

Human Right Violations in Santa Rosa California Policing the Black Lives Matter Protests

Submitted by the Sonoma County Commission on Human Rights to the Santa Rosa City Council, the California Department of Justice, United States Commission on Civil Rights, the United States Department of Justice, and the United Nations Human Rights Committee

July 2020



SECTIONS

- I. Background Summary and Historical Climate (p. 2-7)**
- II. Recent Notable Local Incidents Related to Police Violence (p. 8-14)**
- III. Protest Related Human Rights Violations Reported to the Commission (p. 15-25)**
- IV. Commission Recommendations Supporting Injured Protester Demands (p. 26)**
- V. International Human Rights Law Violations (p. 27-36)**
- VI. Appendix of Media Coverage and Supportive Evidence of Protester Accounts (p. 37-39)**

I. Background Summary and Historical Climate

It is important to note a series of incidents leading up to the George Floyd protests within the historical context of Sonoma County to adequately contextualize the relationship between law enforcement and BIPOC communities. This Commission has received numerous reports that law enforcement agencies regularly engage in arbitrary stops and questioning of BIPOC residents, and that racial profiling is understood to have been the standard procedure of all LEAs in Sonoma County for generations. This Commission has received multiple reports of concerns of LEAs harboring active white supremacists within officer ranks as well as officers who, while perhaps not members of active groups, espouse white supremacist and white nationalist ideologies which present themselves with most interactions with BIPOC residents. These presentations include disrespectful behavior, aggression, racial slurs, escalation, interrogation, physical violence and assault. This is believed by many to correlate to the deep historical relationship to the Confederacy that exists in Sonoma County¹, which can easily be identified in historical and newspaper archives², oral histories of BIPOC communities, the widespread use of the Confederate flag, as well as the yearly Civil War [reenactment](#) on private property at Duncans Mills (cancelled for 2020 due to Covid-19).

This relationship has been further strained over the years by a series of high-profile cases of police use of force, brutality and killings involving Santa Rosa Police Department, Rohnert Park Police Department, the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office, and other LEA's. Since the year 2000, there have been at least 91 community members who have been killed in an incident involving local law enforcement, averaging almost 5 deaths per year. There have also been numerous community driven efforts to address use of force by law enforcement as well as recommendations made by the Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Oversight and its Citizen's Advisory Committee, that have not been adopted by law enforcement. Additionally, the community has viewed videos of highly graphic and violent arrests, use of force injuries, and deaths of citizens committed by law enforcement in released body camera footage. These incidents are not new, but more visible since the adoption of body worn camera policies by LEAs. This combination of heightened visibility of police violence in the community and a lack of responsiveness by law enforcement agencies to public calls for change, has contributed to a deep public distrust of law enforcement within Sonoma County, with particular regard to BIPOC communities.

¹See, "A Far Away Outpost of Dixie," Santa Rosa History, Jeff Elliot, June 2018

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2018/06/a-far-away-outpost-of-dixie/>

²See, "The Hidden Lives of Black Santa Rosa," Santa Rosa History, Jeff Elliot, June 2020

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2020/06/the-hidden-lives-of-black-santa-rosa/>

a. 2000 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report

Over twenty years ago, Sonoma County community members, disturbed by increasing police violence in their county, requested the intervention of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. After holding a series of hearings in Sonoma County and gathering voluminous information, the California Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights issued a report on "Community Concerns About Law Enforcement in Sonoma County."³ That report drew many conclusions as to how to improve deteriorated relationships between law enforcement agencies in the county and the communities they police. Among the conclusions of the report was the following:

“The Advisory Committee believes that effective policing is a partnership between a community and law enforcement. Denying the legitimate concerns of either half of this alliance imperils effectiveness of the already fragile partnership. Police departments should not marginalize the individuals or organizations within their communities who voice their concerns about the type of policing being provided. This input can be a basis for constructive change for those departments with the wisdom to see its value.

Since we entrust police officers with certain privileges, including the use of deadly force, in order for them to perform their role, it is the right and responsibility of citizens to protest police practices they view as unwarranted, unnecessary, or a gross abuse of discretionary authority. We provide police officers with the responsibility to enforce the laws and protect individuals and property. We do not grant them the authority to be arrogant or to abuse this trust. For a law enforcement department to view citizen concerns about police practices as a threat makes a mockery of this trust, and the consequences are community fear, ineffective policing, and deteriorating police-community relations.”

In response to many incidents of excessive use of force, the committee further recommended that "the cities of Rohnert Park and Santa Rosa and the county sheriff require the immediate creation of civilian review boards." None of the local jurisdictions took up the recommendation and civilian oversight did not happen as a result of this report.

³See, “Community Concerns About Law Enforcement in Sonoma County,” California Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, May 2000, <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/sac/ca0500/main.htm>

b. 2007 Killing of Jeremiah Chass

In 2007, Sonoma County Sheriff's deputies responded to a call made to the Fire Department for assistance with a mental health crisis of a youth in Sebastopol. As a result, deputies shot and killed Jeremiah Chass, a Black 16-year-old youth at his home outside of Sebastopol. Chass, in acute mental distress at the time, was holding a knife and had been pepper sprayed by deputies, instead of their attempting to use de-escalation techniques to calm him. When the pepper spray failed to cause Jeremiah to drop the knife, deputies shot and killed the young man. Chass was shot within two minutes after the arrival of the deputy who pulled the trigger. While the Sheriff's Office claimed publicly that they had saved the life of Jeremiah's younger brother, the evidence showed that the younger brother was in the house away from Jeremiah at the time deputies shot him seven times. Jeremiah's family sued the county and secured a settlement in 2009 of \$1.75 Million dollars for the killing of their son. Despite the settlement, the Sheriff at that time said there was no reason to change the training of deputies in responding to mental health calls.

c. 2013 Killing of Andy Lopez

Andy Lopez was born the same year as the above report was issued by the committee and ignored by local authorities. Andy grew up in the unincorporated Moorland area of the county, just outside of the Santa Rosa city limits. Moorland was and is a disadvantaged area of the county where many undocumented immigrants live, and suffers from high levels of poverty and lack of public investment. It also has a history of policing by the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office ("SCSO") characterized by a strong enforcement stance, unhealed by efforts at community understanding, engagement, or outreach. Local schools such as Cook Middle School, which Andy attended, also are policed by SRPD. SRPD also participated in coordinated "gang enforcement" activities with the SCSO in the Moorland neighborhood.

