June 14, 2016

STAFF REPORT ON A RESOLUTION SUBMITTING ON THE COUNCIL’S OWN MOTION A PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT TO BE VOTED UPON AT THE MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 8, 2016 THAT WOULD (1) ESTABLISH THE OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT POLICE OVERSIGHT AND MONITORING (“OFFICE”); (2) ESTABLISH A POLICE COMMISSION (“COMMISSION”); (3) CREATE THE POSITION OF INDEPENDENT POLICE MONITOR TO AUDIT ALLEGATIONS OF POLICE MISCONDUCT, TO TAKE DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND TO CREATE HIRING, TRAINING AND EDUCATION POLICIES, AND TO SET MINIMUM STAFFING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE OFFICE AND COMMISSION; (4) SET STANDARDS AND/OR METRICS FOR TRANSPARENCY AND POLICE COMMUNITY RELATIONS; AND (5) REPEAL ORDINANCE NO. 12454 C.M.S., WHICH ESTABLISHES AND PRESCRIBES THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CITIZEN’S POLICE REVIEW BOARD (“CPRB”) AND DIRECTING THE CITY CLERK TO FIX THE DATE FOR SUBMISSION OF ARGUMENTS AND TO PROVIDE NOTICE AND PUBLICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW AND AUTHORIZING CERTAIN OTHER ELECTION ACTIVITIES.

Dear Fellow City Councilmembers,

Since 2003, the Oakland Police Department has been under court supervision under the terms of a settlement agreement (the “Negotiated Settlement Agreement”) in the matter of Delphine Allen, et al. v. City of Oakland. It is the desire of the City of Oakland – its elected leadership, and the City Administrator and Chief of Police -- to not just sustain the reforms of the Negotiated Settlement Agreement after Court supervision ends, but to continue to improve on mechanisms for police discipline and oversight, to ensure that the Oakland Police Department is a national leader in unbiased policing, procedural justice and positive police-community relations.

While under the terms of the Negotiated Settlement Agreement, Oakland has undertaken major changes in how the Police Department reports and investigates use of force, adopted a state-of-the-art system to identify early warning signs of officers in need of intervention and additional training, enhanced and improved systems for the investigation of complaints related to officer conduct, and has established systems to strictly monitor officer performance and promptly and appropriately discipline officers who violate rules and policies or who fail to report rule-breaking by others.
As the City of Oakland edges closer and closer to compliance with the Negotiated Settlement Agreement, it is time that we develop a comprehensive and holistic strategy to maintain critical reforms in police oversight and to continue to build upon them. We believe that in order to effectuate true and sustained change in the Oakland Police Department ("Department"), we must look at all of the root causes and their component parts.

Sustained, transformative behavioral change in the Department is not easy. It requires a substantial commitment of political will and of public funds. It requires that we take a hard look at what causes police misconduct and what it takes to create authentic community trust.

Our strategy requires simultaneous investments of City resources into four critical pillars:

1. **Accountability** – Ensure the City takes all reasonably practicable steps to impose and uphold effective, consistent and fair disciplinary actions.

2. **Transparency** – Create structure requiring police accountability and oversight bodies to interact and communicate consistently and with greater transparency requiring timely notifications to the public.

3. **Police Hiring, Training and Education** – Create a personnel management structure to sustain cultural and behavioral change in the Department focusing on hiring practices, training requirements and continuing education.

4. **Community Engagement** – Police officers respect and are accountable to the community they protect; therefore we must prioritize community involvement in all aspects of police strategy, with an emphasis on healing and restorative justice.

The Federally-appointed Monitor and the Court-Appointed Investigator have made clear that this responsibility lies with the Chief of Police. However, it must be acknowledged that in the Court-Appointed Investigator’s second report, dated March 21, 2016, the City Council was urged to do more to proactively address issues of sustained police oversight.

**Our Process**
To provide some background on this proposal, we had been working on the development of a proactive solution addressing our long-term concerns on police oversight before the Investigator’s March report. Our proposal, indicative of the seriousness with which we view the issue of police oversight, is comprehensive. It has been thoughtfully developed with a wide range of stakeholders and is absolutely an indication of the Council’s proactive approach to uncovering police misconduct or unsound policing practices when they exist, curing them and sustainably fixing any root causes of the behavior. Going beyond this approach of looking at problem behaviors however, this proposal attempts to create a holistic structure and intention around hiring, training, leadership development, community engagement and mediation for trust-building in the community to encourage, support and sustain police officers as guardians in the community.

