

READ AND CONSIDERED
DATE 8/17/22 BY [Signature]

Response to Grand Jury Report Form

Report Title: Rohnert Park Department of Public Safety
Report Date: June 14, 2022
Response by: Darrin Jenkins Title: City Manager
Agency/Department Name: City of Rohnert Park

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

I agree with the findings numbered: F1, F4

I disagree partially with the findings numbered: F2, F3, F5, F6

(Attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed with an explanation of the reasons.) See attached.

RECOMMENDATIONS: R1, R2, R3, R4, R5

Recommendation numbered: R4 has been implemented.

(Attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)

- Recommendations numbered: R1, R2, R3, R5 have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
(Attach a timeframe for the implementation.)
- Recommendations numbered: _____ require(s) further analysis.
(Attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. ***This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.***)
- Recommendations numbered: _____ will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.
(Attach an explanation.) See attached.

Date: August 4, 2022 Signed: [Signature]

Number of pages attached: 3

Statement Attached to Response to Grand Jury Form for Darrin Jenkins, City Manager

Rohnert Park Department of Public Safety Grand Jury Report June 2022

FINDINGS

The Sonoma County Civil Grand Jury determined that:

- F1. The previous Director of Public Safety received one formal written evaluation from the current City Manager during the five years in which he reported to him.
- F2. During his three-year tenure, the present Director of Public Safety has received only one formal written evaluation, which occurred at the end of his first six months.
- F3. A single evaluation fails to document the strengths and weaknesses of the Director's ongoing performance.
- F4. The City Manager has no formal process to solicit input from within the Public Safety Department and to communicate concerns to the Director of Public Safety.
- F5. There is no procedural requirement dictating regularly scheduled meetings between the Director of Public Safety and the City Manager. While meetings currently happen weekly at the request of the current Director, there is no procedure requiring that this practice be maintained into the future.
- F6. There is no requirement for the Director of Public Safety to routinely provide presentations or department updates to the City Council in a public setting. Therefore, there is little opportunity to allow community input to or provide transparency of the Department's activities.
- F7. Police vehicle tracking has been and remains inadequate.

Responses to 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 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 on-going feedback about their performance including strengths and weaknesses.
- F4 – Agree. Communication 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 City Manager meetings with the Director of Public Safety, these have

occurred weekly at the request and direction of the City Manager. 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 provide 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, 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 command staff to a handful of unscheduled uses of vehicles, since that time new policies and procedures are on place. Vehicle sign-out along with an expanded more robust command structure providing much more supervisory coverage of sergeants and officers have been instituted. These changes enable appropriate vehicle use tracking.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Sonoma County Civil Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. By December 31, 2022, the City Manager institute an annual written performance evaluation for the Director of Public Safety. (F1, F2, F3)
- R2. By December 31, 2022, the City Manager obtain input from a representative sample of Rohnert Park Department of Public Safety personnel to be considered in the evaluation of the Director's annual performance. (F4)
- R3. By December 31, 2022, the City Manager establish a schedule for communicating with and getting feedback from the Public Safety Officer Association. (F4, F5)
- R4. By September 30, 2022, the City Manager and the Director of Public Safety complete the preparations for and institute the Public Safety Presentation Calendar as recommended to the City Council on August 10th of 2021. (F6)
- R5. By December 31, 2022, the City Manager and the Director of Public Safety complete the recruitment for and establishment of the Chief's Community Round Table as recommended to the City Council on August 10, 2021. (F6)
- R6. By July 1, 2023, the City Council allocate funds to install GPS tracking on all police vehicles. (F7)
- R7. By December 31, 2023, the Director of Public Safety shall install GPS tracking on all police vehicles. (F7)

Responses to Recommendations:

- 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 – We expect to complete the recruitment by the Grand Jury's deadline of December 31, 2022.