

**Police Review Board Meeting**  
**Wednesday, August 29, 2018**  
**3:00-4:00pm**

**Meeting Notes**

**Chair, Jonathan Simon:** Since we don't have the public here; anytime they come I will open it up to them." Faculty representative Nikki Jones suggested we form an agenda and Chair Simon said he would be happy to schedule another meeting later this semester if people find it productive. We may get even an appeal that may require that. So the floor is open....

**Chair Simon:** I'll be taking notes for this purpose.

**Sheresa Fox:** I'm recording.

**Faculty Representative NJ:** I was on the committee last year and I don't think we met last year. Were you here last year? (Question was directed to Sheresa Fox) Response from SF: I started/contracting with the VCA which has now been a year but became career as of February 1<sup>st</sup> of this year. So, I know we were still trying to gather the committee together and we didn't have a chair yet and Jonathan officially accepted so finally we were able to form. Then Jonathan & Capt. Yao -(UCPD Dept. Rep) and myself sat and had our first meeting to get to know each other – an introduction meeting – that was it. This is now the official.

**Faculty Representative NJ continued:** Rachel-(Roberson) (Graduate Assembly Rep) and I are also on this system-wide task force that's reviewing the use of force and complaint process for the UCPD and Chief Bennett is on that task force as well. And, one of the questions we are dealing with is thinking about what the role of this board is. If it is an advisory capacity? I asked this question not last year but the year before and the response then was if it is an advisory capacity then I think regular meetings are necessary. If we are doing only the more limited charge of reviewing appeals, then we don't meet. But as I understand it as the last conversation I had on this task force that (I'm follow up with Chief Bennett on this when I report back. Chief Bennett believes this to be an advisory board. If that's the case we are not meeting that charges at all. That would something that I would like to have on the agenda for the next meeting. Cause, it's really: To be totally honest with about it ... It's really disappointing for me to know that the conversation about policing has been like for our students on campus all year and not to have that or have this and there's no one here. And, the last time we had this, the last year and the year before there was nobody there. So it brings into question; what is the purpose of this committee?

**Response from CJS:** I can't speak to the board that you served on since I've come on basically this is the first opportunity we've had to meet. My intention is definitely evident. The words that Chuck Wesselberg used in the last report was in addition to the merit of appeals the other key function or standing of responsibility was to quote "monitor and review departmental policies and procedures". To me that is little more than just advisory. Like, we should be taking proactive look at what needs to be. My intention would be to that we will have... First off we can use this meeting to identify some areas of concern that should be early ones to consider prioritizing for that purpose. That is my intention as chair to do that.

**CJS:** The floor is open - we can go back to the car-stop thing. Clearly one of the things that I would love to post as an item for us to meet on is perhaps is how to interpret these race patterns if we can move faster on getting data on regular stops which may not be practical given the strains on the force as you were describing (speaking to Cpt. Yao) it would take even labor to do that. But, that to me is a priority for sure.

**CJS to DH Law Rep:** Do you want to talk about the car stop?

**Response from DH:** Yes, now I have two things to talk about... I'll finish on this one: Policy & Advisory role. Several years ago now, we were asked by the VC to look into complaint procedures. And we, Chuck Wesselberg and I kinda started that process. And, we got copies of the current orders and we got copies of the revisions that were in process. And, think that was perhaps 2 ½ years ago? Something like that... And, I understand from my last communication with Chief Bennett which was about 2 months ago. The current Internal Affairs order for the department was written in 1995? And there's been discussions about revisions but nothing has changed over that time.

**Capt. Yao – UCPD:** For the external complaint/Internal Affairs procedures is a separate policy.

**DH continued:** So, we started looking at it and then Chuck dropped off and things just never happened. The last word I got from Chief Bennett; System wide all the chiefs were looking at a state wide police department external complaint policy. And, I given her some feedback with some of my own impressions with suggestions of what should be in and should not be in the policy. What's happening with that - I have no idea. But that clearly was a role that we were getting ready to be involved in at that time and nothing ever came of it.

**CJS to DH Law Rep:** That was a request from the Chancellor's office?

**Response from DH:** Yes. I think that was one or perhaps least two.

**CJS:** I understand the Chancellors have asked this board to investigate, I guess some incidents that dates back some years now... Was at Wheeler Hall a demonstration that led to some injuries and some arrests I think at the time, the demonstrator's response to that. The Chancellor asked the then board to investigate that. And we could be asked. I guess we could refuse but generally I think probably we should say yes if the Chancellor is that concerned about something. My views are that we could be self-starting where we don't wait, where we review policies, where can monitor activity, to identify potential problems.