Seeking to better understand how to address all of these issues, we have met with key stakeholders and incorporated the feedback we’ve received from community advocates, faith leaders, the City Administrator’s office, the City Attorney’s office, Department leadership, police oversight experts, leadership from local educational institutions, and others into the
proposal you see today. Throughout this process, our goal has remained to create a structure in which sustained cultural and behavioral change in the Department is not only likely but inevitable.

The following is a description of our proposal for four strategy areas: Accountability, Transparency, Police Education, Hiring and Training, and Community Outreach. Investment into each of these pillars is critical to the success of this Charter Amendment.

1. ACCOUNTABILITY – Ensure the City takes all reasonably practicable steps to impose and uphold effective, consistent and fair disciplinary actions.

To create a system in which police accountability is consistently evaluated each and every day by a professional, trained, and independent expert, we will take four legislative steps, taken in the following order:

(1) Establish Office of Independent Police Oversight and Monitoring (“Office”)

Creating an independent body whose sole task is to create positive behavioral change within the Department will provide us with a central nervous system for our efforts. This role has been, for the last 13 years, filled by the Negotiated Settlement Agreement and the Federally-appointed Monitor. Although this role may seem duplicative in the near-term, in order to demonstrate the City’s capacity to manage this critical responsibility in the long-term, we must establish this Office as soon as possible and offer it the support that it needs to succeed.

(2) Hire Independent Police Monitor (“Monitor”)

The Office will be led by the Monitor, who will be tasked with making disciplinary decisions, conducting audits of investigations on allegations of police misconduct, monitoring disciplinary processes, hiring, training and education norms, making policy recommendations to City leadership and coordinating all four elements of the City’s police oversight strategy.

To select a Monitor, the City Council Rules Committee will establish a selection panel comprised of five members, including panelists ranging from police accountability advocates, NCPC representatives, faith based leaders, and members of the Community Policing Advisory Board and Safety and Services Oversight Committee. Each of the City Council Rules Committee members will select one panelist and the Mayor will select the fifth panelist.

The Mayor will then submit no fewer than eight proposed candidates for the Monitor position to the selection panel and the panel will publicly recommend three of those proposed candidates to the Mayor. Of the three candidates, the Mayor will select the Monitor whose appointment must be confirmed by the City Council. The Monitor, who may be terminated by the Mayor, will be in a director-level position on par with the Police Chief and will have access to all Police Department data.

The Monitor is the individual Oakland residents can turn to in times of Department-mistrust and is accountable to the people through his or her removal by the Mayor. It is critical that in
addition to a civilian oversight body, the Police Commission, residents are able to identify one leader who maintains complete authority over the most serious disciplinary decisions within the City. This mechanism for direct leadership provides residents with one person to communicate with, who both is an expert in this field and has authority to bring about change.

The following duties and authorities are therefore given to the Monitor:

Monitor’s Reporting Duties:
- Monitoring and oversight of City processes in order to support constitutional policing in six core component areas: Uses of force, Supervisory ratios, Training, Stop data, Early Intervention Systems and Discipline.
- Issuing reports and policy recommendations on an at least semi-annual basis to the City Council, Mayor and City Administrator, addressing issues arising out of recent arbitration decisions, the City Attorney and Department’s efforts to support the police discipline process, strategies for improving the discipline and arbitration processes, recent developments in police discipline and updates to police policy, and police personnel trainings.
- Evaluating Investigation Bureau staff capacity and making recommendations to the City Council regarding what level of resource allocation is needed.
- Designing and implementing a mandatory orientation for Commissioners within one year of the beginning of his or her service, enlisting the assistance of law enforcement, the local legal community, human resources experts and Oakland community members to maximize Commissioner expertise.\(^1\)