On October 22, 2013, Sonoma County Sheriff's Deputy Erick Gelhaus shot and killed 13-year-old Andy Lopez in the Moorland neighborhood of southwest Santa Rosa, while Lopez was walking through a vacant lot carrying a toy, airsoft gun designed to resemble an AK-47 assault rifle. The deputy fired upon Andy within seconds of getting out of the squad car and ordering him to drop the gun.

The killing of a Latino child in the Moorland neighborhood by a Sheriff's Deputy further ruptured community relationships and stirred anger across the county. This rupture occurred in the context of long-simmering community resentments about a lack of care by government for the needs and concerns of the local immigrant and Latinx communities. In addition, many members of these communities had long perceived local law enforcement as prejudiced against them, based on their historical experience of disproportionate police targeting of their

communities for enforcement. In this context, the Lopez shooting ignited community outrage, resulting in multiple, contentious public protests by community activists who believed the shooting reflected racial profiling of a child. In one of those protests, local students protesting at the Sheriff's Office were met with a militarized response of SWAT teams in armor and armed snipers on the roof.

d. Creation and History of IOLERO

In the context of protests of the Lopez killing, the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors established a diverse, 21-member Community and Local Law Enforcement ("CALLE") Task Force to explore ways to heal the ruptures between local law enforcement and communities. This laudable decision led to over 1.5 years of challenging community meetings, often once a week, to discuss difficult issues of police accountability and transparency, community-oriented policing, and community healing. Out of this effort, came the recommendation to establish the Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Outreach ("IOLERO"), among other things.⁴ CALLE also recommended that the Sheriff change its use of force policies to better reflect the desires of the community for de-escalation and the use of force only when necessary. However, these use of force policy and practice recommendations were ignored and have not been implemented to this day.

As originally conceived by the CALLE Task Force, IOLERO would have provided civilian oversight for all local law enforcement agencies across the county, thereby providing a coordinated and efficient means of accountability, transparency, and public input to all local policing agencies. This model made sense given the many areas of collaboration among local law enforcement, such as gang enforcement, protest policing, investigations of officer involved shootings, and other examples of mutual aid. It soon became apparent, however, that no local town or city was interested in participating in this model. Therefore, IOLERO was established in 2015 as an agency providing civilian review of only the Sheriff's Office, which also provides police services under contract with the Town of Windsor and the City of Sonoma.

While IOLERO began operating in 2016 with much promise and some level of cooperation with the local Sheriff, that relationship was characterized by tension from the beginning. The dynamic soon became difficult as the Sheriff responded first with defensiveness and then with attacks on IOLERO, in response to IOLERO reports that offered critical feedback to the operations of the Sheriff's Office.

⁴ See full report at <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/IOLERO/Community-and-Local-Law-Enforcement-Task-Force/>

For example, in response to an IOLERO report identifying ongoing, significant deficiencies in the Sheriff's investigations of alleged deputy misconduct, the Sheriff recommended eliminating IOLERO entirely.⁵ Among the misconduct investigations identified as significantly flawed by the IOLERO report was that of the jail "yard counseling" incidents, wherein inmates in the county jail were tortured by correctional deputies for several days. While the Sheriff never acknowledged fault in these incidents, the agency settled a federal lawsuit over them for \$1.7M soon after the IOLERO audit of the investigation concluded that it was significantly flawed and designed to shield the agency from liability.

Among several important recommendations issued by IOLERO for changes to the policies and practices of the Sheriff's Office, which were ignored by the Sheriff, were the following: 1) significantly limit use of force in the controlled environment of county jail facilities; 2) require de-escalation where reasonable, prior to moving to use of force; 3) conduct regular, robust, scenario-based training in recognizing and correcting for implicit or unconscious bias; 4) institute cultural competency training of deputies led by local community leaders/elders; and 5) include community members in decisions on hiring and promotions of deputies.

Given IOLERO's lack of real authority and need to rely on the voluntary cooperation of the Sheriff, the first IOLERO Director recommended significant changes to the IOLERO authority and structure in his last Annual Report issued in December of 2018. When the Board of Supervisors failed to take up those recommendations for consideration, a group of community members began an effort to put those changes to the IOLERO Ordinance on the ballot for a vote.⁶

This effort was halted by the Shelter in Place orders of the county Public Health Officers in March of 2020. Nevertheless, recent events have shown even more clearly the need for effective oversight of the Sheriff's office.

⁵ See the IOLERO Report at Sheriff's response at http://sonomacounty.ca.gov/templates_portal/Project.aspx?id=2147565191

⁶ See the rationale offered for the proposed ordinance at www.socoeffectiveoversight.org

e. Creation and History of Santa Rosa Independent Police Auditor

As mentioned above, no local city or town was willing to participate in IOLERO as a model of civilian oversight of their police departments. Most cities and towns rejected even the idea of oversight of their police. The City of Santa Rosa, which was involved in the policing of Moorland and thus a target of protests after the Andy Lopez killing, did heed the call for civilian oversight of its police. However, it chose to institute a model of civilian oversight with less transparency and public involvement than that provided by the IOLERO model. Instead, Santa Rosa hired a private contract auditor charged with auditing internal SRPD investigations of officer misconduct and offering confidential feedback to SRPD managers and officers about what he discovered. While the police auditor did issue public annual reports, they lacked any information about individual investigation audits or his findings in those audits. Rather, the public reports discussed general trends and conclusions. Even this level of critical feedback, however, proved too much for City officials, who responded harshly to the auditor's last public report critical of the City's response to homelessness. The auditor soon thereafter found himself out of a job with Santa Rosa. Since then, Santa Rosa has been without independent civilian oversight of any form for almost two years.