**Faculty Representative NJ:** I would definitely encourage us to be as proactive as possible given that because the dormant nature of this body other groups have been mobilizing and taking up charge without the administrations explicit request. So, for instance myself and Sebastian (Vrankovecki) - ASUC Rep actually are both student representatives of the Academic Senates; Student Demonstration in Action Committee. We took up some of those charges of investigating after the Free Speech demonstrations and some of the fallout of negative interactions with UCPD and other PD's that came on site. We have put together a report but as of right now, I don't know if it's been shared beyond the Academic Senate. I know the ASUC has also put together a student coalition on reviewing university by policing. I'm not sure as of right now what the status of that body is going into a new academic year. We run the risk of losing some of our teeth so to speak if we don't start doing something.

**Response from CJS to NJ:** Well, it remains to be seen what teeth mean in this context since we do serve as a monitoring and advisory and we don't have direct powers to make reports in that regard. But, I agree with you. But, I would also say that I'm pleased with the Academic Senate and the ASUC on being engaged on that. I wouldn't want to preempt them on that. This committee shouldn't necessarily preempt them in the sense of telling them not to! "Stay out of our business or something" that would not be my inclination.

**Response from NJ to CJS:** I cannot speak for those groups but as a member of one of them... We took action in part because we were not receiving feedback from the PRB because it wasn't in existence.

**Response from CJS to NJ:** I think, I suppose: Alex correct me if I'm stating this wrong. I know we stand as an appellate body but we can also receive complaints directly? (Capt. Alex Yao) – That is correct. Maybe that should be more visible whatever. To me that would include... It doesn't have to include, I was injured. It could be I was at this demonstration and I was really unhappy with what I saw.

**Faculty Representative NJ:** If we're meeting more regularly than we can have on going conversations. The challenge of the first year of all the committees is that they weren't meeting very regularly. They were meeting every semester.

**CJS:** Since we're on the topic and all of you have a stake in this; how often would you like to meet? Or how much would be too much? I mean semesters are like functionally speaking 4-5 months? So do you want to meet every month?

**Response from NJ to CJS:** Maybe monthly. I was on a call with the chief there and they have a monthly meeting and they have many more people but they have a monthly meeting.

**DH Law Rep:** Other boards that I have been involved with like the city's Police Review Commission they meet monthly. I was involved for 5 years on the BART Police's Review Board and they meet monthly.

**CJS:** That's an interesting precedent.

**DH Law Rep:** That's fairly standard if there's enough things to be done. And part of the issue is the people on the board. How much work do you want to do? If you want to take on looking at policies and procedures, you could meet every 2 weeks and keep yourselves very busy for years probably if that's what you chose to do.

**Comm Rep John Cummings:** What would be good as just as an agenda item is to invite the Vice Chancellor, Marc Fisher. Just to get his views on what this is because he appoints and there's been all these changes to the administration; I'm not sure he knows a whole lot about what we're supposed to be doing. Cause it will force him to pay attention to it.

**CJS:** Based upon that model: He or whoever occupies that position would be an obvious starting point. We might also consider inviting other groups and bodies, including ones that have done some work on the policing issue – like the committee you were referencing. (CJS speaking NJ) We could have a meeting together with your committee and kind of learn from you guys what your concerns are. One way to do it is find a time for a monthly meeting and then sort of have a notion if we don't develop an agenda within a week of it, it gets cancelled or something of that nature. So, if we have an item that we want to talk about Alex and I can work together and to try and provide some information for that if it's available

it may not. It may be talking about a policy issue without a lot of data. Unfortunately the reality often in this business criminal justice system generally.

**Staff Rep. Kathleen Valero:** I'm just going to say as a counter measure... I'm serving the role of chair for a staffing group which is why they said "Oh, when your chair you're the person that does this." I'm like ok. And here I am. And, I suppose if there were a hot topic or something like there was last fall and we were meeting then we would probably be very busy doing stuff with and about that or having active conversations. But, I didn't even know that this was supposed to necessarily be a public meeting. I'm feeling kind of clueless.

**Response from CJS to KV:** This is an unusual meeting in the sense that once a year we're chartered I guess to have a public meeting. (KV – to have a meeting - ok.) It's usually bundled with a report but this year doesn't exist because we didn't have any actions to report on.

