

## ATTACHMENTS:

### 1. Resignation Letter from Jerry Threet, CIAO – September 10, 2024

**From:** Jerry Threet <[jerry\\_threet@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:jerry_threet@ci.richmond.ca.us)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 10, 2024 11:57:31 AM  
**To:** Mayor City Council <[mayor\\_city\\_council@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:mayor_city_council@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Claudia Jimenez <[Claudia\\_Jimenez@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:Claudia_Jimenez@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Eduardo Martinez <[Eduardo\\_Martinez@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:Eduardo_Martinez@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Soheila Bana <[Soheila\\_Bana@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:Soheila_Bana@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Gayle McLaughlin <[Gayle\\_McLaughlin@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:Gayle_McLaughlin@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Doria Robinson <[Doria\\_Robinson@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:Doria_Robinson@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Melvin Willis <[melvin\\_willis@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:melvin_willis@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Cesar Zepeda <[Cesar\\_Zepeda@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:Cesar_Zepeda@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Carol Hegstrom <[carolhcprc@gmail.com](mailto:carolhcprc@gmail.com)>; Oscar Garcia <[ogarcia.cor@gmail.com](mailto:ogarcia.cor@gmail.com)>; Marisol Cantu <[marisoltaskforce@gmail.com](mailto:marisoltaskforce@gmail.com)>; Steven Lacy <[s.lacycprc@gmail.com](mailto:s.lacycprc@gmail.com)>; Andre Jackson <[andrejackson.properties@gmail.com](mailto:andrejackson.properties@gmail.com)>; Daniel Lawson <[danlawsoncprc@gmail.com](mailto:danlawsoncprc@gmail.com)>; Rachel Lorber <[lorber.richmondcpcc@gmail.com](mailto:lorber.richmondcpcc@gmail.com)>; Carmen Martinez <[carmencprc@gmail.com](mailto:carmencprc@gmail.com)>  
**Cc:** Shasa Curl <[Shasa\\_Curl@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:Shasa_Curl@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Sharrone Taylor <[sharrone\\_taylor@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:sharrone_taylor@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Shannon Moore <[Shannon\\_Moore@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:Shannon_Moore@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Kimberly Chin <[Kimberly\\_Chin@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:Kimberly_Chin@ci.richmond.ca.us)>; Benjamin Therriault <[BTherriault@richmondpcd.net](mailto:BTherriault@richmondpcd.net)>; Bisa French <[bfrench@richmondpcd.net](mailto:bfrench@richmondpcd.net)>; Joseph England <[jengland@richmondpcd.net](mailto:jengland@richmondpcd.net)>  
**Subject:** Resignation from position of CPRC Investigative & Appeals Officer

Good Morning, Mr. Mayor, Councilmembers, and Commissioners -

I write to notify you of my resignation from the position of Investigative and Appeals Officer for the Richmond Community PoliceReview Commission (CPRC). While it has been my intention to continue serving in this role until Richmond was able to hire my replacement through a recruitment process, recent events sadly have led me to decide that is no longer possible. My own sense of professional integrity prevents me from continuing to serve in this role. While my resignation is effective September 30, 2024 so that I may assist the City with transition issues, I will suspend work on investigations for the CPRC.

As the City Council has made steady progress filling empty seats on the CPRC, there have understandably been changes in group dynamics within the CPRC and in the approach the Commission takes to its mission. For the most part, I have felt supportive of these changes as a natural evolution of the CPRC under new commissioners. For example, I have offered my support for proposed changes to the CPRC ordinance by providing information about how other oversight bodies approach their tasks and outlined possible options for change when appropriate.

There also has been an uptick in complaints filed with the CPRC over the last year. Again, I feel this is an overall positive development, as complainants have told me they learned about the option of filing a complaint with the CPRC from the commissioners, most of whom are newly appointed in the last year or so. Engaging the public so that they know they can lodge complaints is a key mission of the CPRC. This is a necessary development after the isolation of COVID and helps ensure accountability..

However, there also has been trends that has not been so positive. As newer commissioners have joined the CPRC, there has been a steady erosion in adherence to evidence based, objective evaluation of investigations of complaints and other cases subject to CPRC review. Sometimes, evidence is

completely ignored, even when it is crucial to the questions at issue in the investigation, such as the officer's state of mind at the time. At times, commissioners have described the evidence in ways that are diametrically opposed to the actual facts in evidence. Some commissioners have accused those with a different view of the facts with bias in favor of police officers for considering evidence that supports the officers' actions as appropriate under the circumstances. And some commissioners have begun to approach discussions as if they are grudge matches to be won or lost between those discussing difficult issues. Most concerning, commissioners have reached a sustained finding of misconduct, which requires that a violation be "highly likely," in a case where any objective view of the investigative evidence would lead to a finding of "exonerated" or "not sustained."

Nor do I think commissioners are currently giving these important matters the time and attention they need to thoroughly review the evidence, which sometimes is quite voluminous. Commissioners often first open the files of investigative evidence a couple of hours prior to the closed session when a matter will be considered, as indicated by the time stamps of their access through DropBox. There sometimes is little to no effort by commissioners to watch all relevant body worn camera video footage that is material to the issues under consideration. Yet, some commissioners come to the discussion of the cases with strong opinions that do not seem informed by a thorough understanding of the evidence

Put plainly, I no longer believe the commission can be relied upon to reach a valid finding on allegations of officer misconduct based on an objective, thorough, and unbiased view of the totality of the investigative evidence. Unfortunately, that is the standard that must be met to honor both the ethical obligations of each commissioner, as well as the due process rights of the civil servants who serve as Richmond Police Department officers.

Given this, I can no longer continue to be associated professionally with this civilian oversight body. Doing so would require that I support a body that does not adhere to the NACOLE Code of Ethics. It also would require that I object to actions I consider unethical and illegal, which would require more emotional and cognitive attention that I can give to this endeavor. In addition, the California State Bar Rules of Professional Conduct for attorneys suggests that an attorney should resign from a position that could assist in the violation of law.

I strongly suggest that the CPRC receive supplemental training in the ethical obligations as commissioners on a semi-judicial body that adjudicates matters affecting the due process rights of city employees. I also think it will be very important to ensure that the hiring committee for my replacement in this position be carefully balanced to ensure that its members respect both the ethical obligations of the CPRC and the due process rights of police officers in Richmond.

I wish you the best of luck in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Jerry Threet  
Investigative & Appeals Officer  
Community Police Review Commission  
City of Richmond, CA