



CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

September 8, 2026

The Honorable Lawrence G. Brown
Presiding Judge
Sacramento County Superior Court
500 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: **Grand Jury Report - Sacramento Community Police Review Commission:
Window Dressing or Progressing**

Document No.: 1679639

Dear Judge Brown:

The City of Sacramento provides the following response to the Sacramento County Grand Jury, consistent with its obligations under California Penal Code section 933.05, to the 2025-26 Grand Jury report entitled "Sacramento Community Police Review Commission: Window Dressing or Progressing."

A. FINDINGS

F1. The City Council and the SPD have not provided the Commission with the ability to have effective community participation, including a public-facing website, dedicated email or other digital presence that links to the Commission, thereby limiting public access to the Commission's work and reducing transparency (R1).

Response: The City disagrees with this finding.

Effective Community Participation – Meetings

At the time the grand jury report on this subject was issued, the City already provided multiple avenues for the community to both view and participate in meetings of the Commission. The City also maintained a website for the Commission. All meetings after July 21, 2026, will have new, and improved, means of participation.

The Commission meets monthly in the Sacramento City Hall chambers with a fully noticed agenda posted physically and electronically consistent with the Ralph M. Brown Act and the more stringent City of Sacramento Sunshine Ordinance. (Sacramento City Code ("SCC") section 4.04.020) Each meeting is accessible in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act to ensure full public participation.

At the time the grand jury report was published, each meeting was live streamed, and could be watched at no charge, directly from the City's website. At the same site, previous meetings of the Commission have been archived and can be freely watched at any time after the meeting is concluded. (https://sacramento.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=21)

Since the publication of this grand jury report, the City has moved the streaming video of the Commission and City Council meetings to a dedicated YouTube channel for all meetings after July 21, 2026. (<https://www.youtube.com/user/TheCityofSacramento>) Commission meetings that occur after July 21, 2026, will not be archived to the City's website but can be viewed on this same YouTube channel.

Those members of the community that cannot appear at one of the commission meetings may participate by sending electronic comments to any item on the agenda (<https://publiccomment.cityofsacramento.gov/>), and those comments are available to the members of the Commission.

Prior to July 21, 2026, Commission agendas were available on the City Clerk's web page. Currently, the public can view upcoming agendas on the City's Public Participation Hub. On both sites, interested citizens had/have the ability to provide comments on all agenda items, which comments are available to the Commission before each of their meetings. (<https://publiccomment.cityofsacramento.gov/>)

Effective Community Participation – Accessibility of Calendars

Consistent with City Council resolution, all committee meeting calendars can be obtained online at <https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/clerk/meetings-and-agendas>. The Commission's meeting calendar can be located at <https://boards.cityofsacramento.org/board/2945>.

The Public Participation Hub, from which citizens can watch the meetings, submit online comments on any agenda item is located at <https://publiccomment.cityofsacramento.gov/>.

A Public Facing Website

The City maintains a public facing webpage for the Commission, as it does for all commissions. (<https://boards.cityofsacramento.org/board/2945>) This page provides information about the Commission's meetings, including the location as well as the actual dates for upcoming meetings. This page also includes a link through which a user can view published agendas for upcoming meetings and archived videos and agendas of past meetings.

The website also describes the necessary qualifications and mechanisms of appointment for each of the eleven members of the Commission and identifies all of the current members. It also includes a description of the Commission's powers and enabling ordinances within the Sacramento City Code. Finally, the site includes the Commission's most recent Annual Report and Workplan.

Dedicated E-Mail System

While the City does not maintain e-mail accounts for the members of the Commission, members of the public that wish to comment on Commission business may do so on the City's website. Previously, this was done on the Clerk's web page but is now achieved on the City's Public Participation Hub.

F2. The City Council's failure to provide the Commission with an effective process for considering its recommendations limits the ability of SPD, the Council, and the community to evaluate the Commission's recommendations (R2).

Response: The City disagrees with this finding.

Chapter 17 of the Sacramento City Council Rules of Procedure requires the Commission to prepare an annual report outlining the Commission's achievements over the prior year, and identifying proposed "projects, priorities, and recommendations" for the following year. This annual report is first presented by members of the Commission to the City's Personnel & Public Employees (P&PE) committee, which is a standing committee made up of four city council members. The P&PE Committee is tasked with ensuring the annual report is ready for review by the entire city council, and if so, passes the report forward for their consideration at a future meeting. The city clerk then places the annual report on an agenda for an open meeting of the city council for their review and consideration. Members of the public can freely access the P&PE and City Council agendas on the City's website and comment on them either by attending their respective meetings or through the City's online Public Participation Hub.