Monitor’s Duties of Receipt:
- Receive briefing from the Chief of Police on at least a monthly basis on all allegations of police officer misconduct and all serious incidents involving sworn OPD employees, on-duty or off-duty.
- Receive reports from the Police Commission upon Commission and Investigatory Bureau’s completion of each case.
- Receive requests from the Mayor, City Administrator or by affirmative vote of the majority of City Council members for audits and investigations of the investigations that have been undertaken by either the Investigatory Bureau or by the Internal Affairs Division of the Police Department or both.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Expertise regarding the following: OPD history, historic OPD and Community relations, the meaning and impact of the Negotiated Settlement Agreement, public records and meetings laws, confidentiality requirements, State and Local laws relating to peace officers’ personnel actions, rights and privacy, State and Federal statutory, Constitutional and Case law concerning stops, detentions, search, seizure and arrest, rights of arrested persons, steps in the criminal justice process, including arrest, booking, arraignment, bail, hearings and trial.

\(^2\) If it appears that any case may have potentially fallen through cracks in the City of Oakland’s police oversight system, this is a function the City Council believes to be particularly important in ascertaining where exactly the investigatory and disciplinary processes are falling short.
- Collect input to improve the police policies and practices, trainings, and the discipline process at least annually, by seeking recommendations from the Police Commission, Police Department’s Internal Affairs Division and Office of Inspector General, Skelly officers, Supervising officers, attorneys, and others closely involved in matters within the Office’s jurisdiction.

Monitor’s Powers/Authority:
- Power to audit any and all allegations of police misconduct and all Serious Incidents (defined as an officer-involved shooting, death or serious bodily harm caused by the action and/or inaction of a Police officer, and/or criminal activity by a Police Department employee, whether on-duty or off-duty).
- Authority to manage all Office staff and supervise personnel.
- Power to attend all Police Commission meetings, examining witnesses as he or she deems necessary.
- Authority to make final disciplinary decisions on cases in which the Police Department has recommended an amount of discipline greater than five days’ suspension and/or the Police Commission recommends discipline.
- Right to attend any discipline arbitration and any Skelly hearing he or she would like to attend.
- Right to audit the Police Department and the Commission to develop and sustain a fair, consistent and predictable process, measuring their performances at various points in the process of discipline, including but not limited to intake, investigation, Skelly hearings, and arbitration.

In order to effectively complete the tasks we are assigning to the Monitor, he or she will need sufficient staffing, including administrative staffing, policy analysis staffing, and auditing staffing. This individual will have access to all investigatory materials from both the Internal Affairs Division of OPD and OPD’s Office of Inspector General.³

(3) Establish A Police Commission

The current body responsible for Oakland’s civilian oversight of the Department is the Citizens’ Police Review Board (CPRB). The current CPRB, a board of nine members, is tasked with “providing the community with a public forum to voice its concerns on policy matters and individual cases alleging police misconduct, through a mechanism of independent, impartial, fair, and transparent civilian oversight.”⁴

We will replace the CPRB with a robust Police Commission (“Commission”), with a specific list of desired qualifications for membership including significant experience in the fields of management, policy development, law, investigations, law enforcement, youth representation, and human resources, as well as representation from communities that experience the most frequent contact with the Department. We also mandate an increased level of mandatory training for all Commissioners, which would include but not be limited to training in procedural justice,

³ Note: the proposed Charter Amendment does not remove any IAD function.
⁴ http://www2.oaklandnet.com/Government/o/CityAdministration/d/CPRB/index.htm
implicit bias, crisis intervention, Peace Officer Standards and Training ("POST") Domains 15 and 16 (arrest, and search and seizure procedures) as well as bi-annual ride-alongs with the Department.

Youth Commissioners would receive a stipend for his or her attendance of meetings and the Commission will be provided with an annual budget for on-going training and education of Commissioners. This emphasis on and investment in training, education and increased requirements for relevant experience will help to increase the capacity and skill-level of this citizen's body. In turn, the Monitor will be provided with a stronger independent viewpoint as he or she deliberates over the disciplinary recommendations of both the Commission and of the Internal Affairs Division of the Department. This increase in quality will also translate into a greater evidentiary record, an increased quality of questioning and professional-level information gathering for the City to rely on in arbitration proceedings.

The Commission will have complete discretion over which cases it chooses to review, voting to hear or not hear cases as it sees fit, and as a result, will be better able to adjust its own workload as is necessary. This nine-member body will be appointed by City Councilmembers and nominated by the Mayor and will be entrusted with the duty of reviewing the most serious allegations of police misconduct, hearing testimony, questioning witnesses and recommending discipline on these cases directly to the Monitor and City Administrator.