II. Recent Notable Local Incidents Related to Police Violence

a. Sonoma County Jail “Yard Counseling” Torture Incidents

In May and June of 2015, multiple Sonoma County Correctional Deputies used excessive force against multiple inmates during a series of incidents involving “yard counseling” at the Main Adult Detention Facility. Although inmates filed grievances regarding these incidents, they were not investigated until the filing of a federal lawsuit in October 2015. The lawsuit alleged that deputies tortured inmates by using excessive force; used corporal punishment in violation of the Constitution; treated inmates in dehumanizing and demeaning ways; deliberately failed to document incidents as required by jail policies; and lied about the incidents in their reports.

The two SCSO investigations of these incidents encompassed over 380 pages of factual review and analysis, and many hours of video recordings. They concluded that *all* of the reviewed incidents were “compliant with policy and the law.” The IOLERO independent auditor reviewed the two investigations, spending more than 180 hours to complete it. The resulting audit report numbered 75 pages, focusing mainly on incidents involving one inmate, as that was the primary focus of the Sheriff’s investigations. The incident actually involved numerous other inmates, and their allegations were not investigated. The IOLERO Auditor found, based on a very thorough review of all investigative evidence, as well as evidence from the federal lawsuit that was equally available to the investigator but not considered by him, that the evidence supported a finding for each of the 8 allegations sustained, including allegations that the deputies tortured the inmates who filed the lawsuit. The auditor also found that the Sheriff’s investigation was significantly biased in favor of the Sheriff’s Office and their employees and was designed specifically to exonerate them of all wrongdoing, despite the evidence to the contrary.

Following the issuance of the IOLERO audit report to the Sheriff’s Office, that agency soon thereafter settled the federal lawsuit in June 2018 for \$1.7 Million, plus an agreement to revoke the “yard counseling” policies that allowed the torture of inmates. Also of note is that the Human Resources department, which provided administrative support to this Commission, demanded that then Vice Chair Smith publish a press release from the Sheriff’s Office that denied all allegations, after noting she had posted a public press article on the incident. When she refused, the county directed a staff member to remove the article from the Commission’s Facebook page in censorship.

b. Sonoma County Sheriff Deputy Thorne Assault Incident and Trial

In September of 2016, Sonoma County Sheriff Deputy Scott Thorne, along with two other deputies, responded to a call of a domestic dispute in the unincorporated area of Sonoma Valley. The deputies pushed their way into the residence, despite the woman answering the door saying that there was no issue with which she needed assistance. Deputy Thorne quickly

broke through a locked bedroom door in the house to confront a Latino man on a bed, looking at his cell phone. When the man refused to get up off the bed and said he was calling his lawyer, Deputy Thorne began to use his Taser on the man. Deputy Thorne then proceeded to beat the man with his baton and used his baton to choke the man, who was on his stomach. The deputies arrested the man for resisting arrest. The DA refused to file the charges and sent the case back to the Sheriff's Office for further investigation, whereupon the body worn camera footage was reviewed and Deputy Thorne was charged with assault.

At the trial of Deputy Thorne in March 2018, Deputies Diehm and Zastrow, who accompanied Thorne during his assault of the victim in this case, both testified in his defense. The two deputies testified that Thorne's use of extreme force against a man who had not threatened them was entirely within their training and departmental policies with regard to proper use of force. Despite then Sheriff's Captain Essick testifying against Thorne, the testimony of these two deputies led the jury to reach a verdict of "not guilty" of assault under color of authority for Thorne. Deputies Diehm and Zastrow subsequently were elected officers of the Deputy Sheriff's Association, the union for patrol deputies that work for the Sonoma County Sheriff. This appears to indicate the rewards that await deputies who stick together to defend against an attempt to hold one of their own criminally liable for excessive force.

c. Killing of Branch Wroth by Rohnert Park Police Officers

In May of 2017, Rohnert Park police officers responded to a call for service that a motel occupant had failed to check out on time, was having a mental health issue and needed a welfare check. The officers found Branch Wroth in a confused and agitated state without his pants in his motel room. The officers at first tried to convince Wroth to put on his pants and leave the room, but soon moved to try to arrest him when he would not cooperate. The officers steadily escalated the force they used when Wroth continued his refusal to cooperate in his arrest, beating him, using a Taser on him, and finally sitting on him while he was face down, as he cried out for his mother and father and pleaded "I can't breathe." The officer responded, "You can breathe." Wroth died as a result of the encounter with the officers.

District Attorney Ravitch cleared the officers of any wrongdoing after an investigation of the incident by Sonoma County Sheriffs. The DA concluded that the police officers used "the least amount of force possible at each stage," and "delayed physical contact until it was absolutely necessary." She reached these conclusions despite the officers neither calling a mental health professional to the scene to assist with the mental health crisis, nor attempting to de-escalate the situation in any way. The Sheriff's Office conducted the criminal investigation of the Rohnert Park Officers despite having been previously sued successfully by the Wroth family when Sheriff's deputies previously Tasered the brother of Branch Wroth repeatedly in the county jail.