**Response from KV:** Well, isn't that good news? In self respects, that's very good news.

**Response from CJS:** I'm also sensitive on how over-worked our staff is and what-not.

**Staff Rep. Kathleen Valero cont.:** Sure. I was going to counter with... If we don't have the clarity of what we would be doing instead of considering monthly at the opening offer; Quarterly might be sufficient or until or such time were we know there's something of substance to discuss? Which doesn't mean that I would be opposed to other groups who are active and they would like second opinions and we could echo or amplify those voices then that would feel like a useful use of my time on a more consistent basis. But, if showing up once a year for no news is good news, I could live with that too.

**Response from CJS:** I think it's a balance as you said between... Everyone is juggling so many things and not wanting to have people come here and not have something really worth their time and a sense that maybe so much time has passed since we have met that there are some issues that we would want to look at in the first period that we're together and then kind of see what comes. We don't know what's in the future and if other things happen we may be asked to take on other things that would fill up our time.

**Comm Rep John Cummings:** Just a little history... When the committee was asked to do these elevations on the Weaver Hall incident, they spent a lot of time on it. (CJS -That was a big deal as I recall.) It was a big deal and they submitted the report (CJS – that was a damn good report actually, I read it. They had a former federal magistrate that wrote it.) Yeah, it was but the administration never responded to them. And the feeling from some of the committee members at that time was... Don't ever do this again. We spent so much time on it and they didn't even bother to acknowledge it. That was the concern that led to one of the members saying "We should follow whatever the bi-laws and regulations called for setting up this review board and we shouldn't go beyond that." So from my point of view it would be very helpful if the Vice Chancellor and the Police Chief said this is what the expectations are for this board. Because, I would agree with you (CJS) I don't think we know what they are. So we meet sporadically and we'll have the public meeting and nobody comes and so were kind of flushed. (KV – Checking a box) Yeah.

**Response from CJS:** Taking your point about the unproductivity of that run report and I recall the Chair at the time –I'm trying to remember his name: He put a lot of expertise as well into reading it. (JC – I think Jesse Chopra was his name.) Jesse Chopra was the chair at the time. He and the magistrate did a

lot of writing on it. That was frustrating as it was an enormous output of effort and it was requested by the administration then ignored it right? That's a kick in the teeth if there ever was one. I'm imagining in the terms of possible meeting at least at the beginning a little bit more than just addressing appeals. Starting with that model of being an advisory we have to meet with the chief to see if there are issues. I think this department has a strong tradition of wanting to be proactive on issues, if we could advise, if we can identify something, that ought to be worked on or ought to be looked at; whether its arrests or stops. That doesn't necessarily require a huge amount of paperwork. Hopefully, the Chair could take it on themselves to summarize our discussions. We could meet with the chief if there is a topic that's worthy of her time as well.

**NJ:** Maybe we take a hybrid approach would be if people are interested in taking a look at the stop data then we're there for the monthly meetings. That's what we'd want to do a semester but it's not required if you don't want to be on that sub-committee for everyone.

**Response from CJS:** That's a good point cause you know; when we do review of, if and when we are asked to do an appeal as effectively, it won't necessarily be the whole committee: It would be myself and 1 or 2 other members, I believe? There's no reason we couldn't adopt that model as Nikki is pointing out which could be very good. Alex, you can speak to this... If we wanted to learn more about stops is there data we can start working with?

**Response from DH to CJS:** The data is pretty raw stuff

**Response from CJS to DH:** I'm not talking about putting this stuff online. It would be just for our purposes.

**Response from AY to CJS:** I think there's a lot of data there that's where we get started. I think we post it yearly until this year – the year's not finished so we're mostly monthly right now. I think the latest one right now would be April stats or May stats I can't remember. (CJS-That's just the audit.) – Yes, that just for audit. So, there's a lot of data there. I think that's where we get started and once we start then the board member can decide what kind of things they need information on from the police department to help interpret or analyze the data.

**Response from NJ:** I'm conflicted. I think we're a little more interested in pedestrian stops as those are the ones most likely involve the students and those are the more common encounter – that I would imagine that occur.

**Response from AY:** Yeah, So, I'm not quite sure whether or not we have that readily available it doesn't mean the data is not there. Just like anything we need to be able to extract it and find a good way to extract and make sure you get good data. That's something we can look into from the PD side to see how we can do that.

**Response from CJS:** We can at least find out what the mechanics are. I could probably hire a student to help with the analysis. I don't want to pile a lot of stuff on your 41 officers.