With each Commission disciplinary recommendation, the Monitor brings the Commission’s recommendation to a meeting with the City Administrator and representatives of both the Police Department and the Police Commission in a joint conference. After the conference takes place, the Monitor will consult with the City Administrator and the Monitor will have the authority to make a final disciplinary decision.

This same system of disciplinary decision-making will apply for cases in which the Police Department has recommended any amount of discipline greater than five days’ suspension. As mentioned above, this process is already underway, but the final decision-maker is the City Administrator. Although the City Administrator would continue to be present during this process, this legislation would shift the final decision-making power from the City Administrator to the Independent Police Monitor. The Commission’s role in making strengthened, reasoned recommendations to the Monitor will be critical to the Monitor in this process.

In light of the fact that the Monitor and City Administrator will be present and party to these deliberations, with the passage of this Charter Amendment, the City Council requires that the Monitor and City Administrator attend the same robust level of mandatory training that all new Commissioners attend.

---

5 Under the existing disciplinary decision-making system, these conferences take place with the same parties represented except that a representative of the CPRB attends this meeting instead of a representative of the Commission and with the exception of the Monitor.
(4) Increased Emphasis on Investigatory Bureau

The City will support police accountability through proper resource allocation to investigations of police misconduct. Throughout our conversations with experts in civilian oversight of law enforcement, it was clear that the heart of police oversight and monitoring lies in the quality of the investigations of police misconduct. If the City misses this window of opportunity to handle a case properly from the very beginning, that opportunity is lost, and the solutions needed in that situation, whether that be discipline, education, additional training or mediation, are more challenging to implement. As a result, we place a heavy emphasis on sufficient staffing of this investigatory body.

To understand what types of supports are needed, the Monitor’s first task will be to evaluate current CPRB staff capacity and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding resource-needs for investigations. The Monitor will be asked to work closely with the current CPRB Executive Director to identify these levels of resource-allocation. With the Executive Director’s help, the Monitor will inform the City Council of what is needed to reach a sufficient level of resources, investigators, policy analysts, legal staff, and administrative support staff, properly supporting the Office of Independent Police Oversight and Monitoring’s investigations.

The Commission will then have the authority to review any case it chooses to review by a majority vote including but not limited to officer-involved shootings and cases of death and/or serious bodily harm in police custody, citizen complaints brought to the Commission which the Investigatory Bureau’s Executive Director deems appropriate for Commission review, and any case referred to the Commission by the Independent Monitor. As is the case with the Citizen’s Police Review Board, the Executive Director of this Investigatory Bureau will open an investigation on every case in which it is alleged that there has been an officer-involved shooting or death in police custody. We understand that the current Executive Director has tended to act in this way. However, through this Charter Amendment, the City Council will codify this mechanism for ensuring that investigations take place every time an allegation rises to this level of seriousness.

2. TRANSPARENCY – Create structure requiring police accountability and oversight bodies to interact and communicate consistently and with greater transparency to the public.

The second element of our strategy is a significant increase in transparency on all matters related to police behavior. We will restore community trust by increasing the level of information sharing between the City and community by placing a consistent and reliable communication structure into place. Three changes to the City’s transparency policy will go into effect: (1) require regular reports to the community and (2) establish a “Right to Know” Policy for allegations of serious misconduct in which privileges of confidentiality are systematically evaluated.

(1) Regular Reports to Community

At least semi-annually, the Monitor will report to the City Council with two sets of data. First, the Monitor will report complaint and disciplinary data from the Office (summarizing the work
of the investigatory staff and the Commission) and IAD, including the following: number of total complaints, the date of each complaint, whether the Department recommended discipline, whether supervisory accountability was assessed, whether that discipline was sustained, and the final disciplinary action taken, if different from what the Department had recommended. For those complaints which are closed and discipline has been implemented, the Monitor will report on whether the discipline was in line with or less than what is recommended in the Department’s discipline matrix and previous sanctions, closely evaluating and comparing levels of discipline across cases.

