></p> <p><b>Est. 2018</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9, including 1 UCD student and 1 alternate</li> <li>• Alternate member shall not vote except if one or more of the regular members is absent, or a regular member is disqualified because of an expressed conflict of interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Council (except for UCD student)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 member is UCD student, appointed by ASUCD</li> <li>• Appointment shall reflect a diversity of the community and include members of various ethnicities, racial backgrounds, sexual orientations, economic status, etc.</li> <li>• A minimum of 2 members shall have demonstrated previous adverse interactions with the Davis Police Department</li> <li>• No member will have a law enforcement background</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2018, the Independent Auditor's position was revamped and the PAC was created</li> <li>• 4-year term</li> <li>• 2 City Council Members serve as liaisons to the PAC</li> <li>• Current City Council Resolution to change structure/purpose of PAC:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expanded definition of purpose</li> <li>➤ Change from 9 to 7 members and 1 alternate</li> <li>➤ To end of list of diversity representations, add "religions and those with prior adverse interactions with the Davis Police Department"</li> <li>➤ Change 2+ members with adverse interactions with Davis Police to "peace officers/law enforcement."</li> <li>➤ The PAC is split on whether to continue to prohibit anyone with a law enforcement background.</li> <li>➤ Clarify duty to implement community outreach plan and other duties</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
6.	<b>Inglewood</b>  <b>Citizen Police Oversight Commission (CPOC)</b>  Est. 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 appointed by Mayor</li> <li>2 from each City Council district</li> <li>1 by Police Chief</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City residency requirement or be owner/operators of a business in Inglewood</li> <li>Members shall broadly represent the racial, ethnic, religious, age, gender, sexual orientation, and disabled members of the general public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meetings have been canceled every month since January 2020. An unverified news source indicated that cancelations extend back to June 2018</li> </ul>
7.	<b>Long Beach</b>  <b>Citizen Police Complaint Commission (CPCC)</b>  Est. 1990	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council</li> <li>1 from each City Council district</li> <li>2 at-large appointed by the Mayor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City residency requirement</li> <li>The Commission shall be broadly representative of the population of the City in terms of race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, labor or business affiliation, and physical disability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPCC investigates police misconduct complaints and reviews service provided by Long Beach PD members</li> <li>The Commission has a Complaint Manager and 2 part-time investigators</li> <li>City Council has initiated a "Framework for Reconciliation" plan to consider a redesign of the Commission</li> </ul>

	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
8.	<b>Los Angeles</b>  <b>Board of Police Commission (BOPC)</b>  Est. 1920's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appointed by the Mayor and confirmed City Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City residency requirement.</li> <li>Civilians only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>25-50 hours per week</li> <li>5 year terms</li> </ul>
9.	<b>Los Angeles County</b>  <b>Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission</b>  Est. 1916	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 members are appointed by the LA County Board of Supervisors – 1 for each district</li> <li>4 of the 9 members are appointed by the Board upon recommendation of Board Executive Officer, in consultation with County Counsel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LA County residency requirement</li> <li>Prohibited:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Current employee of LA County</li> <li>➤ Current employee of any law enforcement agency, including police or prosecutorial agency, or employee of such agency within previous year</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Works with Office of Inspector General and Office of the Independent Monitor</li> <li>Purpose: Improve public transparency and accountability with respect to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, by providing robust opportunities for community engagement, ongoing analysis and oversight of the department's policies, practices, procedures, and advice to the Board of Supervisors, the Sheriff's Department and the public</li> </ul>



	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
10.	<b>National City</b>  <b>Community &amp; Police Relations Commission</b>  <b>Est. 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 members</li> <li>• 7 voting and 1 non-voting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 of the 7 voting members must be residents of National City</li> <li>• 1 non-voting member must be member of the National City Police Officers' Association.</li> <li>• Need not be an elector of the City</li> </ul>	
11.	<b>Novato</b>  <b>Police Advisory and Review Commission (PARC)</b>  <b>Est. 1992</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointed by City Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 4 must live in the City</li> <li>• 1 may live within the 3 zip code areas designated for Novato</li> <li>• Background check</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Assistant City Manager plans and directs the work of PARC</li> </ul>

