1	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California	(Exempt from Filing Fees Pursuant
2	MICHAEL L. NEWMAN Senior Assistant Attorney General	to Gov. Code, § 6103(a))
3	NANCY A. BENINATI (SBN 177999) Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
4	Anthony V. Seferian (SBN 142741) Marisol León (SBN 298707)	
5	TANYA KOSHY (SBN 277095) JOSHUA PIOVIA-SCOTT (SBN 222364)	
6	KENDAL L. MICKLETHWAITE (SBN 305719) Deputy Attorneys General	
7	300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013	
8	Telephone: (213) 269-6048 Fax: (916) 731-2129	
9	E-mail: anthony.seferian@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff, the	
10	People of the State of California	
11		
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
13	COUNTY	OF KERN
14		
15		
16	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX REL. ROB BONTA,	Case No.
17	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	
18	71 1 100	STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL
19	Plaintiff,	JUDGMENT AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION
20	V.	
21 22	CITY OF BAKERSFIELD and THE BAKERSFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT,	
23		
24	Defendants.	
25		
26		
27		
28		
	1	
	STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF	FINAL JUDGMENT AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION
		ı

Plaintiff, the People of the State of California, by and through its attorney, Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the State of California (the "Attorney General"), and by Supervising Deputy Attorney General Nancy A. Beninati, and Defendants City of Bakersfield and the Bakersfield Police Department, stipulate as follows:

- 1. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter hereof and the parties to this Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment and Permanent Injunction ("Stipulation").
- 2. The Stipulated Judgment ("Judgment"), a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1, may be entered by any judge of the Kern County Superior Court.
- 3. The Attorney General's Office may submit the Judgment to any judge of the Kern County Superior Court for approval and signature, based on this stipulation, during the court's ex parte calendar or on any other ex parte basis, without notice to or any appearance by the defendants, which notice and right to appear the defendants hereby waive.
- 4. The parties hereby waive their right to move for a new trial or otherwise seek to set aside the Judgment through any collateral attack, and further waive their right to appeal from the Judgment, except the parties agree that this Court shall retain jurisdiction for the purposes of enforcing said Judgment.
- 5. The parties jointly represent that they have worked cooperatively to come to an agreement as set forth in the Judgment.
- 6. The parties have stipulated and consented to the entry of the Judgment without the taking of proof and without trial or adjudication of any fact or law herein, without the Judgment constituting evidence of or an admission by the defendants regarding any issue of law or fact alleged in the complaint on file herein, and without the defendants admitting any liability regarding allegations of violations that occurred prior to the entry of the Judgment.
- 7. The defendants will accept service of any Notice of Entry of Judgment entered in this action by delivery of such notice to their counsel of record or the Bakersfield City Attorney, and agree that service of the Notice of Entry of Judgment will be deemed personal service upon them for all purposes.

1	8. The individuals signing below represent that they have been authorized by the		
2	parties they represent to sign this Stipulation.		
3	9. This Stipulation may be executed in counterparts, and the parties agree that an		
4	electronic signature shall be deemed to be, and shall have the full force and effect as, an original		
5	signature.		
6	PLAINTIFF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
7	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California		
8			
9	DATED: August 23, 2021 Sancy & Beninat		
10	Nancy A. Beninati Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff, The People of the State of California		
12			
13			
14			
15	DEFENDANTS CITY OF BAKERSFIELD and THE BAKERSFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT CITY OF BAKERSFIELD AND THE		
16	BAKERSFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT		
17 18			
19			
20	DATED: August 19, 2021 Linguis Annau		
21	Virginia Gennaro, Bakersfield City Attorney, Attorneys for Defendants, City of		
22	Bakersfield and The Bakersfield Police Department		
23	Bepartment		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	3		

1	ROB BONTA	Exempt from Fees
2	Attorney General of California MICHAEL L. NEWMAN	(Gov. Code, § 6103(a))
3	Senior Assistant Attorney General	
4	NANCY A. BENINATI (177999) Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
5	Anthony V. Seferian (142741) Marisol León (298707)	
6	Tanya Koshy (277095)	
7	Joshua Piovia-Scott (222364) Kendal L. Micklethwaite (305719)	
8	Deputy Attorneys General 300 S. Spring Street, Suite 1702	
9	Los Angeles, California 90013	
	Telephone: (213) 269-6048 Fax: (916) 731-2129	
10	E-mail: anthony.seferian@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff, The People of the	
11	State of California	
12		
13	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
14	COUNTY	OF KERN
15		
16	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF	Case No.
17	CALIFORNIA, EX REL. ROB BONTA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE	
18	OF CALIFORNIA,	
19	Plaintiff,	STIPULATED JUDGMENT
20	v.	
21	CHEV. OF DALLED CEVEL D.	
22	CITY OF BAKERSFIELD and THE BAKERSFIELD POLICE	
23	DEPARTMENT,	
24	Defendants.	-
25		
26		
27		
28		
		1

INTRODUCTION

The People of the State of California, ex rel. Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the State of California (Attorney General), filed a Complaint for Injunctive Relief (Complaint) in the Superior Court of Kern County against the City of Bakersfield (City), and the Bakersfield Police Department (BPD), pursuant to the authority granted to the State of California under California Civil Code section 52.3, to seek declaratory and equitable relief to address alleged incidents of conduct by law enforcement officers that deprive individuals of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the state or federal Constitution or state or federal law. The Attorney General, the City, and BPD (collectively, Parties) are committed to effective, constitutional law enforcement, and enter into this Stipulated Judgment for the common good of the people of the City of Bakersfield.

The City and BPD generally and specifically deny each and every allegation contained in the Complaint. The Attorney General, City, and BPD are committed to effective, constitutional law enforcement that protects individuals' statutory and constitutional rights, treats individuals with dignity and respects and promotes public safety in a manner that is responsive to the community's priorities and accomplished in a manner that is fiscally responsible. The Parties herein agree to the entry of judgment without the taking of proof, trial, or the adjudication of any fact or law, without this Stipulated Judgment constituting evidence of liability of the City or BPD, or admission by the City or BPD of any issue of fact or law alleged in the People's Complaint, without the City or BPD admitting any liability, and with all Parties waiving their right to appeal. Each party agrees to bear its own attorney's fees and costs to date.

The purpose of this Stipulated Judgment ("Judgment" or "Agreement") is to ensure that the City and BPD protect individuals' statutory and constitutional rights, treat individuals with dignity and respect, and promote public safety in a manner that is fiscally responsible and responsive to community priorities. The Parties recognize that these outcomes require partnership between BPD and the community it serves, one in which BPD is transparent about its processes and provides community members with a voice in its functions. This Agreement is designed to enhance BPD's relationship with its community through increased transparency and

public input, improved oversight and accountability systems, and increased support for officers through effective law enforcement policies, training, and supervision. The Parties agree that the Effective Date of this Judgment is the date the Judgment is entered by the court.

Upon the conclusion of the Attorney General's investigation of the BPD, the City and BPD acknowledge that they are dedicated to constant evolution and improvement. The BPD acknowledges that it can always benefit from additional and continual reform in a manner that is sustainable over time. The Attorney General acknowledges that BPD has taken action to improve its law enforcement services and accountability, including, but not limited to: outfitting its officers with body-worn cameras; expanding its Quality Assurance Unit which has created many oversight systems to include random audits and inspections; purchasing and implementing public safety management software; hiring consultants to review policies and practices; developing a formal sergeant and lieutenant field training officer (FTO) program; increasing the complement of lieutenants and captains; implementing Text to 911; introducing principled policing and procedural justice training courses; providing employee wellness training; and volunteering to collect data under the Racial and Identity Profiling Act one year earlier than the mandatory collection date.

THE COURT, HAVING CONSIDERED THE MATTER, AND GOOD CAUSE APPEARING:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

This court has jurisdiction over the allegations and subject matter of the People's Complaint filed in this action and the Parties to this action; venue is proper in this county; and the court has jurisdiction to enter this Stipulated Judgment as stipulated here as follows:

I. USE OF FORCE

1. BPD agrees to revise its use of force policies and practices to reflect its commitment to upholding the rights secured or protected by the Constitution of the State of California and the United States Constitution, and federal and state laws, protecting human life and the dignity of every individual, and maintaining public safety. As specified below, BPD agrees to review and revise its use of force policies to include focusing on the concepts of sanctity of life, necessity, proportionality, and de-escalation; require officers to intervene; and define an imminent threat

justifying lethal force that is consistent with Penal Code section 835a, subdivision (e)(2). BPD's use of force policies, and other related policies, must remain consistent with Penal Code section 835a and Government Code section 7286, which (1) limits authorization of the use of lethal force to situations where the officer reasonably believes, based on the totality of the circumstances, it is necessary to defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury (Pen. Code, § 835a); and (2) direct law enforcement agencies to maintain a use of force policy that requires the use of de-escalation techniques, crisis intervention tactics, and other alternatives to force when feasible. To that end, BPD's use of force policies will incorporate these concepts and requirements in the following ways:

A. Use of Force Policies and Principles

- 2. BPD will continue to review and revise its policies and associated training materials, to ensure compliance with the requirements of this Agreement and enacted California law, including Penal Code section 835a and Government Code section 7286.
- 3. BPD agrees to maintain, and where necessary review and revise, its use of force policies as follows to:
 - a. clearly define and describe when force is and is not authorized;
 - b. clearly define and describe the purpose of authorized and prohibited force options as well as define and describe the tools and techniques permitted and prohibited for all force options;
 - c. better describe the applicable legal standard for use of deadly and non-deadly force;
 - d. have its use of force policy be guided by the principle of the sanctity of human life;
 - e. limit the use of deadly force to situations where the officer reasonably believes it is necessary, not just reasonable, to defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury if the officer reasonably believes that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury (Pen. Code, § 835a) ("deadly force" herein and throughout this Stipulated Judgment means any use of force that creates a substantial risk of causing death or serious bodily injury; deadly force includes, but is not limited to, the discharge of a firearm);

- f. require that officers, whenever feasible, undertake efforts to utilize de-escalation tactics or employ less-lethal options before using deadly force ("feasible" herein and throughout this Stipulated Judgment means reasonably capable of being done or carried out under the circumstances to successfully achieve the arrest or lawful objective, without increasing risk to the officer or another person);
- g. require that officers use force only to effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, to overcome resistance or to prevent escape, to prevent the commission of a public offense, in defense of others or in self-defense, or to gain compliance with an order that is based in the law;
- h. affirm the importance of proportionality (as defined below);
- i. consistent with state law, prohibit chokeholds, carotid restraints, and other maneuvers
 that are designed to, or may foreseeably result in, cutting off blood or oxygen to a
 subject's head;
- j. require employees to avoid restraining a subject face down whenever possible, or to do so only for a very short time, and then place a restrained subject in the recovery position as soon as possible following a use of force so as to reduce the risk of positional asphyxia and/or effects associated with excited delirium syndrome;
- k. require, where feasible, that suspects who must be transported in a recumbent position be transported by rescue ambulance personnel and accompanied by an officer;
- prohibit discharging a firearm at moving vehicles, unless the operator or occupant of a
 moving vehicle poses an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the
 public or an officer and the officer is unable to move out of the way;
- m. prohibit discharging a firearm from a moving vehicle absent exigent circumstances;
- n. prohibit force against subjects who only verbally confront officers;
- prohibit force against subjects who are handcuffed or otherwise restrained, unless the subject is actively resisting and poses a direct and immediate threat to officers and/or themselves;