Second, the Monitor will report on all data and trends regarding Police Department training and education. Specifically, he or she will inform the Council of the percentage of officers that have received the following trainings: Procedural Justice, Implicit Bias and Crisis Intervention and De-escalation training and Job-related Stress Management. Along with this data, the Monitor will provide insight into any trends he or she sees regarding connections or the absence of connections between training and/or education and involvement in allegations of police misconduct and sustained findings of police misconduct.

(2) Establish “Right to Know” Policy

Residents have a clear need for access to reliable sources of factual information when serious allegations of police misconduct occur. This provision helps to make clear to community members that this type of information will be shared on a consistent basis, as permitted by law, with the fewest number of questions left unanswered as possible.

Under the Right to Know Policy, when a Serious Incident is alleged, the Chief of Police will notify the Monitor immediately and provide two status reports to the Monitor in the coming days and weeks.

Before sharing information with the public, the Monitor will work with the Mayor and City Administrator to evaluate the City’s capacity to waive privileges and exemptions to public records requests as may be appropriate.

After the Monitor has been briefed by the Chief and evaluated the possible waiver of privileges and exemptions, the Monitor will share as much information with the public he or she legally is able at the earliest possible date. The notification will be posted on the City website, and made accessible on the Office’s homepage. If individuals experience any difficulty in gaining information from the Department or from any other Office, or prefer not to engage with the Department during a time of sensitivity, community members will be able to contact the Monitor with any questions and concerns with the confidence that the Monitor will have updated information.

3. POLICE HIRING, TRAINING AND EDUCATION – Create a personnel management structure which sustains cultural and behavioral change in the Department.

In an effort to ensure that the Oakland Police Department maintains, upholds and strengthens its system of police discipline, it is vital that we incorporate the following sections when discussing
police accountability and transparency. According to many experts in the fields of procedural justice and implicit bias, in order to drive behavioral change throughout the Police Department you must begin by changing the culture from within by implementing an emphasis on procedural justice training programs as well as investing in the current employees by offering continuing education to our officers.

(1) **Evaluation of Hiring Practices**

At least once each year, the Monitor will be tasked with evaluating hiring practices on several levels. He or she must evaluate specific standards currently in place, the timeline expected by hiring staff, whether or not those conducting hiring are adhering to those standards and whether the hiring timeline may be problematic for any reason.

The context for the assignment of this task to the Monitor lies in the fact that Oakland is currently aiming to increase its force to approximately 800 officers. Although there are many who wish to reach this goal quickly, it is critical that we maintain oversight over whether or not the interest in reaching a greater number results in problematic hiring decisions in any way. The Monitor’s analysis here will be extremely valuable.

(2) **Ensure All Officers Receive Critical Trainings**

The City will increase its emphasis on providing the following trainings to all officers (command staff, rank and file and new hires): Procedural Justice Training; Implicit Bias Training; Crisis Intervention and De-escalation Training; and Job-related Stress Management.

These trainings are placed in high regard. As such, the Department will be required to assess an individual officer’s level of completion in these trainings as part of the promotional decision-making process. The Monitor will share as much data as possible, within the bounds of State and local personnel and privacy laws, regarding the status of Departmental training and education with the public in his or her reports.

(3) **Increase Frequency of Post-Training Coaching**

Within one year of the passage of this Charter Amendment, the Department and Monitor will establish what level of budgetary increase is needed to provide more frequent training updates, also known as refresher courses, to all officers, including post-training coaching and annual re-training (re-certification). These refresher courses would apply to all of the aforementioned trainings in order to effectively sustain Departmental behavioral change. Specifically, trainings with a strong emphasis on in the field problem-solving, diplomacy and de-escalation will be prioritized.

In order to satisfy the requirements outlined in this pillar of the Oversight and Monitoring Strategy, the Department must work with the Office to ensure that its databases track all forms of officer training, whether as a result of academy, supervisor request, or discipline, in a centralized and easily searchable location, accessible to the Monitor. The records should identify the topics
of each training and the trainer. The Department should also make every effort to ensure materials for related trainings are easily identified and accessible.

(4) Regular Reports to Community

At least semi-annually, Monitor will report on Hiring, Training and Education to the City Council. The Police Chief will help to revise and upgrade hiring requirements, training curriculum, promotion criteria, etc. to incorporate guidance from Monitor.