**DH:** I just want to caution people about trying to understand some of this data as it gets very, very complicated. I looked at the data several years ago on traffic stops, citations and that kind of stuff and the only thing I could conclude was the department was discriminating against white males because it was based on the population within the city or the population within the campus. There's a

disproportion number of white males that were receiving citations. That was data that I looked at before compared to anybody else. Now, I didn't believe that was actually the case but that was the rudimentary analysis of the numbers would indicate. And so, that because white males are inclined to drive crazy and commit violations? Is it because in our population or in our world if you see 2 people: male and a female driving down a street in a car, probably 90% of the time it's the man is driving opposed to the woman. So, do men drive more than women? So there's a whole bunch of stuff trying to figure out what these numbers mean.

**DH cont.:** I went through a similar exercise when I was on the BART Board. BART has an app - people might be familiar with it... that allow you to use their smartphone to report instances the are occurring upon the trains. So you don't have to get on the phone and say "Hey there's some crazy person on the train doing xy&z." Then the crazy person see's you're the one that called the Police and promotes an encounter so you can actually use your phone and text them such and such is happening. A community group; this is several years ago now, was looking at some of those numbers and they're saying there was something wrong here because this is fostering a racial disparity in the reporting of disturbances on the train. Because about 60% of the disturbances: The people who were reported for creating the disturbances were African Americans. So some people were saying obviously there's something racist going on here because this app is somehow generating this disproportionate response. But, if you look down/dig a little deeper into it, which is what I did... most/almost all of those complaints were behavior issues and could be sorta tagged to typically homeless people creating some type of issue on the train and some people reporting that via the app. That was an interesting piece of information. So, I went a looked at the demographics for the homeless population in Alameda County and San Francisco County and guess what? The demographics are 55% of the homeless people in those 2 counties are African Americans. So, if people are reporting things that are disturbances by homeless people or just homeless in en Masse, it would be sort of expected that you're going to have more African Americans reported than some other racial group because they're the bulk of that population. Now, that's just the reality of our society. Criminologists and Sociologists can do a lot of analysis as to why the homeless population in these counties are predominately African American but if you're looking at disturbances caused by the homeless population, you're going to see more African Americans being involved in the disturbance.

**Response from KV:** The stats you just quoted not too long ago was that 55% (DH-it was 60%) Ok, 60%. Wouldn't you be looking not so much the clarity of...? "Well, of course that would be more." You're looking more for a relational, is it disproportionate? You would be looking for the magnitudes in the relationship not; "Well of course." That margin is not so much higher than say 50/50. If it was 50/50 and then, but you know 80% of the reports were people of color then you might say "there's something else going on here but besides well, obviously 80% and 80% that's a one, one correlation. Correlation and causation are different things.

**Response from DH:** I don't disagree but my point is its very, very complicated trying to understand what the numbers actually mean.

**Response from NJ:** We were trained to deal with the complexities of criminal justice data though I assure you.

**Response from KV:** Absolutely, absolutely.

**NJ:** Sometimes the presumption can be that we're looking for wrong doing but really just the exploratory nature that we as the board should be informed. If people comes to us we should be able to have that explanation that we capable of providing. (**VA** – Right. Sights & stats.) We should just tell them.

**Response from CJS to DH:** It is valuable to being able to converse with people like yourself that will know some of what's going on and maybe able to help to identify what's probably generating that particular pattern.

**Response from NJ:** That's a conversation down the line. The first conversation should be what do things look like?

**DH:** It's funny, cause Chuck Wesselberg was looking for some graduate students who have statistical expertise to actually start examining that and he wasn't able to find anybody to start that.

**Response from NJ:** We're a world class university! Are you kidding me, he couldn't find anybody?!

**Response from DH to NJ:** He (Chuck Wesselberg) wasn't able to find anybody who was *willing* to do it. I don't think the issue was finding someone who was capable of doing it – There were plenty of people who were capable. Question was finding people who are interested in doing it. All I'm saying is – for Lay people or for people who are not lay people who've got expertise in criminal justice but may not have expertise to understand statistical analysis. You need somebody who can look very, very deep into those numbers before you come to any conclusions.

**Response from CJS:** Well, there's always the debate of what numbers are you comparing to each other? Is it the general population, the arrest population or is it a figure you don't really know? How much crime or activity? (**NJ** –Space matters as well.) So all of those end up in huge interpretive issues. To me, what it comes back to though, we've done all this research in a different mode which is cognitive bias research – I don't know if you guys put your officers through that training? But I make my prim pro students take these cognitive bias tests. Think Northwestern has one, Harvard has one. I always fail too in the sense that like 80% of the people I'm more likely to see a gun in the hands of a person of color when they put it up on the screen. What I think it really tests is how fast you can move or differentiate ordinary objects, weapons. So we know that effect is there. We're working that, become part of the training I imagine, to try to address it so we want to follow those patterns.