- p. prohibit the use of electronic control weapons (ECW's) in "drive stun" mode, unless reasonably necessary to avoid the use of any force that could increase injury to the suspect, the officers, or others, with those instances being fully documented and justified in the use of force reports;
- q. prohibit the use of ECW's on handcuffed individuals and children who appear to be under the age of 14;
- r. prohibit the use of ECW's on the following individuals, unless officers can provide justification of articulable facts necessitating the use of the ECW on any of the following: (a) pregnant females; (b) elderly persons; (c) individuals who have been recently sprayed with alcohol-based pepper spray or who are otherwise in close proximity to combustible materials; (d) individuals whose position or activity may result in collateral injury (e.g., falls from height, operating motor vehicles, possibility of drowning in water, etc.); (e) a youth who appears to be between the age of 14 and 17; and (f) an individual whom the officer has reason to believe may have a disability;
- s. require that any employee who observes another employee use force that exceeds the degree of force permitted by law and/or policy shall promptly intervene and then report their observations to a supervisor;
- t. where feasible, ensure its officers effectively employ cover, distance, time, tone, and available resources to de-escalate and minimize the need for force;
- u. provide that the conduct of both the officer and the subject leading up to the use of deadly force must be included in the evaluation of the decision to use force (Pen. Code, § 835a, subds. (a)(2) and (e)(3));
- v. prohibit the use of deadly force against a person who is only a danger to him or herself and does not pose a direct and immediate threat to officers or civilians (Pen. Code, § 835a, subd. (c)(2));
- w. require officers to use de-escalation techniques, crisis intervention tactics, and other alternatives to force when feasible (Gov. Code, § 7286, subd. (b)(1));
- x. stress the sanctity of life throughout the policy;

y. Address necessity as follows

- i. Define when force is necessary and require that officers use force only when reasonable and necessary to achieve a lawful objective;
- ii. Emphasize that the use of force is not a routine part of policing;
- iii. Require that officers use force in an unbiased manner, consistent with the antibias-based policing policy of BPD; and
- iv. Expressly require that officers use lethal force as a last resort and, before using such force, require, when feasible, exhaustion of all other means reasonably available under the circumstances, including de-escalation techniques and strategies, such as tactical repositioning;

z. Address proportionality as follows

- i. Explicitly require officers only to use a type of force that is proportionate to the threat and not excessive in light of the lawful objectives involved;
- ii. Provide specific guidance on what type of force is appropriate for the level of threat presented by the individual, and require officers to only use the amount of force that is both objectively reasonable under the totality of the circumstances, and necessary to effectuate arrest or achieve a lawful objective;
- iii. Provide express guidance on proportionality, to ensure officers understand the relationship that should exist between the law enforcement objective they are attempting to achieve, the threat presented, and the force required in a particular situation; the guidance may include adopting a spectrum, chart, or matrix, that can take the form of a graphical representation; and
- iv. Prohibit specific types of force that are inconsistent with the concepts of proportionality and necessity, such as retaliatory force;

aa. Address de-escalation as follows

Make it an affirmative duty to de-escalate, before using force, requiring that
officers shall employ de-escalation techniques and strategies whenever
feasible, as required in Government Code section 7286(b)(1);

- ii. Provide clear guidelines for the use of de-escalation techniques and strategies, such as using tactical repositioning and strategic communication skills, switching staff, modulating the tone employed, taking cover, or calling upon other resources, such as crisis intervention-trained officers, non-law enforcement agencies, or assistance from family members or friends, when and where appropriate;
- iii. Require officers to provide, when feasible, verbal warnings to individuals before using force, whether lethal or non-lethal, and require officers to (1) document, in any incident or use of force report, whether the individual had an opportunity to comply after the warning was issued and before an officer used force, and, (2) if no verbal warning was given, why one was not feasible; and
- iv. Require officers, when feasible, to employ cover, concealment, distance, time, and tactics to minimize the need for lethal force;

bb. Address the duty to intervene as follows

- i. Make it an affirmative duty for officers/employees to intervene, when in a position to do so, if they know or have reason to know that another officer/employee is about to use, or is using, unreasonable, unnecessary, or excessive force or is otherwise violating BPD's use of force policy;
- ii. Require officers, following an incident involving the use of unreasonable, unnecessary, or excessive force, to promptly report to a supervisor the use of force and the efforts made to intervene;
- iii. Provide for possible discipline of any officer who so fails to intervene; and
- iv. Hold supervisors and managers accountable for prohibiting retaliation against any officer who so intervenes;

cc. Address an imminent threat as follows

i. Continue to provide clear guidelines on what conditions may constitute an imminent threat justifying lethal force, consistent with California's deadly

9

6

28

force standard expressed in Penal Code section 835a and Government Code section 7286.

- 4. BPD shall continue to have policies and corresponding annual training governing each type of force instrument that it authorizes officers to carry.
- 5. BPD agrees to clarify that its officers may not use force against individuals who may be exhibiting resistive behavior, but who are under control and do not pose a threat to public safety, themselves, or to officers. BPD agrees to continue to require that its officers assess the threat of an individual prior to using force, and emphasize that a use of force must be proportional to the threat or resistance of the subject. If a threat or resistance no longer exists, officers cannot justify the use of force against a subject.
- 6. BPD will continue to require in policy, and emphasize in its training, that a strike to the head with any impact weapon is prohibited unless deadly force is justified. Unintentional or mistaken strikes to these areas must also be reported in the officer's use of force report, to ensure that all reasonable care was taken to avoid them.
- 7. BPD will have a specific policy requiring that a subject of a use of force who is injured or complains of injury receives medical treatment, photographs are taken of the existence or absence of injury following a use of force, and all injuries be documented in the use of force and arrest reports.
- 8. BPD, with regard to baton deployment, will provide policy and training guidance on the appropriate times to use that type of force relative to other less-lethal options.
- 9. BPD officers shall not deploy oleoresin capsicum (OC) spray or any other chemical spray (e.g. mace, tear gas, or other chemical irritants) on a person who is handcuffed or otherwise restrained, unless the person presents an imminent threat to the safety of the officer or others, and officers first attempt to exercise additional control over the person by using hands-on control measures or arrest control techniques.

B. Use of Canines

10. BPD shall ensure its canine-related policies, training, and field deployment activities are carried out in a manner consistent with "bark and hold" techniques. BPD's canine-related

policies and training shall continue to be based on searching and locating (bark and hold) subjects to be apprehended rather than immediately resorting to employing force, except when exigent circumstances or an immediate threat is evident. BPD will continue to ensure its canine policies and related training are consistent with contemporary police best practices, including a process for conducting and promoting ongoing feedback to promote continuous improvements in policies, training, and practices in the field.

- 11. Canine handlers shall limit off-leash canine deployments, searches, and other instances where there is an increased risk of a canine bite to those instances in which the potential use of injuring force is reasonable, the suspect is wanted for a serious offense, or is reasonably suspected to be armed, based upon individualized information specific to the subject.
- 12. A canine handler shall keep his or her canine within visual and auditory range during deployments at all times, except when a canine clears a threshold (e.g., rounding a corner, entering a room, ascending/descending a stairwell, or entering a confined space, such as a crawl-space), or when canine deployment beyond the handler's visual and auditory range is necessary to ensure the immediate safety of others.
- 13. All field supervisors and watch commanders shall continue to be familiar with BPD's canine policy and use of force reporting requirements. A canine handler shall obtain approval from a canine sergeant or lieutenant, a field sergeant, or the watch commander (sergeant or higher) prior to deployment, unless the canine handler must react immediately in apprehension of an escaping felon, or a subject is suspected to be armed based upon individualized information specific to the subject who poses an imminent threat to others, or when protecting themselves or others from assault. The approving supervisor shall not serve as the canine handler in the deployment.
- 14. Prior to canine deployment, canine handlers shall issue three loud and clear warnings that a canine will be deployed and advise the suspect to surrender, and warn the suspect that the deployment of a canine can result in their sustaining a dog bite, unless such warnings pose an imminent threat of danger to other officers on scene, the canine handler, or the public. The canine handler shall ensure the warnings are capable of being heard throughout the area of the

deployment and will allow a sufficient period of time between each warning to provide a suspect an opportunity to surrender. These warnings shall be given in Spanish and English if the suspect is reasonably believed to be a Spanish-speaking Limited English Proficient (LEP) individual.

- 15. If a canine bites any individual, the handler or an on-scene officer shall immediately contact a BPD dispatcher to request Emergency Medical Services response. If additional medical attention is required for a person who has been bitten, the individual shall be transported to a City-approved medical facility for treatment.
- 16. For each canine apprehension, the involved handler, and any other officers who used or observed a use of force, shall complete a use of force report before the end of shift unless approved by a supervisor.
- 17. In addition to the information that must be included in all use of force reports, a canine handler's use of force report documenting a canine apprehension shall continue to include the following: (1) whether there was contact between the canine and the subject, including contact with the subject's clothing; (2) documentation of the duration of the canine's contact with a subject; (3) the approximate distance of the canine from the handler at time of apprehension; and (4) whether a warning was given and, if not, why not. In addition, in all apprehensions where there is canine contact with visible injury sustained by someone, or a complaint of injury, a supervisor not involved in the application of force shall be summoned to the scene if feasible for the purpose of completing a Use of Force Report consistent with investigative requirements established under the Agreement.
- 18. Unless personally involved in the incident, the canine supervisor (a canine sergeant or lieutenant) shall evaluate each canine deployment for compliance with BPD policy, this Agreement, and state and federal law, and provide written documentation of this evaluation. If the canine supervisor is unavailable or was directly involved in the incident, this evaluation will be completed by a staff member of higher rank. Deployment reviews, using KATS K-9 Activity Training System or a similar tracking system, shall also be evaluated by the Operations Captain, with each person in the chain of command required to review and document their evaluation of the incident.

- 19. BPD agrees to continue maintaining and enhancing its canine certification program to ensure that: (1) canines and their handlers demonstrate control and proficiency in specific, widely accepted obedience and criminal apprehension exercises; (2) canines and their handlers receive a minimum of 16 hours of training every four weeks; (3) the trainer keeps detailed records of whether each canine team has met specific control criteria for each control exercise, and what remedial training was given if a canine team was deficient in any area; and (4) the trainer reports all deficiencies to the unit supervisor. The program shall ensure that canines are certified annually by a nationally recognized trainer or organization, and that a canine is not deployed unless its certification is current. BPD agrees to ensure that the certifying agency's standards are consistent with BPD policy and standards.
- 20. BPD agrees to continue to employ the services of a qualified trainer who is capable of providing certified canine training, and who delivers such training and maintains training records in accordance with BPD policy and this Agreement.
- 21. BPD agrees to continue to centrally record and track each canine team's training records, certification records, and health records, regardless of whether individual handlers also maintain records.
- 22. BPD agrees to continue to track canine deployments and canine apprehensions on a monthly basis to assess its canine unit and individual canine teams. For tracking purposes related to evaluation of incidents, including the Early Intervention System, a "canine deployment" occurs any time a canine is removed from the patrol vehicle for a potential or an actual engagement with a subject.
- 23. BPD agrees to include canine deployments as an element of the Early Intervention System, and to provide for the review, pursuant to the protocol for that system, of the performance of any handler whose canine has bitten someone during the reporting period. Canine data and analysis shall be included in BPD's Use of Force Annual Report.
- 24. BPD agrees to continue not to use the services of any of its canines without first ensuring that the canine is controllable and otherwise able to meet the standards required by BPD policy.

- 25. BPD will ensure no handler or canine will be deployed unless the handler and canine are current on all training requirements and the canine is fully controllable during exercises.
- 26. BPD shall collect and maintain all records on canine training, deployment, apprehension, and bites, and analyze canine-related data to develop, consistent with best practices, training and operational recommendations for individual dogs, handlers, and the unit as a whole.
- 27. BPD shall establish procedures for auditing canine training, deployment, and administrative documentation, to be performed by the Quality Assurance Unit.
- 28. The responsibilities of the Canine Commander shall be explicitly described in a position description that identifies both operational and administrative expectations, and the knowledge, skills and abilities required to effectively manage canine operations. The duties involved shall include submission of a comprehensive quarterly report to the Chief summarizing all canine deployments that occurred during the reporting period, identification of any patterns or trends of note, evaluation of and efforts to minimize risk exposure, and recommendations for improvements in policy, training, and support for field operations the Canine Unit is engaged in. This report shall describe and address all claims for damages and litigation associated with the unit's operations that were filed during the reporting period.
- 29. BPD shall amend its canine policy to (a) prohibit the deployment of canines for crowd control and when the subject appears to be under the age of 18, unless such deployment is specifically approved by an executive/command-level officer (rank of Captain or higher), (b) require the approvals of any deployment of a canine as provided for in subdivision (a) of this paragraph be fully justified and documented in the use of force report, (c) specifically address what force may be used by an officer to defend a canine, and (d) prohibit any canine team that fails to graduate or obtain certification to be deployed in the field until graduation or certification is achieved.