In addition to the annual report process, Chapter 17 of the Rules of Procedure provide an avenue for the Commission to make "other recommendations" to the city council. Pursuant to Chapter 17, subsection (C)(4), the Commission may present any such recommendations to the P&PE Committee, which may either pass the matter for consideration by the full council, or ask the Commission for additional information before doing so. The public is free to participate in the P&PE and City Council meetings for these items the same as for the annual report and workplan.

F3. The City Code does not require SPD to respond, formally or informally, to Commission recommendations, leaving a void regarding the status of the recommendation (R3).

Response: The City disagrees in part with this finding.

The grand jury correctly points out that the Sacramento City Code does not require the Sacramento Police Department to respond to recommendations from the Commission. This is because the Commission's "powers and duties" do not include making recommendations to the SPD. Instead, the commission is tasked with making recommendations to the city council. (SCC 2.110.030) As such, there are no recommendations to which the SPD can be required to respond, although they have historically frequently done so.

Commission recommendations may be transmitted to the SPD by the Commission which are documented and tracked on a “Recommendation Submission and Response” form which:

- summarizes the Commission’s recommendation;
- provides the date the recommendation was received by the police department;
- the department’s response to the recommendation;
- the status of any implementation of the recommendation or the denial of the recommendation

This form was widely used from 2018 to 2023 to track the SPD’s response to Commission recommendations. Since that time, there have been no submissions, but it remains a viable avenue for the Commission to push recommendations to the SPD. The response forms remain available to the public on the SPD’s transparency page at:

(https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/police/police-transparency/sacramento_community_police_review_commission) There is also a link to this page from the Commission’s web page.

F4. The City Council has no consistent process for documenting or publicly communicating the status of Commission recommendations once they are received, which effectively prevents the Council from participating in the process promised by the Commission’s creation (R4, R5).

Response: The City disagrees with this finding.

Commission annual reports and work plans, as well as other recommendations are outlined in staff reports to the City Council at an open meeting pursuant to Chapter 17 of the Council Rules of Procedure as set out in response to the grand jury’s finding number two.

F5. With few exceptions, the City Council simply places Commission recommendations on its consent calendar, which diminishes the recommendations that reflect the community’s involvement (R3).

Response: The City disagrees in part with this finding.

The City agrees that Commission recommendations frequently appear on the City Council’s consent calendar. However, this placement does not in any way limit or diminish the community’s ability to access and openly discuss these items.

Consistent with the Brown Act and the City’s Sunshine Ordinance, the Commission’s recommendations appear on a published agenda for review by the public. In addition, everyone in attendance at the meeting has the ability to submit a “speaker slip” on every item on the city council’s agenda, including those on the consent calendar. Items placed on the consent calendar can be pulled for individual consideration by councilmembers if they choose, and members of the public are free to discuss these items the same as items on any other part of the council’s agenda. Members of the public who can’t attend the meeting can comment on the items electronically via the City’s Public Participation Hub.

F6. Neither the Commission nor SPD has a procedure to track the implementation of Commission recommendations, thereby preventing knowledge of their status (R5).

Response: The City disagrees with this finding.

Commission recommendations may be transmitted to the SPD by the Commission which are documented and tracked on a “Recommendation Submission and Response” form which:

- summarizes the Commission’s recommendation;
- provides the date the recommendation was received by the police department;
- the department’s response to the recommendation;
- the status of any implementation of the recommendation or the denial of the recommendation

This form was widely used from 2018 to 2023 to track the SPD’s response to Commission recommendations. Since that time, there have been no submissions, but it remains a viable avenue for the Commission to push recommendations to the SPD. The response forms remain available to the public on the SPD’s transparency page at:

(https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/police/police-transparency/sacramento_community_police_review_commission) There is also a link to this page from the Commission’s web page.

F7. The City’s Code does not require Commissioners to receive training on oversight procedures, applicable law, and policing issues, undermining their ability to serve as an effective advisory body (R6).

Response: The City agrees with this finding.

F8. The City Council failed to act on the 2021 audit recommendations from the Sacramento City Office of the City Auditor to improve the Commission's effectiveness, thereby limiting the Commission’s ability to carry out its mission (R7).

Response: The City disagrees with this finding.

While the City has not implemented each of the sixteen recommendations from the City Auditor, each of the sixteen recommendations has been studied, and seven of the recommendations have already been implemented. Others are still subject to review and potential implementation.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

R1. The City Council and SPD should take steps to enhance community participation, including establishing a public-facing website and dedicated email address linked to the Commission, by December 31, 2026 (F1).