**AY:** Once you reverse the data, the one thing I can think of: For example: If you're looking at the data of the demographics of people that we stopped, detained or what have you; That data doesn't tell you how it came to the Police Officer's attention right? Because it might be that the Police Department actually got called- somebody called. First the police proactively contacted them so there's also that one issue in there that: If you're trying to determine or not if there was disparity in enforcement while looking who at called. Someone calling the police officer proactively called the person vs we got a call where we actually have to respond.

**CJS:** We've had all these examples from around the country of black students studying in a libraries and someone calls 911for that. It's not the police necessarily who put the flame on that but another student but another excessive citizen sighting.

**AY:** Digging under the data to the origin of the call, it is possible to look through the police reports and categorize them and all that stuff, it just takes a little time.

**Grad Assmb.Rep. Rachel Roberson:** I think there's a possibility as we dive deeper into the data and unpacks some nuances and 51/51 reports as well. As a former resident director, I know that our UCPD officers are deemed as the primary emergency response for 51/50's and as we think about some of the possibilities of this board's base, we might be able to engage some real critical limitations about wellness and providing the best support as possible for our students.

**Question from KV:** 51/50 stands for?

**Response from CJS:** Mental health emergency.

**Response from DH:** It's the welfare institutions code to give police officers the ability to commit someone for psychiatric evaluation. Involuntary evaluation.

**Response from RR & PRB Staff Asst. Sheresa Fox:** It's involuntary.

**NJ:** I think part of it, what you're saying Rachel: If there's evidence of burden response is on police right now maybe there's other resources the university should invest in the right to also respond to student wellness before it gets to that point.

**CJS:** That's a big issue generally I think for the campus.

**KV:** It's like the emergency room is the only healthcare someone will get.

**RR:** Again, as we look at changing the resources you know 51 officers. 1 or 2 are responding to a potential 51/50 and where they're not able to respond elsewhere. The potential closing of Alta Bates is also going to be impacting this. Just how far officers are going to be transporting people? So, I think we have some opportunity to provide some necessary reporting. – (KV-be proactive.)

**DH:** Within the city they have a mobile crisis clinic – Some of the first responders are actually licensed clinicians who will go with the police to check the vitals.

**AY:** But their hours aren't 24/7.

**DH:** Their hours are from 10 in the morning to 11 at night... I think. Maybe later.

**RR:** I've unfortunately had to answer some 3am phone calls for some 51/50's as well.

**CJS:** That's and great issue. It's one I'm personally quite invested in having written an article on the limits of the LPS Law in CA. Too many people end up in prison instead of being treated at some point along the way. Let me make a suggestion in terms of the meeting concepts: Suggested was once a month, once a quarter, it's already September I hate to tell you that. It's going to be September tomorrow or the next day. It's going to take us awhile to figure out what we can get in the way of data or what-not but my senses is maybe I should see about organizing a meeting for October for least those who want to come to have pulmonary discussion about stop data, what we would like to get, what's available, what are some of the questions we want to ask of it? Maybe that can include how many of those are calls for service, do we have figure for what percent are the calls for service are 51/50 related? (Mental health emergencies.) And I can work with Sheresa to see if we can schedule something for October. That's already going to take us halfway through the semester. The problem with Berkeley is

the semesters they are long until they're too short – so you find there's going to be exams, then you get Thanksgiving and all those things in November. So if we end up meeting in October that could be once in a semester meeting or quarterly if we include summer as well. But if we find there's an agenda that we really want to pursue; that's when a sub-committee can meet more regularly. Does that sound agreeable? (Question directed to entire group.)

**RR:** I would also offer potentially another public meeting now this semester is officially underway. It's a lot easier – I can speak as a Student rep. My body (Student) has yet to meet to actually have a kick-off meeting. Our first meeting is in 2 weeks so it really limited my ability to spread the word with the timing. So, if folks are open to say, another meeting in December? So I can actually invite some of my constituents to engage in some of these conversations.

**Response from CJS to RR:** I'm open to that. Our mandate is once a year but this isn't the one for this year it would presumably be early in the spring. I think in the past it's typically held in the spring term but it got pushed around mostly because of schedules. But I'm not against having it early as December. It's not clear that we have a report or anything to present. It might depend what your sense is and you can be our ears in terms of the students giving you their concerns that people would like to bring to a public meeting too. I suspect in these public meeting when there's a lot of strife this would be packed and people would want to spend 2 hours talking to us.