C. Use of Force Reporting Policy

30. BPD agrees to continue to require officers to report all uses of force greater than a standard handcuffing. A reportable use of force is as follows:

- a. Any use of force which is required to overcome subject resistance to gain compliance, that results in death, injury, complaint of injury in the presence of an officer, or complaint of pain that persists, and which does not result in an allegation of excessive or unnecessary force; or
- b. Any use of force involving the use of personal body weapons, chemical agents, impact weapons, extended range impact weapons, vehicle interventions, firearms, and any intentional pointing of a firearm at a subject, regardless of whether the use of force results in any injury or complaint of injury or pain.
- 31. BPD shall require its officers to completely and accurately describe the force used or observed, including describing in detail the actions of the suspect necessitating the use of force and the specific force used in response to the suspect's actions; any warning provided to the subject prior to the use of force, and if no warning given, why one was not feasible; any injuries or complaints of injuries; whether persons who have been sprayed with OC spray have been promptly provided with a neutralizing agent or solution to flush the affected area; and any medical treatment or refusal of medical treatment of the suspect. BPD will work with the Monitor to develop a best practice model to decontaminate subjects sprayed with OC spray. This reporting requirement also relates to any use of force incidents that occur when employees are off-duty but engaged in exercising police powers.
- 32. BPD will categorize reportable uses of force into levels (i.e., Level 1, 2, and 3) based on seriousness and specify associated roles and responsibilities of involved officers, supervisors, and investigative personnel at each level regarding reporting and review. Level 1 shall be the category of force at the lowest level with Level 3 being the highest level of force. The specific levels of force and the types of force that constitute those categories will be defined by the Monitor in consultation with the California Department of Justice (DOJ).
- 33. All levels of force, including non-reportable levels of force, should be clearly identified and described in the use of force policy.
- 34. The use of force reporting policy shall explicitly prohibit the use of conclusory statements without supporting detail, shall include original language in all statements as opposed

to boilerplate language, and reports documenting use of force. Officers shall be held accountable for material omissions or inaccuracies in their use of force statements, which may include being subject to disciplinary action.

- 35. BPD agrees to continue to require officers who use or observe force to notify their supervisors immediately following any reportable use of force incident or upon receipt of an allegation of unreasonable or unreported use of force by any officer. Officers who use or observe force and fail to report it shall be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.
- 36. BPD shall specify the reporting, investigation, and review requirements for each level of force, including reporting requirements for the involved and witness officers, the responsibilities of the investigating supervisor, criminal and administrative investigator responsibilities, and review requirements.
- 37. All officers who use reportable force shall be required to complete a use of force statement, as shall officers who witness a Level 2 or Level 3 use of force. The name and rank of every officer on scene shall be included in the supervisor's use of force report, even if that officer did not witness the Level 2 or Level 3 use of force. The use of force reports shall also include a physical description of the height, weight, gender, and race of each officer at the scene.
- 38. The Critical Incident Review Board (CIRB) shall review all Level 3 uses of force and any other matters referred to it by Internal Affairs, the Chief, Assistant Chief, or division commander.
- 39. BPD shall identify in the use of force policy the nature and extent of the use of force information it will release to the public.
- 40. BPD will continue to inform the public and develop a policy and process to inform the public about all officer-involved shootings and deaths in custody. As soon as practical following any officer-involved shootings and deaths in custody, BPD will provide information to the public which is legally allowed and which does not compromise an ongoing investigation.
- 41. BPD will develop a policy that provides for a liaison to the families of individuals involved in an officer shooting or to an individual who sustains serious bodily injury as a result of BPD officer actions. The policy will require the liaison to address the family of such individuals

with respect and to provide as much information as possible to address the questions that family members may have and which does not compromise the ongoing investigation.

D. Use of Force Supervisory Investigations

- 42. For all reportable uses of force, the investigating supervisor shall conduct a thorough investigation. This investigation will require supervisors to:
 - a. respond to the scene, examine the subject of the force for injury, interview the subject for complaints of pain, and ensure that any injured subject receives medical attention from an appropriate medical provider;
 - b. ensure identification and collection of all relevant evidence, including camera recordings;
 - c. direct the canvassing for, and interview of, civilian witnesses; and
 - d. collect statements from witness officers; and review all officer use of force statements for adequacy, accuracy, and completeness.
- 43. Following the investigation, the supervisor shall complete a supervisory investigation documented in a "Supervisor's Report on Use of Force." This Report shall include:
 - a. the supervisor's narrative description of the incident, including a complete and comprehensive description of all of the physical and testimonial evidence related to the incident;
 - b. documentation of all evidence of an injury or lack thereof;
 - c. identities of all officers involved in or witnessing the force; and
 - d. whether interviews of individuals with LEP were conducted in the interviewee's primary language, and if so, by whom.
- 44. An employee at the rank of lieutenant or higher shall conduct a review of the supervisor's investigation of the use of force, which review will include at least the following:
 - a. An assessment of the investigating supervisor's use of force investigation to ensure it is complete, thorough, and objectively conducted, and provides all supporting documents and statements from involved officers and witnesses;

- b. a recommendation as to whether the officer's actions appear to be within BPD policy and consistent with state and federal law, and an assessment of the incident for tactical and training implications; and
- c. documentation of any training or tactical concerns, and/or corrective action taken or recommended.
- 45. Upon completion of the lieutenant's review, the investigative reports shall be forwarded through the chain of command, which will review the report to ensure that it is thorough and complete, and that the analysis and subsequent findings are supported by a preponderance of the evidence and documented. A final determination of whether the incident is within policy must be made by a manager at the rank of captain or higher, if the use of force (a) resulted in a complaint of pain or an observable injury, or (b) involved a weapon. The commanding officer shall conduct an analysis and adjudication based upon a preponderance of the evidence and ensure any corrective actions, to include training and discipline, policy modifications, or risk management and mitigation measures, are carried out and documented.
- 46. BPD will hold officers accountable for uses of force that violate policy or law, and continue to require sergeants and lieutenants to refer uses of force that may violate law or BPD's use of force policy to Internal Affairs for further investigation or review.
- 47. BPD will hold supervisors accountable for not detecting, adequately investigating, or responding to force that is unreasonable or otherwise contrary to BPD policy.
- 48. BPD managers will be responsible for identifying and reporting force trends and for taking preventive steps to curb problematic trends, including issuing or revising policies, directives, training bulletins, or providing additional mentoring and supervision to individual officers.
- 49. BPD managers will regularly review and track "training and tactical review" related findings, recommendations, and comments to ensure that informal supervisory feedback does not replace the need for formal discipline.
- 50. BPD will work with the Monitor to update and modernize its CIRB policy so that it is consistent with this Agreement and tracks with contemporary policing best practices. The

5

8

11

12

14

15

18 19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

purpose of the CIRB will be to work in conjunction with the Administrative Review Process to conduct a timely and more holistic evaluation, beyond just individual policy compliance of all critical incidents. The board's evaluation shall encompass the actions of all involved personnel (including non-force users, supervisors, and support personnel) and issues of training, tactics, supervision, equipment and pre/post incident response and aftermath. BPD is currently considering including different ranks of officers on the CIRB, will also consider including a member of the community, and will work with the Monitor to develop a policy that includes community input.

- 51. At minimum, BPD will convene the CIRB for all Level 3 uses of force, any use of force that results in serious bodily injury or death, and any other matters referred to it by Internal Affairs, the Chief, Assistant Chief, or division commander.
- 52. With regard to officer-involved shootings, the CIRB reports will provide a detailed rationale for their findings and examine not just the deadly force that was used, but the entirety of the officer-involved shooting incident, including tactics used or not used leading up to the use of force and the need for any additional policies or training or improvements to existing policies or training, including but not limited to those identified in the after-action report (AAR). BPD will develop a process for review, feedback, and ongoing assessments to support continuous improvements based on observations and recommendations identified in CIRB and AAR reports. The AAR will include any and all identified findings and recommendations made by the CIRB, including, but not limited to, all recommendations for improvements in training (both for the individual officers involved and for the entire agency), policies, procedures, tactics, equipment, technology, organization, or any other issues that could contribute to improving future individual or organizational performance. Within 90 days of the CIRB's findings, the Quality Assurance Unit lieutenant will ensure all identified issues are addressed and documented in a formal report that clearly states the findings, and how any identified issues were addressed. The Quality Assurance Unit will submit a report documenting that all identified issues either have been or are being addressed, and provide a status report regarding those issues, documenting how the CIRB's

findings and directions were addressed. The Quality Assurance Unit will be required to reevaluate the corrections at defined time frames to ensure the desired outcomes are achieved.

53. BPD will work with the Monitor to include as part of its commendation policy an award or commendation that recognizes employees who demonstrate exceptional skill in employing de-escalation and community policing practices in the field.

E. Use of Force Training

- 54. BPD will work with the Monitor to determine the use of force training to be provided to all officers. The topics will include the following:
 - a. proper use of force decision making, including when force may be unnecessary in response to minor resistance (biennial);
 - b. role-playing scenarios and interactive exercises that illustrate proper use of force decision making, including training officers on the importance and impact of ethical decision making and peer intervention (annual);
 - c. principles of procedural justice, and avoiding the use of force in response to minor resistance (biennial);
 - d. de-escalation techniques that encourage officers to make arrests without using force (annual);
 - e. threat assessment, including how race and/or bias can impact officers' threat assessments (biennial); and
 - f. for supervisors, initial and annual refresher training on conducting use of force investigations, how to effectively direct officers to minimize uses of force and to intervene effectively to prevent or stop unreasonable force, using BPD's accountability and disciplinary systems after encountering a potentially unreasonable use of force, and supporting officers who report unreasonable or unreported force or who are retaliated against for using only reasonable force or attempting to prevent unreasonable force (annual).
- 55. BPD shall establish a training committee made up of, but not limited to, Training and Logistics Division personnel, Internal Affairs personnel, Quality Assurance Unit personnel, and

use of force experts responsible for assessing the effectiveness of the curricula against current policies and the integration of use of force scenario-based training and adult learning theory.

- 56. BPD shall have clear guidelines for selecting training instructors, with prior performance history being a significant factor in the selection criteria.
- 57. BPD shall convene its FTO's and the force-related training instructors no less than once a year to review, update, and ensure BPD is providing consistent, high-quality, and contemporary training in the use of force, and which is consistent with BPD policies.
- 58. BPD use of force training that is particularly relevant to organizational roles and responsibilities shall also be provided to supervisors, managers, and command staff.

F. Use of Force Analysis

- 59. Within one year of the Effective Date of this Judgment and at least annually thereafter, BPD will analyze the BPD use of force data and the force-related outcome data, to identify significant trends, and identify and correct deficiencies revealed by such analysis.
- 60. BPD's force analysis will include an assessment of the frequency and nature of uses of force that are referred to Internal Affairs for investigation; the subject of misconduct complaints; the subject of civil lawsuits related to criminal obstruction- or resisting-arrest-type charges that are dismissed or declined by the prosecutor; or that involve repeat-officers or units.
- 61. BPD will continue to determine whether policy or training curricula changes must be made as a result of its analysis of use of force incidents.
- 62. BPD will document the results of the use of force analysis in a public report. BPD will agree to a specifically delineated framework to meaningfully engage with community stakeholders in developing the revised policies described above.
- 63. BPD will agree to put together a community advisory working group or panel and will make a good faith effort to have representatives from various diverse stakeholder groups, including, but not limited to, the Kern County Public Defender's Office, California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA), the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), United Farm Workers (UFW), the Dolores Huerta Foundation (DHF), the NAACP, Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance

(GBLA), PICO Bakersfield, as well as members of Sikh and LGBTQ+ community groups. During the first year of the panel or working group's existence, it will meet at least bimonthly. The panel or working group will thereafter meet with BPD at least quarterly to provide input into policy and procedure, provide insight into the community's concerns, and educate the community about BPD. At least one BPD manager, at the rank of lieutenant or higher, shall serve as the agency's ongoing liaison to the panel and actively participate in those meetings and discussions, provide that panel with adequate staff support to carry out its mission, and must regularly report on the group's progress and expectations to the Chief of Police.

64. BPD agrees to work with its community advisory working group or panel when revising policies that are of particular interest to the community including, but not limited to, its use of force and related policies, bias-free policing policies, community policing, civilian complaints, and diversity in recruiting, hiring, and promotion policies.

II. STOPS, SEIZURES, AND SEARCHES

- 65. BPD will reiterate, train, and emphasize that all investigatory stops, seizures, and searches are conducted in accordance with the rights, privileges, and immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the State of California and the United States. BPD will reiterate, train, emphasize and ensure that investigatory stops and searches are part of an effective overall crime prevention strategy, do not contribute to counter-productive divisiveness or tension between BPD and the community, and are adequately documented for tracking and supervision purposes. To achieve these outcomes, BPD shall implement the requirements below.
- 66. BPD will implement policies to be developed in consultation with the Monitor, to ensure that officers document, and BPD supervisors review and evaluate: (1) investigatory stops and pat-down searches, to determine whether they are supported by reasonable suspicion; (2) whether arrests are supported by probable cause and BPD policy; and (3) whether investigatory stops, searches, and arrests, even if comporting with law and policy, indicate a need for corrective action or review of agency policy, strategy, tactics, or training.
- 67. BPD officers should be required to identify themselves by name and rank at the beginning of encounters with individuals unless doing so is not safe.