The City of Rohnert Park was sued by Branch Wroth's parents in federal court, and a jury found the city liable, imposing a judgment of \$4 Million in June of 2019. The City immediately appealed the judgment and it was overturned due to a faulty jury instruction later that year. A retrial is currently pending.

d. Sheriff's Deputy Killing of David Ward

In November of 2019, David Ward, a disabled man, was driving his own recently recovered, previously stolen car, when Sheriff's deputies attempted to stop him. Ward at first fled, but eventually pulled over after Sheriff deputies and Sebastopol Police Department officers gave chase in their patrol cars. Soon after he pulled over, Sheriff Deputy Charles Blount began yelling at Ward both to put up his hands and to open his door. Disoriented, Ward seemed unable to open the door, despite obviously trying to do so. When Ward finally managed to get his window down, Deputy Blount immediately began to try to pull Ward out of the driver's side window of his car, causing him obvious pain as his legs were caught under the steering wheel and his disability involved his lower back. Deputy Little began to Taser Ward, and Deputy Blount began to bang Ward's head forcefully against the car door window frame. Blount then began to choke Ward forcefully, pulling his head out of the car door window while doing so. Ward became unresponsive and was taken out of the car and placed on his stomach. Ward soon stopped breathing and died as a result of his treatment by the deputies. Two Sebastopol police officers looked on as Ward was killed, without saying anything or intervening in any way.

While the Sheriff announced soon after the video was released that Deputy Blount would be fired, additional information has called into greater question the Sheriff's stance. As recently revealed in the press and alleged in a lawsuit filed by Ward's estate, Deputy Blount has a history of using excessive force repeatedly, including improperly using choke holds, against individuals who have not resisted or otherwise acted in ways that justify such force. Yet, Blount has not faced consequences for this history, and has continued to be employed by the Sheriff's Office, in spite of his record of brutality. In fact, the lawsuit filed by Ward's estate alleges that Blount's supervisor recommended that Blount be required to undertake retraining after a previous incident in which he misused the carotid restraint; yet, rather than accept that recommendation, the Sheriff instead disciplined the supervisor who made this recommendation.

In the meantime, the criminal investigation into the actions of Deputy Blount by the DA and Santa Rosa Police still has not been completed, nor reached a conclusion. In addition, after first fighting his firing and arguing that his actions were completely consistent with the Sheriff's use of force training and policies, Blount has now retired with his full pension benefits. Only the successful criminal prosecution of Blount by the District Attorney and his conviction of a felony could divest Blount from his pension. Now, seven months after the incident, the public still awaits an announcement of whether the District Attorney will seek justice for David Ward and hold Deputy Blount criminally accountable for his killing.

e. Local District Attorney Response to Murder of Ahmaud Arbery

Following the murder of Ahmaud Arbery on February 23, 2020, Sonoma County District Attorney Jill Ravitch commented on a social media post of County Supervisor Lynda Hopkins' social media post which expressed support for and showed her participation in the #RunWithMaud campaign. DA Ravitch replied to the post stating, "Some of us had to work today." This comment was perceived as highly insensitive to Black lives on the part of DA Ravitch. It drew wide criticism through social media comments and emails from the public, the Chair and other members of this Commission. Though DA Ravitch expressed that her comment was misconstrued and taken out of context, she refused to engage with the CHR Chair in meaningful dialogue around her ongoing criminal charging decisions regarding local law enforcement officers' use of force and civil rights violations.

The Commission has consistently received reports of, and observed the DA publicly exhibiting both implicit and explicit bias in charges filed against BIPOC in both Juvenile and Adult Criminal Justice cases. For example, after the April 2020 attack on Jason Anglero-Wyrick, described in detail below, her office charged him with felony obstruction of a police officer and made public statements that he had threatened officers with violence, despite the lack of evidence to support such statements. The DA later was forced to dismiss these charges at the preliminary hearing as lacking in evidence, yet the previous statements maligning Mr. Anglero-Wyrick were not corrected, nor did the DA apologize for them.

f. Sheriff Deputy Violence Against Jason Anglero-Wyrick

On April 4, 2020, Jason Anglero-Wyrick, an unarmed Black man, was violently assaulted by SCSO deputies with a K9 unit and Taser, in front of his family, after a police informant allegedly utilized SCSO to retaliate against him over a personal conflict. The deputies' attack was captured on video by a 15-year-old, minor family member and shared widely on social media by Shaun King and others, with civil rights litigation now in process. Prior to their use of violence, Sheriff's deputies who arrived at the scene demanded that Mr. Anglero-Wyrick crawl across the gravel on his hands and knees to them, despite there being no evident threat to their safety. Mr. Anglero-Wyrick was standing with his hands in the air when the Taser was deployed against him, causing him to fall twisting backwards, and land on his stomach. The police dog was then set upon him, even though he was on the ground on his stomach, with his hands and ankles voluntarily crossed behind him for cuffing. The deputy allowed the dog to continue biting and tearing at the leg of Mr. Anglero-Wyrick for an extended time, despite no resistance being offered to the arrest. Mr. Anglero-Wyrick's extensive injuries required multiple surgeries to his leg and he has still not fully recovered after several weeks in the hospital, and subsequent physical rehabilitation while at home.

Mr. Anglero-Wyrick reports widespread use of racial slurs against himself and his family by SCSO and profiling of his children, over an extended period of time prior to and including this incident. Gender discrimination slurs and profanity towards Ms. Naustachia Green can be heard in the video of the Graton incident, as she attempted to shield Mr. Anglero-Wyrick with her body while he was ordered to crawl towards law enforcement. This racially discriminatory treatment of Mr. Anglero-Wyrick by law enforcement is part of an ongoing pattern targeting his family members for over two decades, including multiple past incidents that have involved his father and brother. The targeting has been especially focused within the Sheriff's deputies stationed in West County over these years.