Response: The City has already implemented this recommendation.

While the City will continue to engage in efforts to enhance community participation in the Commission, the City was already engaging in the recommended actions since before the grand jury report, as set forth in response to the grand jury's finding number one.

R2. The City Council should develop and implement procedures for considering Commission recommendations by December 31, 2026 (F2).

Response: The City has already implemented this recommendation.

The City implemented this recommendation before it was made, as set forth in response to finding number two.

R3. The City Council should require SPD to provide formal written responses to all Commission recommendations and a timeline for those responses by December 31, 2026 (F3, F5).

Response: The City has already implemented this recommendation.

As set forth in response to finding number six, the City has a robust mechanism for meeting this recommendation, including a response form maintained on the City's public website. The City also recently enhanced the public's access to the SPD's responses to Commission recommendations by adding a link to the SPD's transparency page on the Commission's web page.

R4. The City Council should acknowledge receipt of and the outcome of each Commission recommendation by December 31, 2026 (F3, F4).

Response: The City has already implemented this recommendation.

When the Commission's annual report and workplan is submitted to the City Council, that action is taken on an open agenda, and the council takes a public vote both receiving and approving the recommendations contained therein.

R5. The City Council should establish a formal, public tracking system for the recommendations by December 31, 2026 (F4, F6).

Response: The City has already implemented this recommendation.

As set forth in response to finding number six, the City has a robust mechanism for meeting this recommendation with the Commission/SPD "Recommendation Submission and Response" form which is posted on both the SPD's transparency page and the Commission's web page as discussed in the City's response to findings three and six.

R6. The City Council should require initial and ongoing relevant training for commissioners to assist them in their duties by December 31, 2026 (F7).

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented by the City Council but will be implemented by the Commission and City staff.

Both the City and the Commission agree that appropriate onboarding and ongoing training in substantive areas will assist the Commission in performing its oversight functions and have already taken preliminary steps in achieving this goal.

At their February 9, 2026, meeting the Commission discussed the implementation of “orientation and ongoing training” that should be required to serve as a member of the Commission. The training suggested by a Commission *ad hoc* committee included five “modules.”

- Module 1: Understanding the Role of a Police Review Commission
- Module 2: Introduction to the Sacramento Police Department and City Government
- Module 3: Police Practices and Procedures
- Module 4: Crime and Violence Reduction Strategies
- Module 5: Community Engagement and Public Relations

The training outlined by the *ad hoc* committee indicated that some of these modules would be presented by the Commission chair and others would be presented by members of the SPD. The Commission voted to incorporate these training recommendations into their 2026 work plan and presented this training plan to the City Council at the council’s meeting on June 16, 2026.

With the assistance of City staff, the Commission will develop and implement a training plan. As of the preparation of this response, there is no timeline for implementation of the training, which timeline will be generated by the Commission itself.

R7. The City Council should formally respond to all recommendations in the 2021 audit by the Sacramento City Office of the City Auditor by December 31, 2026 (F8).

Response: The City Council and City staff have discussed the Auditor’s recommendations on multiple occasions. All of the recommendations have been considered and seven have already been implemented with additional recommendations in the process of being implemented.

Auditor’s Recommendation 1 – The Auditor suggested that the City Council clarify the “purpose, powers, and duties” of the Commission by resolution or ordinance. In 2024, the City Council approved amendments to the City Code, including Chapter 2.110, which, among other things, clarified the “Purposes of the Commission” (SCC 2.110.020) and the “Powers and Duties of the Commission.” (SCC 2.110.030) The Auditor acknowledges that the City has “started” is implementation of this recommendation but wants more clarity between the roles of the Commission and the City’s Office of Public Safety Accountability. (OPSA) The City has retained a consultant to provide a functional analysis of OPSA, which should result in the implementation of this recommendation in 2027.

Auditor’s Recommendation 2 – The auditor suggested that the City Council “determine staffing needs” of the Commission and the “specific role of staff provided.” This recommendation will be implemented, but not by the City Council as responsibility for determining staffing and the role of staff rests with the Charter Officers that send staff to the Commission meetings and assign

staff to respond to Commission requests and priorities. The City Manager will assign staff to the Commission by December 31, 2026.

Auditor's Recommendation 3 – The Auditor suggested that the City Council determine the training curriculum that Commission members should be required to complete and potential remedies if training is not completed. This recommendation will be implemented, but not by the City Council. The Commission has elected to take on this responsibility itself as set forth in response to the grand jury's Recommendation 6, and so it would be inappropriate for the Council to take action on a subject that the Commission has elected to handle on its own.