- 68. BPD agrees to prohibit interfering, threatening, intimidating, blocking or otherwise discouraging a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video (including photographs or video of police activities) in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. Such prohibited interference includes:
 - a. Ordering a person to cease taking photographs or recording video;
 - b. Demanding, absent a lawful purpose, that person's identification;
 - c. Demanding that the person state a reason why he or she is taking photographs or recording video;
 - d. Detaining, absent a lawful purpose, that person;
 - e. Intentionally blocking or obstructing cameras or recording devices (not including physical barricades or screens used as part of a tactical operation or crime scene);
 - f. Seizing and/or searching a camera or recording device without a warrant or consent of the subject possessing the device;
 - g. Using, absent a lawful purpose, force upon that person; or
 - h. Detaining or arresting an individual for violating any other law where the purpose of the detention or arrest is to prevent or retaliate for recording police activity.

A. Investigatory Stops and Detentions

- 69. BPD will reiterate, train, and emphasize that officers will only conduct investigatory stops or detentions where the officer has reasonable suspicion that a person is in the process of committing a crime, or has committed a crime.
- 70. BPD will enhance and revise its current training with respect to investigatory stops by emphasizing the following elements: (1) introducing themselves at the initiation of contact with a civilian when reasonable and practical; (2) stating the reason for an investigatory stop or detention as soon as practicable; (3) ensuring that an investigatory stop or detention is no longer than necessary to take appropriate action; (4) acting with professionalism and courtesy throughout the interaction; and (5) conducting a pat-down search only if the officer has specific and articulable facts justifying the pat-down search.

- 71. BPD will reiterate, train and emphasize to officers that race, color, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, gender identity, disability, or sexual orientation is not to be used as a factor, to any extent or degree, in establishing reasonable suspicion or probable cause, except as part of actual and credible description(s) of a specific suspect or suspects in any criminal investigation.
- 72. BPD officers shall document all stop data required by Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 and the statute's implementing regulations.
- 73. BPD will reiterate, train, and emphasize that officers should use accurate and specific descriptive language and not rely solely on "boilerplate" or form language in any reports describing factual circumstances of investigatory stops, detentions, and searches.
- 74. BPD shall collect and analyze data related to searches based on probation or parole status. BPD shall assess the efficacy of this tactic and its impact on the community and make policy changes accordingly.

B. Searches

- 75. BPD will reiterate, train, and emphasize to officers that race, color, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, gender identity, disability, or sexual orientation is not to be used in exercising discretion to conduct a search, except as part of an actual and credible description of a specific suspect or suspects in any criminal investigation.
- 76. BPD officers will not conduct arbitrary searches. The request to conduct a consensual search will be reasonable. An officer must be able to articulate a valid reason under law and BPD policy for initially having stopped an individual.
- 77. All BPD officers equipped with body-worn cameras (BWC's) or audio recorders will record all requests for consent to search and the individual's response. Where a subject is LEP, the officer shall affirmatively inform the subject in the appropriate non-English language, or arrange for the subject to be so informed in the subject's speaking language.
- 78. BPD policy shall provide that before conducting a consensual search of a residence, the officer must have an objectively reasonable belief that the individual granting the consent has the lawful authority to do so. All consensual searches of a residence must be authorized in writing,

regardless of whether they are captured by the BWC, by the individual giving consent. If consent is granted, a supervisor shall be contacted, briefed on the circumstances, and authorize approval before a search is conducted.

- 79. BPD will make clear that it is the law and BPD policy that officers will only conduct probation or parole searches of individuals when knowledge of a probation or parole search condition has been established prior to the search. BPD will work with the Monitor to develop a policy that provides guidance on this matter and that prohibits randomly or presumptively asking individuals for their probation or parole status, without first having a basis for the inquiry.
- 80. BPD shall continue to ensure that all employees, including non-sworn personnel, have completed the training required by Penal Code section 13519.4, subd. (g) and the required refresher courses as provided for in Penal Code section 13519.4, subd. (i).

C. Stop, Search, and Seizure Policies and Training

- 81. BPD shall provide all officers with initial training and periodic roll call training on its Racial or Bias-Free Based Profiling Policy at least quarterly, and dispatch personnel initial training on bias-free policing, stops, searches, and seizures, including the requirements of this Agreement, to ensure sworn personnel are capable of conducting these activities in a manner consistent with the provisions and expectations of this section and the Agreement. Such policies will be informed and adopt applicable recommendations made by the State of California Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board reports, and other recognized police best practices resources. In addition, BPD will work with the Monitor to develop a training based upon these policies that shall be taught by a qualified instructor with expertise in bias-free policing, constitutional criminal procedure, and Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment issues. The training shall:
 - a. ensure officers understand the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments and related legal restrictions on searches and seizures, including consent searches, probation and parole searches, bias-free policing, bias by proxy for all officers and dispatch personnel, as well as additional limitations under BPD policy;
 - b. address the differences between various police contacts by:

- i. the scope and level of police intrusion;
- ii. differences between probable cause, reasonable suspicion, and mere speculation; and
- iii. true voluntary consent;
- c. provide guidance on the facts and circumstances, in addition to legal and policy limitations, that should be considered in initiating, conducting, terminating, and expanding a stop or search, including consent searches and probation and parole searches;
- d. incorporate role playing scenarios and other adult-learning mechanisms to facilitate officer ability to exercise good judgment about whether and how to stop and search individuals; and
- e. provide guidance on consensual encounters, stopping and/or searching individuals for discretionary and non-violent offenses, including providing guidance about procedural justice, alternatives to conducting investigatory stops and searches, and the impact on civilians of conducting apparently arbitrary stops and searches.

D. Supervisory Review

- 82. BPD agrees to implement additional accountability and supervision practices outlined below, and ensure that existing policies are followed, to ensure that unlawful stops, searches, and seizures are detected and effectively addressed.
- 83. BPD will work with the Monitor to establish a process for sergeants to regularly audit officers. Sergeants shall continue to regularly audit their assigned officers' stop, search, and seizure documentation, in addition to arrest reports and citations, for completeness, accuracy, and legal sufficiency. Lieutenants shall ensure that at least one call from the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) log for each officer under their supervision is audited two times every 30 days. Sergeants shall conduct further review as indicated by weekly audits and other indicia, document their findings, and submit that documentation for review and approval to their manager.
- 84. If an officer's stop, search, or seizure documentation does not provide sufficient detail or articulate sufficient legal and policy justification for the action, the supervisor shall review the

action with the officer to determine whether there was sufficient legal and BPD policy justification.

- 85. BPD sergeants and lieutenants shall evaluate and enhance BPD's processes and procedures to address all violations or deficiencies in stops, searches, and seizures, including non-disciplinary corrective action for the involved officer, and/or referring the incident for disciplinary action when other corrective measures have been ineffective or ignored.
- 86. The BPD Compliance Coordinator shall track repeated violations of the provisions of this Agreement or deficiencies and the corrective action taken, if any.
- 87. BPD agrees to continue to hold accountable sergeants and lieutenants for appropriately and thoroughly reviewing reports and documentation related to stops, searches, and seizures, and requiring officers to articulate sufficient rationale under law and BPD policy.
- 88. BPD will analyze the stop data it collects under the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA), and consult with the Monitor of the Judgment on a semiannual basis to obtain supplemental recommendations from the Monitor for revisions to its policies and training, based upon that analysis.

III. RESPONDING TO AND INTERACTING WITH PEOPLE WITH BEHAVIORAL HEALTH DISABILITIES OR IN CRISIS

89. BPD will continue to evaluate and improve its policies with respect to calls involving a person in mental health crisis or suffering from a mental health disability. Among other things, this policy will continue to emphasize a preference, when responding to calls involving a person in mental health crisis or suffering from a mental health disability, that officers be dispatched who are specifically trained in dealing with these subjects and in the application of de-escalation techniques for handling such crises. Dispatch protocols will continue to emphasize preference for relying upon the Kern County Mobile Evaluation Team (MET) for handling such incidents. When MET resources are unavailable and no immediate threat of harm to others is evident, other trained personnel will be utilized if feasible, and de-escalation tactics will be given highest preference in an effort to resolve these incidents without resorting to the use of force.

- 90. Sworn staff, call takers, and dispatch personnel will receive training that emphasizes recognizing a person may be suspected of having a behavioral health disability or be in crisis by taking into account a number of factors, including self-reporting, information provided by witnesses or informants, BPD's previous knowledge of the individual, or an officer's direct observation.
- 91. Officers will be trained not to make assumptions regarding the dangerousness of an individual based on that individual's disability.
- 92. BPD will continue to use a Crisis Intervention Team Training (CIT) first-responder model of police-based crisis intervention with community, health care, and advocacy partnerships to assist individuals with behavioral health disabilities and individuals who are in crisis.
- 93. The goals of the CIT program will continue to be to equip officers with methods to properly interact safely with persons with behavioral health disabilities or in crisis; de-escalate crises and reduce the unnecessary use of force against individuals with behavioral health disabilities or in crisis; minimize arrests; improve the safety of patrol officers, individuals with behavioral health disabilities or in crisis and their families, and others within the community; refer individuals to Kern County's behavioral health crisis system; and reduce the potential for an inappropriate involvement of individuals with behavioral health disabilities with the criminal justice system.
- 94. BPD will continue to work toward ensuring all patrol officers receive a 40-hour CIT training. BPD will continue to provide CIT training to all cadets in its academies and all lateral transfers. In addition, sworn personnel who are newly promoted to a supervisory position shall receive a refresher CIT training as part of their leadership training.
- 95. BPD will continue to provide CIT training on responding to individuals in crisis to all of its recruits and will continue working toward training all officers. BPD will work with the Monitor to determine the necessary amount of in-service training. The annual training will be adequate for officers to demonstrate competence in the subject matter and will include specified topics.

- 96. All BPD dispatchers, and their supervisors will receive CIT training that is adequate to enable them to identify, dispatch, and appropriately respond to calls for service that involve individuals in crisis.
- 97. Within 180 days of the effective date of this Agreement, BPD will designate a sworn employee at the rank of sergeant or above to act as a Crisis Intervention Coordinator (Coordinator) to better facilitate communication between BPD and members of the behavioral health provider community and to increase the effectiveness of BPD's crisis intervention program. BPD will ensure that the Coordinator is empowered to fulfill all duties of the Coordinator required by this Agreement.
- 98. BPD will develop a protocol to evaluate the effectiveness of its policies for responding to calls for service involving a person in crisis or with a mental health disability. The protocol will include audits and improvement loops to be developed by the Monitor in consultation with the DOJ.
- 99. BPD will work with the Monitor to include as part of its commendation policy an award or commendation that recognizes employees who demonstrate exceptional skill in employing their CIT training in the field.

IV. MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISORY OVERSIGHT

- 100. BPD will, in consultation with the Monitor and with approval by the DOJ, continue to develop and implement policies, guidelines, and training to ensure all supervisors and managers, (a) exercise appropriate supervisory oversight of use of force incidents, (b) conduct objective and impartial investigations of those matters, (c) remain accountable for meeting agency standards and expectations, (d) engage with and listen to community feedback, (e) incorporate community feedback when able and appropriate, and (f) develop and evaluate policing strategies and tactics reflective of contemporary best police practices.
- 101. BPD will, in consultation with the Monitor and approval by DOJ, also develop and implement mandatory supervisory training in accord with contemporary police practices that will include techniques for effectively guiding and directing the actions of their subordinate personnel,

promoting effective and constitutional police practices, and stressing the importance of deescalating conflict situations whenever possible.

102. BPD will, in consultation with the Monitor and approval by the DOJ, develop specific metrics and guidelines for evaluating the effectiveness of the supervision of its officers, and perform evaluations based on these metrics and guidelines on an annual basis. Based on its review of this practice, the Monitor and/or DOJ will make supplemental recommendations as to revisions to the metrics and guidelines to continue to improve the effectiveness of the supervision of BPD's officers.

103. All policies, metrics and guidelines will incorporate processes for internal or external reviews, audits, and/or continuous improvement loops in order to ensure the reforms are effective and sustainable.

V. LANGUAGE ACCESS

104. BPD agrees to effectively communicate with and continue to provide timely and meaningful access to police services to all members of the Bakersfield community, regardless of their limited ability to speak, read, write, hear, or understand English. To achieve this outcome, BPD agrees to:

- a. work and meaningfully engage with its community advisory panel or working group and community stakeholders to develop and implement a language access policy that is consistent with Title VI of the United States Code (42 U.S.C. § 2000d et seq.), to provide meaningful access to BPD programs and services for individuals who have a limited ability to speak, read, write, or understand English, and for individuals that are hard of hearing or deaf;
- b. jointly designate, with the City of Bakersfield, a language access coordinator who will coordinate with BPD and review BPD's language access policy for compliance with applicable federal and California law;
- c. provide training on its language access plan for all officers, communication supervisors, call-takers, and dispatchers that addresses procedures consistent with BPD policy for responding to calls requiring language access services.