The family has continued to report retaliation against them by law enforcement, including: 1) the attempted removal of the minor child from her mother by Child Protective Services in an action initiated by the Sheriff's Office (with the SCSO alleging that the minor's presence during the violence of the Graton incident was the fault of her parents, rather than of the deputies who inflicted the violence)⁷;

2) the DA filing felony charges of resisting arrest and making false public statements, despite the lack of evidence to support such charges; and, 3) a recent attempt by parole officers to return him to the Main Adult Detention Facility on baseless charges of parole violation, where Mr. Anglero- Wyrick feared for his life were he to be detained in the county jail. Mr. Anglero-Wyrick has been active in recent protests over police violence, and recently stopped a woman from fleeing the scene after she attempted to run over peaceful protesters in a white Porsche. SRPD received numerous reports and video footage from on the ground witnesses, yet issued a press release which contradicted all witness accounts and placed the driver of the car in a victim position. The press release also falsely stated that the woman perpetrator voluntarily stopped and awaited the arrival of SRPD officers. Mr. Anglero-Wyrick publicly disputed this account by SRPD, providing video footage to support his account that he forced her to stop by cutting off her vehicle from escaping with his own car. He further stated that SRPD officers arriving at the scene expressed displeasure that he had prevented the woman from escaping the scene. It was soon thereafter that the parole officers paid a surprise visit to Mr. Anglero-Wyrick and demanded that he appear at their offices to be arrested for a bogus parole violation.

⁷ Very concerning in this context is that law enforcement officers were recorded on security video several months before during a search of the residence of Ms. Naustachia Green conversing about how they were "going to get" Mr. Anglero-Wyrick. The participants included SRPD officers, some undercover officers whose agency affiliation was unclear, and a probation supervisor. During this conversation, the probation supervisors is heard stating that they will send CPS out to take away Ms. Green's child, and that would cause her to turn on Mr. Anglero-Wyrick and "make her say whatever we want her to say."

g. Recent Protest Policing Abuses

During recent protests of police violence in Sonoma County after the murder of George Floyd, Santa Rosa Police Department (SRPD), the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office (SCSO), and other local agencies provided policing under mutual aid agreements between those agencies. SRPD was the lead agency requesting mutual aid. Police agencies utilized severe use of force tactics against peaceful protesters, including teargas, projectiles, rubber bullets, chalk grenades, and sting-ball grenades, from distances as close as ten feet. In addition, and even more concerning, law enforcement officers employed techniques such as "kettling" (which is designed to force a crowd into ever smaller areas from which there is no escape, and is an escalatory tactic that often results in increased use of force); and targeted use of force against Black, Latinx and Native American protesters.

On the night of June 2, 2020, peaceful protesters demonstrating in support of Black Lives Matter also mobilized around the birthday anniversary of Andy Lopez, the 13-year-old Latinx youth who was killed by SCSO Deputy Erick Gelhaus in 2013. Deputy Gelhaus was subsequently promoted and returned to street patrol in the same community despite massive community protest and a resolution condemning this decision, authored by this Commission. The Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Oversight (IOLERO) was created in the wake of Lopez' death as part of recommendations from the Community and Local Law Enforcement Task Force (CALLE), yet SCSO did not implement recommendations from IOLERO or its Community Advisory Council, as the Sheriff is an elected official who asserts that his power is independent of the County Board of Supervisors. Sonoma County has never healed from this tragedy, therefore protesters gathered to celebrate what would have been Lopez' 20th birthday, and defied the curfew implemented by SRPD.

h. Deficient Investigations of Attacks & Intimidation Against Peaceful Protesters by SRPD

During recent protests of police violence there have been multiple instances of attempted violent attacks and acts of intimidation against peaceful protesters. These incidents have not been treated seriously by SRPD and have not been adequately investigated. The lack of adequate investigation of such incidents, combined with the violent policing tactics used by SRPD against peaceful protesters, has created an environment of extreme distrust among community members, who believe SRPD has displayed an institutional bias against peaceful protest of police violence, and in favor of those who would harm protesters. Some of those accused of such harm have exhibited signs of White Supremacist ideology.

On May 30, 2020, during a peaceful protest in Santa Rosa town square, a White youth driving a red truck suddenly drove through a crowd of peaceful protesters waving an American flag.

This and other incidents, and how they were responded to by SRPD, have created a feeling among many community members, that SRPD is not operating in an fair and unbiased manner, but rather is aligned with those who oppose protests against police violence in this county. In

addition, other protesters have reported that they have been followed home from protests by SRPD officers in their squad cars, a practice that signals intentional intimidation of protesters and furthers the belief that SRPD officers are aligned against the protests of police violence in Sonoma County. Multiple protesters provided eye-witness accounts and video footage to SRPD to allow them to fully investigate the matter of the red truck. Despite this robust evidence, SRPD initially characterized the incident as a misunderstanding and stated that the youth intended only to fly the flag and show his patriotism in response to the protest. Only after community members gathered additional evidence from the social media accounts of the youth showing his intent to harm protesters, did SRPD finally take the incident seriously and arrest the youth for his criminal acts. Yet, the youth still has not been charged by our District Attorney with a crime.

On June 20, 2020, a White woman in a white Porsche SUV drove into a crowd of peaceful protesters, which included children, despite the efforts of protest guardians who advised her to drive around the area for reasons of safety. The woman drove on the side of the protest for a distance and then very suddenly, with no warning and for no observable reason, veered into the crowd of protesters, causing them to scatter in terror. One minor was reportedly hit by the woman's car, but does not feel comfortable coming forward to be identified, and multiple witnesses have confirmed that the driver hit a protester. When the crowd responded to the woman's reckless actions by banging on and throwing a bicycle at her car, the woman attempted to speed away and escape the scene. A protest supporter in a car sped after the woman, cut her off with his car, and prevented her from leaving until SRPD could arrive. At that point, the woman called SRPD herself and reported that she had been assaulted. Despite voluminous eye-witness reports verifying the protester's version of events, SRPD release a press statement⁸ the following day, characterizing the woman as the victim in this incident, and claiming that her reckless driving that hit a protester and endangered others, resulted from her panic at first being assaulted. Neither SRPD nor the D.A. has charged the woman with a crime to date, nor has she been identified so that the community could research social media to discover evidence of bias, as they did with the youth in the red truck.