(5) Police Leadership Institute

The Monitor shall be tasked with developing partnerships in order to create a Leadership Institute for Police Officers with a local higher education institution. The Police Leadership Institute is intended to identify and train officers early in their career, geared generally towards those with 3-10 years’ experience, although not exclusively, to develop the next generation of OPD leadership. This program would provide a strong background in social sciences, criminology, law, research methods, and other skill sets suitable for leadership in a 21st Century Police Department. Officers would earn certificate upon completion of the program and, if practicable, college credits.

Local higher education institutions we have considered for this project include UC Berkeley’s Goldman School of Public Policy, Stanford University and California State University, East Bay. Our ongoing conversations with these and other institutions will help inform the vision of this Institute.

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT – Community involvement in all aspects of police strategy with an emphasis on mediation, de-briefing, restorative justice, and overall healing.

One of the focus benchmarks of 21st Century Policing is building community trust. In order to improve relationships with communities who have experienced negative encounters with the Department, the Office must work with the Department to build and promote community trust. Together, the Department, the Office and community members will collaborate to design solutions aimed at building community trust. In addition, the Monitor will work to increase support for existing community engagement programs.

(1) Establish Community Roundtable

The first element of increased community engagement is the creation of consistent opportunities for the Department to interact directly with the community members who its efforts have an impact on. To provide this recurring opportunity, the Office will host Community Roundtable meetings. Participants will include representatives from the Department, community members from faith-based groups, youth groups, advocacy groups, residents of neighborhoods that experience the most frequent contact with the Department and formerly incarcerated members of the community.
This body will meet on at least quarterly basis, and will report to City Council at least annually with policy recommendations. The Office will have one designated staff person who is a liaison to this group, and both the City Administrator and the Mayor will have one designated staff person to work as liaisons to the Roundtable.

The Roundtables will be tasked with two objectives. First, the roundtable will be tasked with creating a space for ongoing dialogue. In order to strengthen communication between community members and officers, the Roundtable will provide consistent opportunities for conversation between officers and the community those officers serve.

Second, the community roundtable will design a restorative justice, debrief, and/or mediation component to the Department’s work building and sustaining community trust. The Roundtables will be aimed at addressing the negative outcomes from most intensive and disruptive police actions such as the execution of home arrests, the execution of search warrants and SWAT Team actions, on the arrestees, their families, neighbors and other witnesses. It is of critical importance that the Department communicate to the community impacted by recent police activity as much information as possible about what occurred, why the Department acted as they did, and what community members can expect moving forward. Although there is agreement about the need for this type of follow-up among Department leadership, the City Council must take the next step and clearly define and codify engagement in this way.

It is important that the Community roundtable be connected to community policing and community safety efforts already in existence in the City of Oakland. Therefore, at least one representative from the Community Roundtable will attend Community Policing Advisory Board (“CPAB”) meetings and one representative will be required to attend the Community Safety Partnership meetings. Maintaining connection between these distinct bodies will be highly valuable in meeting common interests.

(2) Enhancement of Community Policing Advisory Board

The Monitor will work closely with the community-led CPAB to develop a robust mechanism for both informing the public of each of the three aforementioned efforts (See Strategies 1-4) and receiving feedback from community members re: impact/effectiveness of these simultaneous investments. The Monitor will also work with CPAB members to incorporate 21st Century Policing principals into the goals of the CPAB and help the body to amend their own enabling ordinance as necessary.

(3) Provide Departmental Incentives for Community Engagement

In order to build community engagement into the Departmental culture, the Department will incorporate engagement with community-based and/or youth-focused organizations into both the Police Academy training curriculum and into promotional criteria for Department officers. This increased level of direct participation in local community groups’ efforts is intended to help to bring greater awareness and appreciation to Oakland’s officers and increase the frequency of positive community member-officer interactions in our City.
As we have stated, it is clear that sustained, transformative behavioral change in the Department will not be easy. It will require a substantial commitment from us as leaders and it will require that we rise to the call of our duties as legislators. This is one of the most important issues we will tackle in our time as Councilmembers, but we are confident that if we establish this Office and move forward with this plan, we will at last identify the root causes police misconduct, remedy those underlying issues and create authentic, long-term community trust.

Respectfully,

Annie Campbell Washington  
Vice Mayor and District 4 Councilmember

Abel Guillen  
District 2 Councilmember

Larry E. Reid  
President Pro Tempore and District 7 Councilmember