105. BPD will consult with the Monitor, DOJ and the language access coordinator to review its language access policies to ensure that the services provided align with the community needs and how these services compare with similar entities.

VI. RECRUITMENT, HIRING, AND PROMOTIONS

A. Recruitment of Sworn Personnel

- 106. To maintain high-level, quality service, ensure officer safety and accountability, and promote constitutional, effective policing, BPD and the City's Human Resources Department will continue to review and revise as necessary its recruitment and hiring program to ensure that BPD continues to successfully attract and hire a diverse group of qualified individuals.
- 107. According to the timeline specified in the Monitoring Plan, discussed in detail below, BPD and the City's Human Resources Department will continue its development of a written Recruitment Plan that includes clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that reflects the diversity of the Bakersfield community.
 - 108. The Recruitment Plan will, at a minimum, require the following:
 - a. Broad distribution of recruitment information, including information regarding career opportunities, compensation, the testing and hiring process, and applicable deadlines and requirements. Such information will, at a minimum, be readily accessible on the BPD and the City's Human Resources Department websites and available upon request to BPD or City officials;
 - b. That candidates continue to be allowed to submit initial applications online to the City's Human Resources Department;
 - c. Opportunities for officers, civilians, and members of City government to continue to assist BPD's efforts to attract a broad spectrum of qualified applicants;
 - d. That the City and BPD allow for continuous written testing for peace officer applicants;
 - e. Recruitment outreach to a broad spectrum of community stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of its ranks, including race and gender, and applicants who are community policing and problem-solving oriented. BPD and the City will continue to

explore opportunities for youth in the City's high schools to gain exposure to policing through internship or other programs, and create ways to support interested youth in fulfilling the requirements to join BPD; and

- f. Expanding diverse hiring efforts, including outreach to national organizations and resources which can assist and support BPD in their efforts to target and attract qualified candidates who better reflect the community's demographics and can help meet the needs and expectations of under-represented populations.
- 109. The Recruitment Plan will be submitted for the Monitor and DOJ's approval. BPD, the City's Human Resources Department, and the Monitor will meet and confer to resolve any objections the Monitor notes. BPD and the City's Human Resources Department will implement the Recruitment Plan upon approval and as required by the Monitoring Plan.

B. Hiring

- 110. BPD and the City's Human Resources Department, with the aid of the Monitor, will conduct an in-depth review of BPD's current hiring processes for officers and City hiring criteria, to assess whether any process, criterion, or requirement has a disparate impact based on a demographic category. If BPD and the City's Human Resources Department or the Monitor determines that any step in the hiring process may result in a disparate impact based on demographic category, BPD, the City's Human Resources Department, and the Monitor will determine whether there are reasonable alternative selection procedures available that would comply with City requirements and serve the City's needs while having less of a disparate impact, and if so, BPD and the City will implement those alternative selection procedures.
- 111. BPD and the City will work with the Monitor to evaluate whether the written entrance examination has a disproportionate impact based upon race and/or gender, and if so whether the examination should be modified to reduce or eliminate the disparity.
- 112. BPD and the City will work with the Monitor to evaluate whether the preinvestigative background questionnaire and personal history statement provided by Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and any other materials utilized have a disproportionate impact

are made without favoritism or unlawful discrimination; increase transparency and officer

awareness about the promotions process and promotions decisions, including, but not limited to, identifying criteria for promotions; and incorporate enhanced strategies for promoting qualified applicants who reflect a broad cross-section of the Bakersfield community.

- 119. The City's Human Resources Department and BPD will report annually to the City Council, and to the public, on their websites, BPD's promotional activities and outcomes, including the number of applicants, interviewees, and selectees, categorized by gender, race, ethnicity, and national origin.
- 120. The City's Human Resources Department and BPD shall evaluate the promotion plan every two years, to assess BPD's promotions processes for the ranks of senior officer, detective, sergeant, lieutenant, and captain, to ensure that its policies and practices comply with the law, are transparent, and are consistent with the Agreement. The assessment will include the senior officer, sergeant, detective, lieutenant, captain, and assistant chief promotions processes. The senior officer, sergeant, detective, lieutenant, captain, and assistant chief promotions assessment, at a minimum, will identify:
 - a. The processes by which BPD selects candidates for promotion to senior officer, sergeant, detective, lieutenant, captain, and assistant chief who possess a core set of competencies, characteristics, and capabilities and, when applicable, who are effective supervisors in compliance with BPD policy and the Agreement;
 - b. Methods for consideration of each candidate's work history, including disciplinary actions taken and commendations received, in the selection process;
 - c. Department strategies for promoting qualified applicants who reflect a broad cross-section of the City's community;
 - d. The frequency with which BPD and the City's Human Resources Department should hold promotional exams;
 - e. Opportunities to increase transparency and officer awareness about the promotions process and promotions decisions, including, but not limited to, identifying criteria for promotions; and

f. Recommendations for any modifications to the current promotions processes that would enable BPD and the City's Human Resources Department to address the requirements of this section.

- 121. Within 60 days of the completion of the promotions assessment, BPD and the City will develop an implementation plan to respond to any recommendations identified in the assessment, including any recommended modifications to the promotions processes and a timeline for implementation. Upon completion, the results of the assessment and its implementation plan will be provided to the Monitor for review and approval. Within 120 days of receiving the Monitor's approval, BPD and the City's Human Resources Department will begin to implement the plan.
- 122. Within one year of the Effective Date of the Judgment, BPD and the City's Human Resources Department will identify and publish, both internally and externally, for the ranks of senior officer, detective, sergeant, lieutenant, captain, and assistant chief, the duties, eligibility criteria, knowledge, skills, and abilities considered to select qualified candidates who are effective supervisors in compliance with City policy and this Judgment.
- 123. Within one year of the Effective Date of this Agreement, BPD and the City's Human Resources Department will develop strategies to increase transparency and awareness about the promotions process for the ranks of senior officer, detective, sergeant, lieutenant, captain, and assistant chief, including, but not limited to, criteria for promotions and promotion decisions.
- 124. The Bakersfield City Council will prepare a proposed charter amendment for the November 2022 General Election which will seek to permit the appointment of a person from an external agency to the position of Chief of Police.

VII. COMMUNITY POLICING

125. BPD agrees to enhance, promote, and strengthen partnerships within the community, to continue engaging constructively with the community to ensure collaborative problem-solving and bias-free policing, and to increase transparency and community confidence in BPD. To achieve this outcome, BPD agrees to implement the requirements set forth below. As noted above, BPD also agrees to form and maintain a community advisory panel or working group, and

to develop and amend its use of force policies, community policing strategy and policies, biasfree policing policies, and civilian complaint policies with input from the community advisory panel or working group and other stakeholders within the community.

126. BPD will agree to develop a strategic plan to meaningfully engage with community stakeholders and work with its newly formed community advisory panel or working group, as described below, in developing the revised policies described above.

A. Community and Problem-Oriented Policing

- 127. BPD agrees to broaden its current efforts to actively participate in community engagement efforts, including participating in local community meetings, making itself available for community feedback, and working with the community on the development of diversion programs. BPD agrees to enhance its engagement with all members of the community, including its critics. BPD agrees to create additional easy points of access for community feedback and input, such as providing "community feedback" or "talk to your lieutenant" links on its website and social media pages.
- 128. A variety of sworn personnel, up through the chain of command, shall continue to actively attend community meetings and events. BPD agrees to develop a plan for such attendance. The plan shall indicate the number and types of events to be attended on a regular basis and take into account the need to enhance relationships with particular groups within the community, including, but not limited to, youth, LEP individuals, and communities of color.
- 129. BPD agrees to provide structured annual in-service training on community policing and problem-oriented policing methods and skills for all officers, including unit supervisors and lieutenants. This training shall include:
 - a. methods and strategies to improve public safety and crime prevention through community engagement;
 - b. scenario-based training, including roll call training, that promotes the development of new partnerships between BPD and the community targeting problem solving and prevention;
 - c. leadership, ethics, and interpersonal skills;

d. community engagement techniques, including how to establish formal partnership
and actively engage community organizations, including youth, immigrant, and
LGBTQ+ communities;
e. problem-oriented policing tactics for both employees and community members;
f. conflict resolution and verbal de-escalation of conflict; and

- g. cultural awareness and sensitivity training.
- 130. BPD will continue to incorporate into its organizational strategies and policing philosophy the Final Report of The President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing and its concepts.
- 131. To continually improve police-community partnerships, BPD will assess and report on the impact of community engagement initiatives. BPD will issue annual public reports and post them on its website, on its community engagement efforts, identifying successes, obstacles, and recommendations for future improvement.
- 132. BPD agrees to seek the assistance of its community advisory panel or working group and community advocates in widely disseminating information to the public, in English and Spanish, and as set forth in other requirements of this Agreement.

B. Community Survey

- 133. BPD agrees to assist the Monitor in conducting a reliable, comprehensive, and representative biennial survey of members of the City community regarding their experiences with and perceptions of BPD and of public safety.
- 134. To conduct the biennial community survey, the City shall provide funding for the Monitor, as part of the City's annual budget set forth below to select and retain an individual or entity that shall:
 - a. develop a baseline of measures on public satisfaction with policing, attitudes among police personnel, and the quality of police-citizen encounters;
 - b. design, conduct, and analyze baseline and subsequent annual surveys of a representative sample of City residents, law enforcement personnel, and detained arrestees;

- c. review and consider prior law enforcement surveys in Bakersfield and other cities, in designing the survey;
- d. engage in formal and informal conversation with City residents, BPD officers and command staff, and DOJ representatives, and observe community meetings;
- e. ensure that the resident and arrestee surveys are designed to capture a representative sample of City residents including members of each demographic category; conduct the survey in English, Spanish, and other languages as necessary to ensure representation of the entire Bakersfield community; and
- f. formally discuss the survey methodology with BPD supervisors and DOJ and consider these opinions in the development of the initial survey and improvements to subsequent surveys.
- 135. BPD agrees to cooperate with the design and conduct of the survey by, for example, helping to organize focus groups of officers and obtaining and providing previous survey instruments and data.
- 136. The report of the baseline survey and subsequent annual surveys shall be publicly distributed and posted on the BPD website.

VIII. PERSONNEL COMPLAINT REVIEW

137. BPD will continue to ensure that all allegations of personnel misconduct are received and documented, are fully and impartially investigated, adjudicated based on a preponderance of the evidence, and that all personnel who commit misconduct are held accountable pursuant to a disciplinary system that is fair and consistent. To achieve these outcomes, BPD and the City agree to implement the requirements below.

A. Complaint Intake

138. BPD shall continue to make personnel complaint forms and informational materials, including brochures and posters, available at appropriate City or municipal properties in Bakersfield, including, at a minimum, BPD stations, courts, City libraries, and the BPD website and social media sites, and shall make a concerted effort to provide them to community groups, churches, and other non-governmental stakeholders.

139. BPD will continue to accept all personnel complaints, including anonymous and third-party complaints, for review and investigation. Complaints may be made in writing or verbally, in person or by mail, telephone (or TDD), facsimile, or electronic mail, as well as in the field. Any LEP individual who wishes to file a complaint about a BPD officer or employee shall be provided with a complaint form and informational materials in the appropriate non-English language and/or be provided appropriate translation services in order to file a complaint.

- 140. The refusal to accept a personnel complaint, discouraging the filing of a complaint, or providing false or misleading information about filing a complaint, shall continue to be grounds for discipline, up to and including termination.
- 141. BPD's civilian complaint policies and procedures will be amended to incorporate, at minimum, the best practices contained in the California Racial & Identity Profiling Advisory Board's 2019 Annual Report, at pages 41-44.
- 142. BPD will make its complaint brochure that explains the complaint procedures available in Spanish or any other language that the City must provide to voters during an election. BPD will also amend its website so that complaint forms can be submitted electronically.
- 143. BPD will amend its complaint form to collect the information delineated in the California Racial & Identity Profiling Advisory Board's 2020 Annual Report, at pages 82-84. The complaint form and information provided on the website shall be amended to state that retaliation for making a complaint or cooperating in a complaint investigation is contrary to BPD policy.