⁸ See, [Vehicle Vandalism and Assault during Planned Protest](#) Sgt. Summer Gloeckner, SRPD Press Release June 21, 2020

III. Protest Related Human Rights Violations Reported to the Commission

On Juneteenth Day, June 19, 2020, multiple victims of police violence inflicted during recent protests of police violence met with Mayor Tom Schwedhelm, SRPD Chief Rainer Navarro, and Sonoma County Supervisors Lynda Hopkins and Susan Gorin. The meeting was facilitated by the Sonoma County Commission on Human Rights and structured as a listening session in which public officials heard the stories of protesters. The emotional stories of the peaceful protesters who experienced violence and other violations of their rights were presented without interruption, and public officials present were visibly moved by what they heard. Some of these protesters' stories are set out below. Shortly after this meeting, on June 23, 2020, the Santa Rosa City Attorney's Office made the following statement in reaction to the filing of a lawsuit against the City of Santa Rosa by protesters injured by police violence during the protests:

The Santa Rosa Police Department officers are trained to act with restraint and did in fact act with restraint, using only such non-lethal force as was required after the peaceful demonstrations waned and some chose to become violent and engage in destructive behavior. The suggestion that peaceful protesters were targeted with violence or that the Santa Rosa Police Department acted with the intent to discourage the exercise of freedom of expression or peaceful assembly is simply not true.

Following this callous and untruthful statement by Santa Rosa officials, the protesters met with CHR commissioners to discuss their views of next steps. At that meeting, they decided that, in light of the City's response, the next step was this report, including an announcement of their demands to Santa Rosa City officials.

a. Marqus "Red Bear" Martinez, Native American, Pomo protester

1. Allegations of Lawsuit by Marcus Martinez

Marqus Martinez (Marqus) is a 33-year-old Native American and a member of the Pomo Indian Tribe. He is a father of five, and a surviving victim of police brutality. Marcus was a plaintiff and one of the former inmates in the jail "yard counseling" lawsuit that was settled by the County of Sonoma for \$1.7 Million in 2018. On Sunday May 31, 2020, Marqus attended a peaceful demonstration in support of the Black Lives Matter movement in downtown Santa Rosa near the Old Courthouse Square. As the number of peaceful protesters grew, mostly young people in their teens and twenties, so did the number of police officers dressed in militarized riot gear.

While peacefully protesting with others, Marqus took a knee and invited the officers to take a knee with him in solidarity, but he received no response. After approximately thirty minutes, tactical teams of police in riot gear approached the protesters and began firing teargas into the peaceful crowd. A tear gas canister exploded next to Marqus, causing shortness of breath and his eyes to tear up. Other protesters provided baking soda mixed with water to help stop the burning.

The crowd dispersed. Many peaceful protesters, including Marqus, withdrew several blocks to the intersection of Mendocino and College Avenues. Protesters began to loosely congregate at the intersection. Marqus turned to face the advancing police and again took a knee, raising his hands in the air to show he was not a threat, but as the officers advanced in a phalanx, they again began to fire more tear gas and rubber bullets in the direction of the protesters.

In response, Marqus stood up and began filming the police with his cell phone, calling out that the police were firing on innocent people. Only a few short seconds into his filming, police fired a sting ball grenade directly into Marqus' face. The grenade impacted Marqus' mouth and exploded. The force of the explosion ripped Marqus' face open and destroyed his phone. Video of this event was filmed by Marqus and submitted to legal counsel.

Marqus' upper lip was split in three places up to his nose, and his teeth had been broken off and driven into the roof of his mouth. One tooth was broken off and driven all the way through his tongue. His jaw was broken in multiple locations, and he was concussed. A friend drove him to a Santa Rosa hospital as Marqus tried to hold his face together. When he arrived at the hospital, he didn't recognize his own face. The hospital was unable to treat wounds of his severity, and transported Marqus to Stanford's emergency department where he immediately underwent extensive surgery.

Marqus has continued to receive additional surgeries in an effort to bring his face back to a facsimile of its previous appearance, and will need dental implants.

2. Statement of Liz Martinez, Native American, Pomo protester

"The zip ties on their wrists were extremely tight. When they asked their arresting officers their names, they didn't give it to them. They weren't read their rights. All of that is not okay. All rights were violated at a peaceful protest. When I - I was there with my brother the night of the protest. I seen him on his knees, with his hands up, asking your officers, our officers, who are supposed to protect us in this town, to just kneel, take a kneel - if you have, you know, any remorse for what it is going on. They did not.

Do I feel anger? Yes. Because also my brother was in a lawsuit with this county that they won against the [Sonoma County Sheriff] for brutality in those cells at our corrections facility. Was he targeted? That is another question on my mind that keeps me up at night.

I'm a mother as well. I have to raise my children in this county. I feel unsafe. I have no criminal record. I'm a student nurse. I'm a real estate agent. And I still fear the police here. When I see my brother's face that night, and he told me no officers came to his aid, once he was shot. Ambulance literally were told to go that did try to come towards him, from the police.

Look at his face. [photograph was shown] How does that make you guys feel? Well, let me tell you, as a sister to this man, Marqus, all I can do is feel so much pain and anger to see my brother's face, and to see his children, who seen him for the first time after this. They all cried.

No one should go through that. Especially, I understand if he was in the wrong and that was what your officers are trained to handle this situation. But in this case, he was innocent.

He could have been killed by that rubber grenade that was used and shot directly in his face, along with those other protesters who were shot in the face, as well. And when I met them at another protest, I cried. That should never happen in this county, in any county.

If you don't, if this doesn't make you feel anything, that shows the root of the problem within your police department, and these officers being hired in their positions. Still, I looked at my brother and it saddens me, because he had went under reconstructive surgery, and is still dealing with the trauma of that night.

So, I am asking you guys to hold these officers accountable. You as the chief and their command, find out which officers did this, because they were out there. Someone did this. Fire them. This is not a slap on the wrist, because my brother could not be here today. And I'm very thankful that he still is [alive]. I'm asking for justice for everybody here. We shouldn't feel this way when you guys took that oath to protect us.”

b. Enriquez “Hank” Gonzales, Native American, Pomo protester

“You know, I have a lot of anxiety. You know, I been protesting, even before that, you know, I was there that day that Marqus got hit in the face. And the next day, he had to go to surgery, and all that.

