

DATE 8/31/22 BY [Signature]

Response to Grand Jury Report Form

Report Title: Rohnert Park Department of Public Safety

Report Date: June 14, 2022

Response by: Jackie Elward Title: Mayor

Agency/Department Name: City of Rohnert Park

FINDINGS: F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F7

I (we) agree with the findings numbered: F1 & F4

I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the findings numbered: F2, F3, F5, F6, & F7

(See attached statement with an explanation of the reasons.)

RECOMMENDATIONS: R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7

Recommendations numbered: R4 have been implemented.

(See attached summary describing the implemented actions.)

- Recommendations numbered: R1, R2, R3, R5 have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
(See attach a timeframe for the implementation.)
- Recommendations numbered: R6, R7 require further analysis.
(See attached explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion.)
- Recommendations numbered: _____ will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.
(Attach an explanation.)

Date: 8/23/2022 Signed: [Signature]
Number of pages attached: 2

Statement Attached to Response to Grand Jury Form for City of Rohnert Park

Rohnert Park Department of Public Safety Grand Jury Report June 2022

Findings:

- F1 – Agree.
- F2 – Partially disagree, the evaluation was at end of the first year, not six months.
- F3 – Partially disagree. If a single evaluation was the only method to communicate the strengths and weaknesses of the director's performance, it would be inadequate. However, it is not the only method of communicating with the Directors about performance. Modern personnel management encourages contemporaneous feedback on performance rather than saving it up for a once-a-year evaluation. Contemporaneous tools such as counseling memos, emails, regular in-person meetings, and telephone consultations are necessary to provide feedback in real time about performance including strengths and weaknesses. All directors have received and continue to receive ongoing feedback about their performance including strengths and weaknesses.
- F4 – Agree. Communications between the members of Public Safety and the city manager are ad hoc and informal as opposed to a formal process.
- F5 – Partially disagree. While there is no municipal code section or written regulations that require regular meetings with the Director of Public Safety, these have occurred weekly at the request and direction of the city manager, not the director. In the Council-Manager form of government, the City Council appoints the city manager, who appoints all the other employees. The city manager is responsible for supervising and determining best practices and procedures for operational supervision. As stated above, the city manager follows modern personnel management practices which encourage contemporaneous feedback on performance rather than saving it up for a once-a-year evaluation.
- F6 – Partially disagree. While there is no legal requirement that the Director of Public Safety provides regular updates to the Council, in fact, the Council has adopted a Public Safety Presentation Calendar which provides dates for updates at Council meetings. Furthermore, there have been tremendous opportunities to allow community input and provide transparency of the department's activities. Rohnert Park far exceeds its neighbors in opportunities for community input and transparency. Since January 2019, the Public Safety Department has presented before City Council 47 times. All of these presentations were made publicly, and transparently, with the public being able to provide community input. Twice a month the director hosts "Chat with the Chief" an hour long live video chat with the community. The city manager and director held fourteen community meetings on public safety in a three month period last year. The department regularly meets with community groups like mobile home park associations, Rotary International, the Rohnert Park Chamber of Commerce, faith based organizations, and education partners on safety issues of concern to them.
- F7 – Partially disagree. While in 2017, vehicle tracking was inadequate to alert the department to a handful of unauthorized uses of vehicles, since that time new

policies and procedures such as vehicle sign-out along with an expanded more robust command structure have been instituted. These new procedures are more than adequate to provide the vehicle tracking necessary to assure that all vehicles are appropriately being used and operated.

- R1 – This recommendation will be implemented by December 31, 2022.
- R2 – This recommendation will be implemented by December 31, 2022.
- R3 – This recommendation will be implemented by December 31, 2022.
- R4 – This recommendation has been implemented as the City Council adopted the Public Safety Presentation Calendar on June 28, 2022.
- R5 – This recommendation will be implemented as the City Council approved the Community Round Table program and directed staff to move forward with implementation on July 12, 2022. The selection of a facilitator, the application, and the selection process are currently in progress. The application process will begin in mid-August and remain open for a period not less than 30 days. An outside selection committee will then select the participants of the Community Round Table. The Community will meet quarterly after the selection is completed. We expect to complete the recruitment by the Grand Jury's deadline of December 31, 2022.
- R6 – Further analysis is required to determine the costs, benefits, and need for GPS tracking on all police vehicles. Due to the ever-changing landscape of technology, there are numerous systems on the market. The department will be required to complete a needs assessment to determine the attributes needed, if any, to provide additional fleet management oversight. This will allow the department to refine a list of possible tracking systems which meet the assessment needs, evaluate costs, and determine whether additional tracking is beneficial. The costs will be shared with the city council for their consideration. The budget meetings for the city are in April, so the council will consider this in April of 2023 for the Fiscal Year 2023-24 budget.
- R7 – Further analysis is required to determine the costs, benefits, and need for GPS tracking on all police vehicles. Due to the ever-changing landscape of technology, there are numerous systems on the market. The department will be required to complete a needs assessment to determine the attributes needed, if any, to provide additional fleet management oversight. This will allow the department to refine a list of possible tracking systems which meet the assessment needs, evaluate costs, and determine whether additional tracking is beneficial. The costs will be shared with the city council for their consideration. The budget meetings for the city are in April, so the council will consider this in April of 2023 for the Fiscal Year 2023-24 budget. If the city council budgets funds for vehicle tracking, the funds will be available on July 1, 2023. Installation of tracking devices may be implemented by December 31, 2023, depending on the availability of the equipment and installation vendors.