B. Complaint Classification

- 144. BPD will enhance its complaint investigation related policies, to ensure that they are complete, clear and consistent. BPD will implement mechanisms to ensure that all personnel allegations are accurately classified at all investigative stages, from intake through adjudication, so that each allegation receives the appropriate level of review required under policy.
- 145. BPD will ensure that personnel complaints are not misclassified as inquiries. Toward this end BPD, as approved by the Monitor and DOJ, will establish a clear definition to identify what conduct constitutes a civilian complaint. The definition of a civilian complaint should

include the Internet posting of a video by a community member, depicting apparent officer misconduct towards a community member and other non-traditional sources of complaints. Any contact from the public designated as a public inquiry must also be reviewed by Internal Affairs. Internal Affairs shall independently review the contact to determine whether it should be categorized as civilian complaint or public inquiry. BPD will agree to modernize its public inquiry system.

- 146. In consultation with the Monitor and subject to DOJ approval, BPD will revise policies to clarify and strengthen requirements related to which allegations of misconduct by BPD personnel, if true, would require imposition of discipline, as opposed to non-disciplinary action, to address the misconduct.
- 147. BPD shall continue to investigate every allegation of misconduct that arises during an investigation, even if an allegation is not specifically articulated as such by the complainant and will work with the monitor to enhance this process.
- 148. In order to ensure that all personnel complaint investigations are thorough, fair, and resolved in a timely and appropriate manner, BPD will continue to designate Internal Affairs to serve as central coordinator and quality control hub for all personnel complaint intake, investigation, adjudication and review processes, even for those cases not requiring a full administrative investigation. BPD will work with the Monitor to enhance this process.

C. Investigations

149. All investigations of BPD personnel complaints, including reviews, shall continue to be as thorough as necessary to reach reliable and complete findings, and the investigation shall address all substantive issues raised by the reporting party. In each investigation, BPD shall consider all relevant evidence, including circumstantial, direct, and physical evidence, as appropriate, and make credibility determinations based upon that evidence. BPD investigators will not use leading questions when interviewing officers and will not permit officers to submit a written statement in lieu of an interview with investigators. There will continue to be no automatic preference for an officer's statement over a non-officer's statement, nor will BPD disregard a witness' statement merely because the witness has some connection to the

complainant or because of any criminal history. BPD shall continue to make efforts to resolve material inconsistencies between witness statements. BPD will work with the Monitor to enhance this process.

- 150. BPD will continue not to permit any involved supervisor, any supervisor who authorized the conduct that led to the complaint, or any supervisor who has a conflict with the BPD personnel subject to the investigation to conduct the investigation into the complaint.
- 151. The misconduct investigator shall seek to identify all persons at the scene giving rise to a misconduct allegation, including all BPD officers. The investigator will make all reasonable efforts to interview all witnesses and any other person at the scene giving rise to the misconduct allegation. The investigator shall note in the investigative report the identities of all officers and persons who were on the scene but assert they did not witness and were not involved in the incident. The investigator shall conduct further investigation of any such assertions that appear unsupported by the evidence.
- 152. All witnesses, including, if authorized by the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act, officers witnessing or involved in an incident that becomes the subject of a personnel complaint, shall provide a written statement regarding their involvement in and/or observations of the incident, or be interviewed as described below.
- 153. Consistent with current policy, interviews shall continue to be recorded. BPD will also conduct all interviews separately. An interpreter not involved in the underlying complaint will be used when taking statements or conducting interviews of any LEP complainant or witness.
- 154. Every BPD misconduct investigation should include a comprehensive investigative summary to ensure that the evidentiary bases for the investigation's findings are clearly supported and accessible to command staff who make disciplinary recommendations.

D. Management Review and Adjudication of Complaints

155. All personnel investigations shall continue to be reviewed and approved in writing by the accused employee's commanding officer. The reviewing commanding officer shall continue to ensure that all substantive allegations were identified and investigated, even if the allegation

was not specifically articulated by the complainant. BPD will work with the Monitor to enhance this process.

- 156. The reviewing commanding officer will continue to adjudicate each substantive allegation using the preponderance of evidence standard and classify each allegation using the Penal Code standards of Sustained, Not Sustained, Exonerated, or Unfounded (Pen. Code, §§ 832.5, 13012).
- 157. When an allegation is sustained, the reviewing commanding officers will continue to recommend the appropriate corrective action or penalty, taking into consideration the seriousness of the offense, the offense's impact on the community, and the employee's work history. BPD will work with the Monitor to enhance this process.
- 158. To ensure fairness, transparency, and predictability, BPD will codify its disciplinary recommendation process to ensure that discipline is uniformly applied and takes into account the 1) seriousness of the offense; 2) impact or potential impact on the Department and its members; 3) employee's work history and acceptance of responsibility; 4) employee's prior disciplinary history; and 5) impact on public trust.
- 159. The reviewing commanding officers will continue to ensure that the disposition of each complaint and allegation(s) therein are recorded accurately in the Department's database used to track such employee actions.

E. Complaint Review and Investigation Training

- 160. BPD agrees to provide updated and revised training to officers and supervisors about proper complaint intake, classification, and investigation techniques. BPD will provide training about how to record complaints from individuals who may not be proficient in English, and the consequences for failing to properly take and objectively investigate complaints from the public.
- 161. All personnel involved in conducting personnel complaint investigations at BPD shall receive initial training on conducting these misconduct investigations and shall receive refresher training each year. This training shall include instruction in:
 - a. investigative skills, including proper interrogation and interview techniques, gathering and objectively analyzing evidence, and data and case management;

2.5

b. the particular challenges of personnel complaint reviews/investigations, including
identifying alleged misconduct that is not clearly stated in the complaint or that becomes
apparent during the investigation, properly weighing credibility of both civilian witnesses
and officers, using objective evidence to resolve inconsistent statements, and the proper
application of the preponderance of the evidence standard;

- c. relevant state, local, and federal law, including state employment law related to officers and the rights of public employees, as well as criminal discovery rules such as those set out in *Garrity v. New Jersey* (1967) 385 U.S. 493, *Lybarger v. City of Los Angeles* (1985) 40 Cal.3d 822, and *Brady v. Maryland* (1963) 373 U.S. 83; and
- d. BPD rules and policies, including the requirements of this Agreement, and protocols related to criminal and administrative investigations of alleged officer misconduct.
- 162. All personnel responsible for the review of personnel complaint investigations at BPD shall receive initial training on reviewing personnel complaint investigations and shall receive refresher training annually thereafter. The training shall include instruction in:
 - a. Ensuring that all witnesses and accused officers are accounted for in the investigation and that they are asked about allegations they may have witnessed or in which they were allegedly involved;
 - b. Ensuring that summarized statements accurately reflect the recorded interviews;
 - c. Ensuring that evidence is identified, analyzed, and interpreted in the investigation;
 - d. Ensuring any risk-management issues are identified and addressed, such as inadequate policies, insufficient training, inadequate or inoperable safety equipment, and ineffective field supervision;
 - e. Determining the appropriate corrective action and/or penalty, when appropriate; and
 - f. Relevant state and local laws dealing with conducting personnel investigations and disciplinary actions.

F. Personnel Complaint Audits

163. BPD shall conduct an annual, randomized audit of BPD's complaint intake, classification, investigations, and the adjudication of those matters. This audit will assess

whether complaints are accepted and classified consistent with policy, investigations are complete, and complaint dispositions are consistent with a preponderance of the evidence. Audits will be submitted through the chain of command to the Chief for a determination regarding recommendations made and further action required.

164. BPD will, on a quarterly basis, submit a report to the Monitor identifying all cases in which employees were found to have committed misconduct, and detailing the steps taken to hold them accountable for their conduct. The Monitor will then submit a report to BPD and to DOJ providing its expert opinion as to whether the cases identified and the steps taken have been sufficient or insufficient, and provide recommendations as to improvements, if any, that should be made to the process for holding such personnel accountable.

165. BPD's Internal Affairs Unit will regularly assess the effectiveness of the complaint process; analyze the complaints to determine if there is a need for a re-evaluation of existing policies, procedures, or trainings; ensure regular audits of complaint investigations to ensure the quality of those investigations, summarized statements accurately reflect recorded interviews, and standards are being met; and make reports of complaint statistics available to the public on a regular basis. BPD will also utilize its Internal Affairs Division to assess the effectiveness of its complaint process, and the process for determining which complaints are investigated by Internal Affairs Division.

166. BPD will publish an annual report of personnel complaint data that reflects the categories of complaints received and the final disposition of those complaint investigations that have been completed as well as the status of any complaint investigations still pending. The report will be made available to the public on BPD's public website, once approved by the Chief and the Monitor. This report will reflect data for the preceding calendar year and will be released by April 1 of each year.

MONITORING

167. This Stipulated Judgment shall be overseen by a qualified third-party Monitor, who shall be provided complete access to BPD's and the City's information and documents to ensure compliance with this Judgment and whose reasonable costs and expenses shall be paid for by the

City. The City is committed to allocating all costs necessary to comply with the terms of the Judgment, and if the City believes that any Monitoring costs are not reasonable, the City shall meet and confer with DOJ within 15 days of the receipt of each invoice. The Monitor shall provide the DOJ and the City with monthly invoices detailing each expense along with any documentation necessary to justify each expense.

A. Selection of Monitor

- 168. Within 15 days of the service of the Notice of Entry of Judgment, the Parties shall meet and confer to select a Monitor and/or monitoring team (Monitor) to oversee the terms of this Judgment. As described in greater detail below, the Monitor will assess the City's progress in implementing, and achieving compliance with, the Judgment; report on the status of implementation to the Parties and the Court; work with the Parties to address any barriers to compliance; and assist the Parties to informally resolve disputes or differences should they emerge.
- 169. The Monitor shall be subject to the supervision of DOJ, consistent with this Judgment and the Monitoring Plan, as defined below. The Monitor shall have the duties, responsibilities, and authority necessary to carry out the terms of the Judgment. The Monitor shall not, and is not intended to, replace or assume the role and duties of the Chief of Police or of the DOJ.
- 170. In order to assess and report on BPD's implementation of this Judgment and whether implementation is resulting in constitutional policing, the Monitor shall conduct qualitative and quantitative compliance reviews, audits, and outcome assessments as specified below, and such additional audits, reviews, and assessments that the Monitor or Parties deem appropriate.

B. Compliance Reviews and Audits

- 171. The Monitor shall conduct compliance reviews or audits as necessary to determine whether BPD has implemented and continues to comply with the Material Requirements of this Judgment. A "Material Requirement" in this Judgment is a requirement of the Judgment that has a significant relationship to achieving the purposes of this Judgment.
- 172. To achieve "Full and Effective Compliance" under this Judgment, the City and BPD must demonstrate that they have (a) incorporated all Material Requirements of this Judgment into

policy, (b) trained relevant personnel as necessary to fulfill their responsibilities pursuant to the Material Requirements, and (c) ensured that each Material Requirement is being carried out in practice. No specific numerical test shall be required to demonstrate Full and Effective Compliance, so long as BPD is demonstrating substantial compliance and adherence with the Material Requirements, continual improvement, and the overall purpose of the Material Requirements has been met. Non-compliance with mere technicalities, or temporary or isolated failure to comply during a period of otherwise sustained compliance, will not constitute failure to achieve or maintain Full and Effective Compliance. At the same time, temporary compliance during a period of otherwise sustained noncompliance will not constitute compliance with this Judgment.

- 173. Compliance reviews and audits will contain both qualitative and quantitative elements as necessary for reliability and comprehensiveness. Where appropriate, the Monitor will make use of audits conducted by BPD's Quality Assurance Unit, taking into account the importance of internal auditing capacity and independent assessment of this Judgment.
- 174. Where the Monitor recommends and the Parties agree, the Monitor may refrain from conducting a compliance audit or review of a requirement previously and consistently found to be in compliance by the Monitor pursuant to audit or review. Thereafter, BPD and/or the City will be deemed to have achieved compliance with those requirements for purposes of this Judgment, absent evidence to the contrary.
- 175. The Monitor, in conjunction with BPD, will conduct an ongoing audit of incidents where an officer brandishes a firearm in the presence of a member of the public. The audit will include a review of all civilian complaints and an appropriate sample of police reports, including use of force incidents, related to any use or such brandishing of a firearm.

C. Outcome Assessments

176. In addition to compliance reviews and audits, the Monitor shall conduct qualitative and quantitative outcome assessments to measure whether BPD's implementation of this Agreement has eliminated practices that resulted in DOJ's filing of the complaint. These

sufficiently complete, provided that the Monitor has determined, and the Parties agree, that this data is reasonably reliable and complete.