Auditor's Recommendation 4 – The Auditor suggested that the City Council codify the training requirements for the Commission in an ordinance. This recommendation will not be implemented. As set forth above (Auditor's Recommendation 3 and Grand Jury Recommendation 6), the Commission members have elected to take on the responsibility of determining their training modules on their own. To codify the training modules would limit and inhibit the Commission's ability to propose their own training regimen both now and in the future.

Auditor's Recommendation 5 – The Auditor suggested that the City identify resources to provide the Commission with an enhanced internet presence. As indicated in response to the grand jury's finding number one, the City maintains a robust internet presence for the Commission. These processes have improved over time, but pre-dated in many respects the Auditor's recommendation. Recent changes to the design of the Commission web page have established compliance with the Auditor's recommendation, and so this recommendation has already been implemented.

Auditor's Recommendation 6 – The auditor suggested that the Commission, City Manager, and City Council work to develop policies and procedures for communicating with the public. The Commission typically has 10 public meetings each year that require compliance with open meeting laws, including the Brown Act and the City's Sunshine Ordinance. The Commission members have frequently engaged in community outreach, and their 2026 work plan included a recommendation that they "Strengthen Community Awareness of the Commission" and "Conduct Structured Community Outreach" in the upcoming year. This recommendation was presented to the City Council at their meeting on June 16, 2026. This recommendation has largely already been implemented and will be implemented consistent with the Auditor's recommendation by December 31, 2027.

Auditor's Recommendation 7 suggested that the City should "clarify" the Commission's responsibility for issuing an annual report. In 2022, the City Council added Chapter 17 to its Rules of Procedure which requires each advisory commission to provide an annual report and workplan for the upcoming year on a form provided by the City Clerk. With that amendment, the City Auditor determined this recommendation has already been implemented.

Auditor's Recommendation 8 suggested that "performance indicators" be established to gauge the effectiveness of the Commission. The City Auditor has concluded this recommendation has already been implemented.

Auditor's Recommendations 9 and 10 suggested that the City provide e-mail accessibility for Commission members and develop policies surrounding the use of such accounts. These recommendations will not be implemented. Providing e-mail addresses to the Commission members causes both procedural and potential legal problems. Direct access by the public to members of the committee dramatically increases the likelihood of Brown Act violations when members of the public communicate with more than a quorum of the Commission. Direct contact with members of the public also limits the transparency of the matters considered by the Commission. In addition, non-city employees are not generally allowed access to City systems in this manner. Finally, members of the public already have the ability to comment on matters before the commission on the City's web site or may communicate their comments to the City Clerk.

Auditor's Recommendation 11 suggested that the City determine the Commission's "level of access of information" across various City departments. According to the Auditor, this recommendation meant that the Commission needed to ensure their requests were made to staff in a way that would ensure timely consideration. The City Manager plans to staff the Commission by December 31, 2026; this staffing will implement the Auditor's recommendation.

Auditor's Recommendation 12 suggested that the City determine an agreed-upon format for Sacramento Community Police Review Commission recommendations. The City Auditor has determined that this recommendation has already been implemented.

Auditor's Recommendation 13 suggested that the City determine whether the Sacramento Police Department should provide written responses to Sacramento Community Police Review Commission recommendations. The City Auditor has determined that this recommendation has already been implemented.

Auditor's Recommendation 14 suggested that the Council determine whether they should vote on all Commission recommendations. This recommendation requires further analysis. Chapter 17 of the Council Rules of Procedure already provides avenues for the Commission to bring their recommendations to the City Council. Whether the Council's "approval" of those recommendations advances the responsibilities and duties of the commission must be studied. In addition, the Council will need to identify staff and technology resources to determine if this recommendation is feasible. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2026.

Auditor's Recommendation 15 suggested that the Council determine whether the City should track and report on the implementation status of Sacramento Community Police Review Commission recommendations and whether to memorialize the requirement and process in resolution or ordinance. Based on recent changes to the Commission web page, the auditor agrees that this recommendation has already been implemented.

Auditor's Recommendation 16 suggested the Council determine whether to provide resources for making Commission recommendation responses and implementation status publicly available in a transparent and timely manner and consider whether to memorialize the funding provision in resolution or ordinance. . Based on recent changes to the Commission web page, the auditor agrees that this recommendation has already been implemented

Sincerely,



[Kevin McCarty \(Sep 16, 2026 17:06:52 PDT\)](#)

Kevin McCarty, Mayor
City of Sacramento

cc: Erendira Tapia-Bouthillier (TapiaE@saccourt.ca.gov)