	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
12.	<b>Oakland</b>  <b>Police Commission</b>  <b>Est. 1980</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7 members and 2 alternates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nominated by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council</li> <li>Mayor and City Council appoint Selection Panel, broadly representative of Oakland's diversity and who represent communities experiencing the most frequent contact with OPD</li> <li>Selection Panel works with City Administrator to determine, consistent with City Charter section 604, information candidates must submit in applications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City residency requirement</li> <li>18-years old+</li> <li>Representative of Oakland's diversity</li> <li>Knowledge or experience in human resources, management, policy development, auditing, law, investigations, law enforcement, youth representation, civil rights and civil liberties</li> <li>Representation from communities with the most frequent contact with OPD</li> <li>Prohibited:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Current police officer or former OPD officer</li> <li>➤ Current City employee</li> <li>➤ Current or former representative of police officer labor union</li> <li>➤ Attorney with pending claim/lawsuit against OPD or one resolved in past year</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-year term</li> <li>Significant time commitment</li> <li>November 2020 ballot initiative S1:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Increase authority of Commission and CPRA</li> <li>➤ Commission operate independent of City Administrator</li> <li>➤ Create Office of Inspector General</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
13.	<b>Richmond</b>  <b>Community Police Review Commission (CPRC)</b>  Est. 1984	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appointed by Mayor after conferring with City Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mayor shall endeavor to appoint individuals representing diverse social, economic, and political interests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-year appointment.</li> <li>Requires 8-hour Police Department orientation and 20-hour ride along</li> <li>Some limited coordination with Office of Professional Accountability (OPA)</li> </ul>
14.	<b>Riverside</b>  <b>Community Police Review Commission (CPRC)</b>  Est. 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appointed by the Mayor and City Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must be a qualified elector of City.</li> <li>Application asks about computer skills, in addition to other general questions used for other commissions.</li> <li>Application also asks about felony or misdemeanor convictions, which may be disqualifying.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18-20 hours per month.</li> <li>4-year term</li> <li>Can be removed by 5 votes of the Mayor and City Council for incompetence, malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance, or neglect of duty; absence for 3 consecutive meetings without permission; breach of confidentiality; failure to maintain elector status.</li> </ul>
15.	<b>Sacramento</b>  <b>Sacramento Community Police Review Commission (SCPRC)</b>  Est. 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 member appointed by each Councilmember and 3 recommended by the Mayor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City residency requirement</li> <li>Prohibited:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Past or present peace officer.</li> <li>➤ Current City employee</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCPRC provides a venue for community participation in reviewing police department policies and procedures.</li> <li>The Office of Public Safety Accountability monitors complaint investigations, along with other duties</li> </ul>

	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
16.	<b>San Diego</b>  <b>Community Review Board on Police Practices (CRB)</b>  <b>Est. 1988</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointed by Mayor and confirmed by City Council</li> <li>• Applicants screened by CRB Recruitment and Training Committee who make recommendations to the Mayor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City residency requirement</li> <li>• 18-years old+</li> <li>• Representative cross section of San Diego community</li> <li>• Solid research, speaking, and listening skills</li> <li>• Background check</li> <li>• Prohibited:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ No current or past SDPD officers</li> <li>➤ No current San Diego employees</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20+ hours/month</li> <li>• 2 year terms; staggered so no more than 12 expire in a given year</li> <li>• Training required before assume duties</li> </ul>



	Oversight Agency	Number of Members	Selecting Authority	Criteria Considered in Selection	Comments
17.	<b>San Francisco</b>  <b>Police Commission</b>  <b>Est. 1878</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7 members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 appointed by Mayor and confirmed by Board of Supervisors</li> <li>3 appointed by the Board of Supervisors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualified elector of City and County</li> <li>At least one of Mayor's 4 appointments must be a retired judge or attorney with trial experience</li> <li>Mayor's nominations subject of a public hearing and vote within 60 days</li> <li>The District Attorney, Sheriff and Public Defender may recommend persons</li> <li>Composition must be broadly representative of the communities of interest, neighborhoods, and the diversity in ethnicity, race, age, and sexual orientation, and types of disabilities of the City and County and have representation of both sexes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct supervision of the Office of Police Accountability</li> <li>Sets policy for the Police Department; conducts disciplinary hearings and imposes discipline as warranted; and hears police officers' appeals from discipline imposed by the Chief of Police</li> <li>November 2020 ballot initiative Proposition D:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Create two oversight bodies for the San Francisco Sheriff's Department, including a 7-member board with 4 appointed by Board of Supervisors and 3 by Mayor</li> <li>➤ Board would have authority to make policy recommendations on SFSD operations, complaints, and in-custody deaths</li> </ul> </li> </ul>