D. Monitoring Plan and Review Methodology

Monitoring Plan

178. The Monitor will develop and complete a Monitoring Plan, including proposed deadlines for implementation for conducting the compliance reviews and audits (Monitoring Plan). It is the Parties' intent that the development of the Monitoring Plan will likely require input from BPD, and BPD agrees to work with the Monitor toward this end. This Monitoring Plan will include specific deadlines and timelines for the first year of implementation of the Judgment, including: (1) deadlines for the development of policies and training materials, and (2) schedules for conducting compliance reviews and outcome assessments. The Monitoring Plan will be submitted to DOJ for approval within 90 days of the Monitor's appointment.

179. Upon approval by DOJ, the Monitor will submit the Monitoring Plan to BPD for final review and approval. BPD will have 30 days to either approve or propose changes to the Monitoring Plan. If BPD proposes changes, the Monitor and DOJ will have 15 days to accept or object to those changes. If the Monitor and DOJ object to any of the proposed changes, the Monitor will provide the rationale for the objection, in writing, and the Parties will attempt to confer to resolve the disagreement.

- 180. If after good faith attempts, disagreement regarding the Monitoring Plan remains unresolved between the Parties and/or Monitor so that the Monitoring Plan is not approved by the Parties, and the disagreement remains unresolved, the Monitor will make the final determination.
- 181. For each subsequent year, the Monitor will develop a detailed Monitoring Plan for implementation of the Judgment. The approval of the subsequent Monitoring Plans will follow the same process as that set forth in paragraphs 178 through 180 of this Judgment.
- 182. At least 30 days prior to the initiation of any outcome measure assessment or compliance review, the Monitor shall submit a proposed methodology for the assessment or review to the Parties. The Parties shall submit any comments or concerns they have regarding the proposed methodology to the Monitor within 15 days of receipt of the Monitor's notification.

The Monitor shall modify the methodology as necessary to address any concerns, or shall inform the Parties in writing of the reasons they are not modifying the methodology as proposed.

Development of Policies, Procedures, and Training

- 183. BPD will submit all related policies, training curricula, and lesson plans required to be written, revised, or maintained by the Agreement to the Monitor and DOJ prior to publication and implementation. The Parties will share draft policies and meet as needed to reach agreement on whether revised policies and training materials are in compliance with the requirements of the Judgment, the Constitution, federal and statutory law, best practices, and current professional standards.
- 184. Forty-five days before a compliance deadline, as set out in the Monitoring Plan, the Parties will submit the policy, training curriculum or lesson plan to the Monitor for review. The Monitor will provide written comments to DOJ and BPD, which the DOJ shall consider in determining whether to approve the policy, training curriculum, and lesson plan.
- 185. If BPD, DOJ, and the Monitor do not all agree that the policy, training curriculum or lesson plan is consistent with this Agreement, legal requirements, and best practices, either Party or the Monitor will provide the rationale for its objection in writing and the Parties and Monitor will attempt to confer to resolve the disagreement. If the disagreement remains unresolved, DOJ will make the final determination.
- 186. BPD will begin implementation of policies and procedures within 30 days of DOJ approval or the Court's decision if a dispute arises, unless otherwise specified or agreed to by the Parties in the Monitoring Plan.
- 187. Within 30 days after issuing a policy or procedure pursuant to this Judgment, BPD shall ensure that all relevant BPD personnel have received, read, and understand their responsibilities pursuant to the policy or procedure, including the requirement that each officer or employee report violations of policy; that supervisors of all ranks shall be held accountable for identifying and responding to policy or procedure violations by personnel under their command; and that personnel will be held accountable for policy and procedure violations. BPD shall document that each relevant BPD officer or other employee has received, read, and sufficiently

understands policy. Training beyond roll-call or similar training will be necessary for many new policies to ensure officers understand and can perform their duties pursuant to the policy.

- 188. Within 180 days from the Effective Date of the Judgment, BPD shall ensure that each BPD sworn personnel member attends a training briefing on the content of this Judgment and the responsibilities of each officer and employee pursuant to it. BPD shall begin providing this training briefing within 45 days of the Effective Date of the Judgment.
- 189. All training will include periodic testing to ensure that employees are appropriately comprehending, retaining, and applying the knowledge and skills conveyed during the training required by the Agreement. Based on results of testing, BPD will provide additional periodic training as needed to officers, supervisors, and lieutenants that is sufficient in duration and scope to ensure that all officers can consistently and effectively carry out BPD's policies.
- 190. BPD shall completely and accurately record information regarding BPD officers' training attendance.

E. Monitor Recommendations and Assessments

- 191. The Monitor may also make recommendations to the Parties regarding measures necessary to ensure timely, Full and Effective Compliance with the Judgment and its underlying objectives. Such recommendations may include a recommendation to change, modify, or amend a provision of the Judgment, a recommendation for additional training related to the Judgment, or a recommendation to seek technical assistance.
- 192. The Monitor may also, at the request of either Party, provide technical assistance consistent with the Agreement.
- 193. The Monitor shall conduct a comprehensive assessment one year after the Effective Date to determine whether and to what extent: (1) the outcomes intended by the Agreement have been achieved, and (2) any modifications to the Judgment are necessary for continued achievement in light of changed circumstances or unanticipated impact (or lack of impact) of a requirement. Based upon this comprehensive assessment, the Monitor shall recommend what modifications to the Judgment, if any, are necessary to achieve and sustain intended outcomes. Where the Parties agree with the Monitor's recommendations, the Parties shall work to adopt

mutually acceptable modifications of the Judgment. BPD will have the option to delay this comprehensive assessment for one additional year if they deem this to be the appropriate time period for the comprehensive assessment. If BPD decides to seek this delay of the comprehensive assessment, they will advise the Monitor and DOJ within six months of the Effective Date of this Judgment.

F. Monitor Reports

- 194. The Monitor will issue to DOJ and BPD a report every year that details the progress in implementing the Judgment and achieving compliance with the Judgment. The reports will include:
 - a. a description of the work conducted by the Monitor during the reporting period;
 - b. a listing of each Judgment requirement indicating which requirements have been: (1) incorporated into policy; (2) the subject of sufficient training for all relevant BPD officers and employees; (3) reviewed or audited by the Monitor to determine whether they have been fully implemented in actual practice, including the date of the review or audit; and (4) found by the Monitor to have been fully implemented in practice;
 - c. the methodology and specific findings for each audit or review conducted, redacted as necessary for privacy concerns. The underlying data for each audit or review will not be publicly available but will be retained by the Monitor and provided to either or both Parties upon request;
 - d. for any requirements that were reviewed or audited and found not to have been fully implemented in practice, the Monitor's recommendations regarding necessary steps to achieve compliance;
 - e. the methodology and specific findings for each outcome assessment conducted; and
 - f. a qualitative assessment of BPD's progress in achieving the desired outcomes for each area covered by the Judgment, noting issues of concern or particular achievement; and a projection of the work to be completed during the upcoming reporting period and any anticipated challenges or concerns related to implementation of, and achieving compliance with, the Judgment.

195. The Monitor shall provide a copy of the reports to the Parties in draft form at least 30 days prior to its due date. The Parties will meet to discuss any comments on the report, and the Monitor shall consider the Parties' comments and edit the report if appropriate before issuing the report.

196. The reports shall be public with the exception of material covered by applicable privacy or confidentiality laws. Any parts of the reports that identify specific officers or supervisors will not be made public. To facilitate public access to the reports, BPD shall post the reports to its public website.

197. Except as required or authorized by the terms of this Agreement or the Parties acting together, the Monitor, including, for the purposes of this paragraph, any agent, employee, or independent contractor thereof, shall not make any public statements or issue findings with regard to any act or omission of BPD, or their agents, representatives, or employees; or disclose non-public information provided to the Monitor pursuant to this Agreement. Prior to making any press statement regarding their employment or monitoring activities under this Agreement, the Monitor shall first provide notice to both the DOJ and BPD and obtain prior authorization from DOJ.

G. Public Statements, Testimony, and Conflicts of Interest

198. The Monitor may testify as to their observations, findings, and recommendations before the Court with jurisdiction over this matter; however, no Monitor shall testify in any other litigation or proceeding with regard to any act or omission of BPD or any of its agents, representatives, or employees related to this Agreement or regarding any matter or subject that the Monitor may have received knowledge of as a result of his or her performance under this Agreement. This paragraph does not apply to any proceeding before a court related to performance of contracts or subcontracts for Monitoring this Agreement.

199. Unless such conflict is waived by the Parties, the Monitor shall not accept employment or provide consulting services that would present a conflict of interest with the Monitor's responsibilities under this Agreement, including being retained (on a paid or unpaid basis) by any current or future litigant or claimant, or such litigant's or claimant's attorney, in

connection with a claim or suit against BPD, the City, or its departments, officers, agents, or employees. This provision does not preclude the Monitor from being retained by DOJ on other matters unrelated to BPD.

- 200. The Monitor is not a state or local agency, or an agent thereof, and accordingly the records maintained by the Monitor shall not be deemed public records subject to public inspection.
- 201. The Monitor shall not be liable for any claim, lawsuit, or demand arising out of the Monitor's performance pursuant to this Agreement.

H. Communication Between Monitor and Parties

202. The Monitor will maintain regular contact with the Parties in order to ensure effective and timely communication regarding the status of the BPD's implementation of, and compliance with, the Agreement. To facilitate this communication, the Monitor will conduct meetings every two months, or as needed, which will include participation by BPD, representatives of the City Attorney's office, and DOJ.

I. Access and Confidentiality

- 203. To facilitate its work, the Monitor may conduct on-site visits and assessments without prior notice to the City or BPD. The Monitor shall have access to all necessary individuals, facilities, and documents, which shall include access to Agreement-related trainings, meetings, and reviews such as critical incident reviews, executive force review committee meetings, and disciplinary hearings.
- 204. The City or BPD shall provide the Monitor with office space and reasonable office support, such as office furniture, secure internet access, telephone, secure document storage, and photocopying, faxing, and scanning equipment, that the Monitor may require while in the City.
- 205. BPD shall ensure that the Monitor shall have full and direct access to all City and BPD staff, employees, and facilities that the Monitor reasonably deems necessary to carry out the duties assigned to the Monitor by this Agreement. The Monitor shall cooperate with the City and BPD to access people and facilities in a reasonable manner that, consistent with the Monitor's responsibilities, minimizes interference with daily operations.

206. BPD shall ensure that the Monitor shall have full and direct access to all BPD documents and data that the Monitor reasonably deems necessary to carry out the duties assigned to the Monitor by this Agreement, except any documents or data protected by the attorney-client privilege. The attorney-client privilege may not be used to prevent the Monitor from observing reviews, meetings, and trainings such as use of force review boards; disciplinary hearings; or discussions of misconduct complaint investigations. Should BPD decline to provide the Monitor access to documents or data based on attorney-client privilege, BPD shall inform the Monitor and DOJ that it is withholding documents or data on this basis and shall provide the Monitor and DOJ with a log describing the documents or data.

207. For the purpose of implementing this Agreement, DOJ and its consultative experts and agents shall have full and direct access to all BPD staff, employees, facilities, and documents and data who have pertinent information about BPD. DOJ and its consultative experts and agents shall cooperate with BPD to access involved personnel, facilities, and documents in a reasonable manner that, consistent with DOJ's responsibilities to enforce this Agreement, minimizes interference with daily operations.

208. The Monitor or DOJ shall provide the City with reasonable notice of a request for copies of documents or data. Upon such request, the City and/or BPD shall provide in a timely manner copies (electronic, where readily available) of the requested documents to the Monitor and DOJ.

209. The Monitor shall have access to all records and information relating to criminal investigations of BPD officers as permissible by law. The Monitor shall have access to all documents in criminal investigation files that have been closed by BPD. The Monitor shall also have reasonable access to all arrest reports, warrants, and warrant applications whether or not contained in open criminal investigation files. Where practicable, arrest reports, warrants, and warrant applications shall be obtained from sources other than open criminal investigation files.

210. The Monitor and DOJ shall maintain all non-public information provided by BPD and the City in a confidential manner. Other than as expressly provided in this Agreement, this Agreement shall not be deemed a waiver of any privilege or right the BPD or City may assert,

including those recognized at common law or created by statute, rule or regulation, against any other person or entity with respect to the disclosure of any document.

J. BPD Compliance Coordinator

- 211. The Parties agree that BPD will hire and retain or assign a current BPD management level employee to serve as the Compliance Coordinator for the duration of this Judgment. The Compliance Coordinator will serve as a liaison between BPD, the City, the Monitor, and DOJ, and will assist with ensuring BPD's compliance with the Agreement. At a minimum, the Compliance Coordinator will:
 - a. coordinate compliance and implementation activities;
 - b. facilitate the timely provision of data, documents, and other access to BPD employees and material to the Monitor and DOJ, as needed;
 - c. ensure that all documents and records are maintained as provided in the Agreement; and
 - d. assist in assigning compliance tasks to BPD personnel, as directed by the Chief or his designee. The Compliance Coordinator will take primary responsibility for collecting the information the Monitor requires to carry out the terms of the Agreement.