Once he was ready to get released, me and Elizabeth, we went to pick him up at Stanford University and soon as we got to town, he was ready to go protest again. And I was, you know, he really motivated me. Since then, I been out protesting. I been here and in San Francisco.

And one thing, I just want it to stop. I'm tired of our people dealing with police brutality. It affects them mentally, just you know, they heal from scars and bruises, that's just the beginning. They carry this stuff for their whole lives. Anytime they get arrested . . . any time they get pulled over for a traffic stop, you know it always goes around a bit.

And I just want to change it, I don't want the next generation to go through what we went through. You know, they're the next future for you. And you guys are pointing guns at them and threatening them, for exercising their rights. And when we exercise our rights, we still get targeted. The only thing it takes to stop them, is to take the camera out and start. It shouldn't take that, you know. Anyone can be professional, it's possible in the hiring, like that, protocol, and you know, anything like that. It takes a lot for me to be here.

It takes a lot for me to go out and protest, and being arrested, and stuff like that, I don't regret none of that. I'm doing it for you know, like I'm doing it for the next generation, I'm doing it for everybody. And if that means, you know, taking my freedom away, so be it. As long as I can make some changes, I'm willing to make that sacrifice.”

c. Omar Paz, Latino protester

"I attended the 20th Birthday Vigil for Andy Lopez in Roseland Tuesday June 2nd from 5:30-7:00pm and, with my younger sister, joined the protest march in downtown Santa Rosa shortly after. We went with a friend and work colleague who was a member of the press and had his badge to shadow his recording of the events. I also wanted to show my sister, through her first protest with me, what her big brother means when he says he does community work outside of his nonprofit job. She's been aware of my community service second hand but never really seen me at an event. Knowing how protests had escalated the week prior, with the deployment of tear gas and SRPD in full riot gear, I also intended to support the safety and rights of the predominantly youth protesters who had organically coalesced into an unplanned march during the Vigil. Not recognizing any formal leadership or organization, my instincts told me it was best to make myself available to the protesters with the understanding that many were participating in an action for the first time in their lives.

I wanted to make sure they knew their rights since they were planning to be out past curfew, be available for any potential de-escalation needed within the group and in any interactions with law enforcement, and, above all else, that actions were being conducted in a safe manner that wouldn't give any reason for excessive use of force. I had no intention of being out until getting arrested or even that much past curfew. However, I was with one half of the now split group on foot with around 10 or so cars who were being kettled in the SRJC neighborhood area. Any direction I would have taken back to my car was being reported as a hotspot for SRPD presence and, if isolated, my sister and I would have been arrested more easily for trying to get home. We figured safety in numbers was best. I lost contact with my media/press associate and my phone had died leaving me no option but to stay with the crowd and act as a big brother to both the crowd and my sister while we were all being arrested after at least 25 minutes of asking SRPD for passage to disperse and go home, thereby complying with their orders since it was around 10:45 - 11pm at this point. Protesters were having severe anxiety and reactions (some seeming to stem from trauma) at the sight of lines of SRPD in full riot gear, the tactical Bearcat vehicle, not hearing a single response to requests to disperse and knowing that we would all be arrested. My experience, by and large, was MUCH different than that of my Black and Brown women and peers of color who were arrested.

For me personally, the main issues were my zip ties being too tight and cutting off my circulation. I still have scars on my wrists. I did not receive any opportunity for a call out number or a call while in the holding cell. There was no offer of warmer clothes/sweatpants when the cells couldn't have been any warmer than 50-55 degrees. My cellmates and I asked for a blanket or change of clothes, but were rejected and told to wait it out. We asked if the water fountain, which also served as a faucet, had consumable water. We got a laugh and "I

don't know, why don't you find out" as a reply. I was shocked by a pronounced lack of mask-wearing by SRPD officers and superiors. I'd say only 65-70% of officers were complying with mask-wearing; this was much higher for the Sheriff's Deputies. As mentioned in a Press Democrat interview, my mother was recently diagnosed with ovarian and stomach cancers. I take EVERY precaution to not expose her as my sister and I are her primary caretakers. I always sanitize, wear a mask, distance as much as I can, and change/sanitize before entering her house. That law enforcement officials were being more careless than the protestors about this was disturbing.

I even overheard a conversation between an SRPD officer and a protester behind me discussing their thoughts of COVID-19 while in line for the van to escort us to the County Detention facility. While discussing the topic of mask safety and social distancing protocols during the arrest, the officer said to a female protester "Normally I shouldn't be engaging you all like this, but what are your thoughts on the coronavirus threat since you're so concerned with safety?" She discussed being anxious and worried. The officer mentioned that he didn't feel it was as big a threat as the media was making and that a handful of his colleagues felt similarly. They felt the mask and state guidelines were blown out of proportion. This response after a hugely public schism between the County Public Health Officer and Sheriff was unsettling.

As for the treatment of others that I observed, it was much grimmer and painful to watch. When the arrests of protesters in cars were coming near an end, I observed a young Latino male in a solid red sweater being one of the few (It can't be more than 6 or 7 people who were treated this way) who were pressed against a car and physically searched before being handcuffed and escorted to the SRJC Parking lot to be processed. Tens of people, before and after, were not treated this way. I witnessed the separate, violent reactions of SRPD to 3 female protesters who were all tackled individually while apart from the larger group by 2 or more officers in full riot gear. One had her weaves pulled out and knees placed in her back, near her neck, with harsh screams and reactions that were inarguably unnecessary. SRPD officers played with the weave kicking and throwing it at each other while smiling, all while a young, Black woman was being brutalized behind them.