**DH:** You still would get a handful of people. The most I've ever at one of these meetings is maybe, 8 people. Another thing, I'm not sure what kind of notice was made for this meeting. In previous occasions – for people who are new at this - They actually placed an ad in the Daily Cal.

**Response from SF to DH:** It did run twice. It ran once on the 9<sup>th</sup> and again on the 16<sup>th</sup> (August)

**Question to SF from CJS:** Did we offer free pizza?

**Response to CJS from SF:** No.

**Question from RH:** So all our meetings are public then?

**Response from CJS:** No, I don't think so.

**Response from DH:** The rules say we have to have one (1) public meeting a year but there's no reason we can't have more.

**KV:** That's the bare minimum. I suppose if the quarterly were public and we decide there's enough to talk about and we're choosing to be proactive or whatever, I'm not opposed to doing more – I just need to know what it is.

**CJS:** First of all, I don't know enough about CA transparency law but it's possible although I doubt it, all our meetings by definition have to be open to the public. What is your understanding of that Alex (Yao) do you have a legal opinion on it?

**Response to CJS from AY:** It depends on what's being discussed. The topic has something to do with it. There are certain things that only are privy to the board that are not necessarily public info.

**CJS:** I assume actually when sub-committees are reviewing a case that would not be a public meeting.

**Response from DH to CJS:** No. That would be confidential information.

**CJS:** It's possible if we wanted to for instance after meeting in October say about some of these issues if we thought it would be valuable to have a public meeting about that. I take your point – we're not limited to one a year.

**RH to SF:** You said there was an announcement on the 9<sup>th</sup> and the 16<sup>th</sup> (August) but basically saying this group was going to meet.

**SF to RH:** It's a public meeting and it's open.

**RH to SF:** This meeting? (SF-yes.) **RH cont:** Because you said this wasn't a public meeting.

**CJS & SF to RH:** No, no, it is a public meeting.

**CJS:** I just said if we meet in October I won't set that as a public meeting.

**SF to RH:** That one wouldn't be a public meeting.

**AY:** Brings up the before mentioned system wide task force that the students and Nikki Jones sits on with Chief Bennett and the advisory board that Chief Bennett also serves on. Stating if the PRB's role turns into more of an advisory role – then we may have more public meetings depend on how thing evolve.

**NJ:** We meet again on Sept 12<sup>th</sup> and one more meeting in Nov where Napolitano will be there to hear some preliminary findings. We have a meeting in Dec then the report itself rolling out at the end of the calendar year I believe.

**CJS:** That could be an urgent meeting depending on what that meeting is – in terms of this board's role. Maybe combined with the Vice Chancellor participating? Because we serve at the Vice Chancellor's request/discretion.

**NJ:** I can report back on that and the Sept 12<sup>th</sup> meeting too.

**CSJ Responds:** That would be perfect. I will work to organize an October meeting maybe we will invite the Vice Chancellor to the meeting and maybe the Chief as well if she's willing. Then maybe you guys can report back on the Sept meetings and give us a sense of where it's going.

**CSJ:** Are there any points or things we want to raise? We're kind of at the end of our schedule time.

**DH:** This will be my last meeting. (**SF to DH:** - So you're opting out?) - I am opting out.

**Notes on DH:** Doug served on the BART View Board for 5 years and served in the city for 34 years. He is currently serving as chair of the Dept of Corrections & Rehabilitation Deadly Force Review Board. Douglas has served on the PRB Board for 4 Years. Doug is a graduate of UC Berkeley is a retired Police Chief and a is a grandfather to 5 grandchildren.

**Action Item:** Organizing a meeting in October with invitation to Vice Chancellor Marc Fischer and Police Chief Margo Bennett.

## Police Review Board Roster

Jonathan Simon – Present  
PRB Chair

Capt. Alex Yao – Present  
UCPD

Douglas Hambleton – Present  
Law Enforcement R/epresentative  
(Has opted out as of 8/29/2018)

Nikki Jones – Present  
Faculty Representative

Rachel Roberson – Present  
Graduate Assembly Representative

John Cummins – Present  
Community Representative

Amanda Tyler  
Faculty Representative - N/A

Kathleen Valerio – Present  
Staff Representative

Sebastian Vrankovecki -NA  
ASUC Representative

Sheresa Fox - Present  
PRB Staff Assistant