K. Monitor Budget and Payment

212. The City shall bear all fees and costs of the Monitor. In approving budgets, the Parties recognize the importance of ensuring that all fees and costs borne by the City are reasonable. The Parties shall work with the Monitor to reach mutually agreed upon reasonable limits on the Monitor's fees and costs. Within 10 days of entry of judgment, the City shall deposit with the DOJ a minimum of \$250,000, which shall be held in an interest-bearing account. The Department of Justice shall pay the Monitor from this account. The Attorney General shall notify the City any time the balance in said account reaches less than \$50,000, and the City shall, within 10 days of receiving such notice, deliver to the DOJ sufficient funds to return the account's balance to \$250,000. When the Judgment has been terminated, all funds remaining in the account shall be returned to the City.

- 213. Within 90 days of appointment, the Monitor shall submit to the Parties for approval a proposed budget for the first year of implementation of the Agreement. The proposed budget will describe the qualifications of all the persons or entities to be hired or employed by the Monitor as well as the Monitoring tasks that they will perform. The Monitor, at any time after their appointment, may request to be allowed to hire, employ, or contact such additional persons or entities as are reasonably necessary to perform the tasks assigned to the Monitor by the Agreement, provided that those expenditures fall within the approved budget. The Monitor will notify the City and DOJ in writing if the Monitor wishes to select such additional persons or entities. The notice will identify and describe the qualifications of the person or entity to be hired or employed and the Monitoring task to be performed. The City and DOJ must both approve of the person or entity before they may be hired or employed, although substantial deference will be afforded to the Monitor's choice. Any person or entity hired or otherwise retained by the Monitor will be subject to the provisions of the Agreement.
- 214. Thereafter, the Monitor shall submit annually a proposed budget for the Parties' approval in accordance with the process set forth above. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, the City shall not be responsible for any costs of the Monitor or related activities that exceed the approved budget.
- 215. At any time, the Monitor may submit to the Parties for approval proposed revisions to the approved budget, along with any explanation of the reason for the proposed revision. Such proposed changes may only be implemented upon written agreement of the Parties. In the event that a dispute arises regarding the reasonableness or payment of the Monitor's fees and costs, the Parties and the Monitor shall attempt to resolve such dispute cooperatively prior to seeking the assistance of the Court to resolve the dispute.
- 216. The Monitor will submit monthly monitoring invoices to the City for approval, and the City will notify the DOJ within 30 days, in writing, that the DOJ is authorized to pay the Monitor's invoice. The City will not unreasonably withhold approval; however, if a dispute arises the City will notify the Monitor and work toward resolving the disagreement. If the

disagreement cannot be resolved through a meet and confer process with all Parties, then the City may file a motion requesting that the court resolve the dispute.

217. In the event that the Monitor is no longer able to perform their functions, the City and DOJ will together select a replacement Monitor, acceptable to both. The Parties' selection of the Monitor will be made pursuant to a method jointly established by DOJ and the City. If the Parties are unable to agree on a Monitor or an alternative method of selection within 60 days of the Monitor's incapacitation, each Party will submit the names of three candidates, or three groups of candidates, along with resumes and cost proposals, to the Court, and the Court will select and appoint the Monitor from among the qualified candidates/candidate groups.

218. Should either of the Parties to the Agreement determine that the Monitor or any member of the Monitor's consulting teams, their agents, employees, or independent contractors have exceeded their authority or failed to satisfactorily perform the duties required by the Agreement, the Party may petition the Court for such relief as the Court deems appropriate, including replacement of the Monitor, and/or any individual members, agents, employees, or independent contractors. Any Party bringing such a petition is required to meet and confer with the other Party at least 21 days prior to such a petition in a good faith attempt to resolve the concern.

COURT JURISDICTION, MODIFICATION OF THE JUDGMENT, AND ENFORCEMENT

219. The Parties agree jointly to file this Judgment with the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern, in a matter to be captioned *People of the State of California v. City of Bakersfield, et. al.*, Civil Action No. ______ and stipulate to entry of judgment. The stipulation shall request that the Court enter the Judgment, and conditionally dismiss the complaint in this action without prejudice, while retaining jurisdiction to enforce the Judgment. The stipulation shall further request that this action be removed from the Court's active caseload until further application by the Parties or order of the Court. The Parties will request that the Court retain jurisdiction over this action and that the Court's conditional dismissal will not prejudice any party to the action.

220. This Judgment resolves all of the State of California Department of Justice's claims under the state and federal constitutions and Civil Code section 52.3 against BPD and the City. No prior drafts or prior contemporaneous communications, oral or written, will be relevant or admissible for the purposes of determining the meaning of any provisions herein in any litigation or other proceeding.

- 221. The Judgment is binding upon all Parties hereto, by and through their officials, agents, employees, and successors. If the City establishes or reorganizes a government agency or entity whose function includes overseeing, regulating, accrediting, investigating, or otherwise reviewing the operations of BPD or any aspect thereof, the City agrees to ensure these functions and entities are consistent with the terms of the Agreement and will incorporate the terms of the Agreement into the oversight, regulatory, accreditation, investigation, or review functions of the government agency or entity as necessary to ensure consistency.
- 222. The Judgment is enforceable only by the Parties. No person or entity is intended to be a third-party beneficiary of the provisions of the Judgment for purposes of any civil, criminal, or administrative action, and accordingly, no person or entity may assert any claim or right as a beneficiary or protected class under the Judgment. The City and BPD deny the allegations in the Complaint. Nothing in this Judgment is intended to be used by third parties to create liability by or against the City or BPD or any of their officials, officers, agents or employees under any federal, state, or municipal law, including 42 United States Code section 1983.
- 223. Unless stated otherwise in the Agreement, if either party disagrees with any aspect of the implementation of the Agreement, that party will engage in good faith informal consultation with the other party and the Monitor to attempt to resolve the disagreement. If the disagreement persists, that party will, within 10 days of the apparent impasse, inform the other Parties and the Monitor in writing of the fact of the disagreement. Within 21 days thereafter, the Parties will meet and confer on the disagreement at a mutually agreeable time. If necessary, any party may petition the Court thereafter to resolve the dispute pursuant to the provisions below.

3

10 11

13

12

15

14

16 17

18

19

21 22

20

23

24 25

26

27 28 however, reserves its right to seek enforcement of the provisions of the Agreement if it determines that the City and/or BPD have failed to fully comply with any provision of this Agreement. The State of California agrees to consult with officials from the City and BPD before commencing enforcement proceedings.

- 227. The Monitor, City, and DOJ may jointly stipulate to make changes, modifications, and amendments to this Agreement. Such changes, modifications, and amendments to this Agreement will be encouraged when the Parties agree, or where the reviews, assessments, and/or audits of the Monitor demonstrate, that provision of this Agreement as drafted is not furthering the purpose of this Agreement or that there is a preferable alternative that will achieve the same purpose. The Parties may jointly move for approval of any proposed changes, modifications, and/or amendments, which will become effective upon approval by the Court. No change, modification, or amendment to the Judgment will have any force or effect if not set forth in writing, signed by all the Parties to the Judgment, and approved by the Court.
- 228. Any time limits for performance imposed by the Judgment may be extended by the mutual agreement, in writing, of DOJ, BPD, and the City, and/or by order of the Court for good cause shown by any Party.
- 229. The Parties shall notify each other of any court or administrative challenge to this Judgment.
- 230. Nothing in this Agreement is intended to: (a) alter the existing collective bargaining agreements; or (b) impair the collective bargaining rights of employees under State and local law. Nothing in this Agreement is intended to amend or supersede any provision of State or local law.
- 231. To the extent that any Party previously implemented a litigation hold to preserve documents, electronically stored information, or things related to the matters described in this Agreement, the Party is no longer required to maintain such a litigation hold.
- 232. The Attorney General's Office may make reasonable requests to BPD for additional information demonstrating its compliance with any provision(s) of this Agreement. BPD shall

furnish such information within 30 days after the request is made, unless another date is agreed upon in writing.

- 233. Jurisdiction is retained by the Court to enforce the Judgment for a period of five years, unless that time is extended pursuant to paragraph 228 above, or reduced pursuant to paragraph 240 below, for the purpose of enabling any party to the Judgment to apply to the Court at any time for such further orders and directions as may be necessary or appropriate for the construction or the carrying out of this Agreement, for the modification of any of the injunctive provisions hereof, for enforcement of compliance herewith, and for the punishment of violations hereof, if any.
 - 234. This Judgment shall take effect immediately upon entry thereof.
- 235. Nothing in this Agreement alters the requirements of federal or state law to the extent these laws may currently, or upon future amendment will, offer greater protection.
- 236. Nothing in this Agreement limits the powers vested in the Attorney General by the California Constitution and state statutory law, including Government Code section 11180 et seq., to oversee or enforce any California laws or regulations, whether addressed in this Agreement or not. The Attorney General may utilize these powers to monitor the City's and BPD's compliance with the terms of the Agreement, or to address distinct and unrelated investigation or enforcement of the laws of the State of California. Nothing in this Agreement shall abrogate the confidentiality of any materials or information obtained by DOJ during its investigation of BPD, except as provided by law.
- 237. The injunctive provisions of this Agreement shall apply to the City and BPD, as well as their successors, directors, officers, employees, agents, independent contractors, partners, associates, and representatives of each of them with respect to their activities in the State of California.
 - 238. The clerk is ordered to enter this Judgment forthwith.

1

4 5

6 7

8

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

26

///

///

27

28

239. The Parties anticipate that BPD and the City can reach Full and Effective Compliance with the Material Requirements of this Agreement within five years of the Effective Date.

240. The Parties may jointly petition the Court to terminate this Agreement at any time after three years of the Effective Date if the Parties believe that BPD has reached Full and Effective Compliance with the Material Requirements of this Agreement, and has maintained that compliance for one year. If, at any time after three years from the Effective Date, the Parties disagree about whether BPD has been in Full and Effective Compliance for one year, either party may seek to terminate the Agreement, by petitioning the court for an order terminating the Agreement. In the case of termination sought by the City or BPD, prior to filing a motion to terminate, the City and BPD agree to notify DOJ in writing when the City or BPD has determined that BPD is in Full and Effective Compliance with this Agreement, and that such compliance has been maintained for no less than one year. Thereafter, the Parties shall promptly confer as to the status of compliance. The Monitor will certify whether he or she agrees that the City and BPD are in Full and Effective Compliance with the Material Requirements of this Agreement, or portions of the Agreement, for at least one year, at the time of the notification. No later than 21 days thereafter, the Parties will meet and confer at a mutually agreeable time as to the status of compliance. If, after a reasonable period of consultation and the completion of any additional audit or evaluation that DOJ and/or the Monitor may wish to undertake, including on-site observations, document review, or interviews with the City and BPD personnel, the Parties cannot resolve any compliance issues, the City and/or BPD may file a petition to terminate the Agreement. The Monitor's certification shall be admissible at the hearing on said petition. At all times, BPD shall bear the burden of demonstrating Full and Effective Compliance with the Material Requirements of this Agreement. ///

61

IT IS SO STIPULATED. 1 2 Respectfully submitted this 23rd day of August 2021. 3 4 For the STATE OF CALIFORNIA: Rob Bonta 5 Michael L. Newman Senior Assistant Attorney General 6 Nancy A. Beninati Supervising Deputy Attorney General 7 Marisol León 8 Tanya Koshy Joshua Piovia-Scott 9 Kendal L. Micklethwaite Anthony V. Seferian 10 Deputy Attorneys General 11 12 13 Nancy A. Beninati 14 Supervising Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Plaintiff, The People of the 15 State of California 16 17 For the CITY OF BAKERSFIELD and the BAKERSFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT: 18 19 CITY OF BAKERSFIELD 20 21 22 Karen Goh 23 Mayor 24 25 26 27 28

1	APPROVED AS TO CONTENT: CITY MANAGER
2	
3	Ву:
4	CIClega
5	Christian Clegg City Manager
6	
7	BAKERSFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT
8	\sim
9	By:
10	Greg Terry Chief of Police
11	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
12	CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
13	By: Verginia Annae
14	Virginia Gennaro
15	City Attorney
16	
17	COUNTERSIGNED:
18 19	By:
20	Randy McKeegan Finance Director
21	Finance Director
22	IT IC HEDERY ODDEDED. AD HIDGED AND DECREED
23	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.
24	
25	
26	DATE:
27	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
28	