During processing in the SRJC Zumwalt Parking garage, I witnessed 2 young Black women directly next to me, being handled aggressively by an officer whose badge number was covered. His name was visible as "J. Anguiano." One of the girls was calmly asking him to use his words when directing her to the wall 5 feet to my right but he kept on tightening his grip on her back left hip, uncomfortably overlapping her buttocks, and on her neck with sturdy gloves. The protester grew more agitated and escalated her tone to mild shouting for him to stop groping her and she started to wriggle from what seemed like extreme physical and emotional discomfort. Officer Anguiano then addressed her with overt aggression, shouting for her to "Stop resisting," "To get over it," and to "Shut the hell up" while he was severely pinching and gripping the young woman's shoulder with his hand getting more and more physical when she was already where she needed to be. Two other SRPD officers stepped in and took over telling him to calm down and to go check on getting the citation form and clipboard for them to fill

out. They appeared to acknowledge the lack of professionalism amongst themselves while whispering and began to attempt to verbally diffuse the situation by engaging in conversation all the while Officer Anguiano stood by looking visibly upset and waiting for something to do.

Among the rest of the protesters in the garage, there was one particular group that seemed segregated from the rest, mostly composed of individuals who had been frisked when arrested. These were exclusively Black and Brown men and women. I observed more hostile, cold behavior towards them during processing. They had tighter handcuffs than most, were being searched a second time, and separated from the rest of the group. Once transported to the County Detention facility, many of us asked about using the restroom. We had been marching for 5 hours, been processed for another hour, and it was past midnight. We were told it would be still longer until we got to our cells and holding areas. One of the male protesters in my group asked to relieve himself around the corner of the wall we had our backs against to respect the privacy of the female protesters with us, which included my sister. He was denied and told he could go where he was standing if he wanted. The protester apologized to the 8 others present, and we all turned around and took a few steps away while he peed on the wall.

While in the detention facility, there were some disturbingly long and suggestive stares by male Sheriff's deputies at the female protesters who were congregated in the waiting area chairs and floor—this after us asking for and receiving an explanation for the separation by gender due to a previous female inmate having been impregnated by a male inmate or visitor in the same waiting area. Some of the SRPD officers whispered suggestive things and even discussing the attractiveness of the women, going so far as to comment on who they would have sex with, though they said it in more explicit words. I couldn't help but think of my sister's wellbeing and that of every female protester. It was hard to observe and later hear these things from my sister as I have an abundance of direct and indirect experience with physical, sexual, and emotional assault experienced by myself, family members, and close friends.

It's taken a lot, emotionally and spiritually, to write all of this down and give tangible weight to experiences that were largely trapped in my head without proper emotional and psychological processing beyond a few press and radio interviews. The behavior and actions of individual officers towards peaceful protesters is inexcusable. I stand firmly with those who have come forward and the hundreds who have chosen not to for understandably personal reasons, and untold trauma and emotional impact. I share my perspective as a community leader, an older brother, a concerned Sonoma County resident, and as a former youth who once sought to have a career in law enforcement and, potentially, the marines. I know full well the weight of leadership, civic duty, and oaths of office. My narrative, and those of others, come forward in the spirit of transparency, justice, and a call to our elected and appointed officials to rise to the call of your constituents and community members. We need bold action. We need you to face the ugly parts of our society headfirst and show that they will not be tolerated. Too many lives have been lost, damaged beyond repair, and impacted negatively, to consider this one isolated incident among a sea of others. Please hear us and do the right thing.”

d. Raquel Paz, Latina protester

“I participated in the 20th Birthday Vigil for Andy Lopez in Roseland Tuesday June 2nd from 5:30-7:00pm and, with my older brother, joined the protest march in downtown Santa Rosa shortly after. We were arrested during that protest. Many of the arresting officers were not wearing masks. There was racial profiling that took place during the arrest. For example, only Black and Brown men, women, and youth were checked for any weapons. We were not given a phone call throughout the whole time or when we were in jail. There were eight times throughout the whole time I was there that I asked to make my phone call. And they just kept sitting. The rest of the officers just kept saying, “Oh, yeah, at some point. Yeah, sure, just hang tight. Hold on.” But our phone call was never given.

There were various times that I witnessed women and men being grabbed inappropriately and aggressively by law enforcement officers. This also includes youth, too. I was separated purposely while in jail from other protesters, and I truly feel that it was because my brother and I were informing protesters of their rights as we were being arrested. I personally witnessed a handful of women with bruises and marks and swelling due to the zip ties being inappropriately tight. Social distancing rules, for example, of having six feet of distance, were not taken seriously. There was a room full of at least, over 40 women that were crammed like sardines, and were not able to be six feet apart in distance because we were not in a room and there were not enough chairs or spaces to sit up. And so, there were various women sitting on the floor.

At one point, when myself and other arrestees were waiting outside the detention facility loading garage, a handful of woman mentioned they had to use the restroom. But officers declined the requests, saying that they would have to wait until they were processed in order to use the restroom. But there was one male arrestee, who also had to use the restroom, and officers allowed him, in front of myself and other women and male arrestees, to use the bathroom right there, and pee against the wall of the detention facility loading garage, while we were present. And officers explicitly mentioned that that would be okay and allowed him to pee in front of all of us.”

e. Nicole Jordan, African American protester

“On 2 June 2020, I was a part of a march with group of peaceful protesters who took to the streets in Santa Rosa, California to help fight police brutality and support Black Lives Matter. Throughout the night we chanted, marched, and above all stayed peaceful. We wanted to celebrate the birthday of the late Andy Lopez (a thirteen year old who was murdered by SCSO back in 2013) with no violence. The SRPD had a different idea. They cornered us on Mendocino Avenue, and despite us staying nonviolent, the police decided to use unnecessary force. FOUR armed officers used excessive force to take me down: a peaceful, nonviolent, UNARMED woman. They tackled me, shoved my face in the ground, and yanked my legs violently out from under me. When they walked me to the vehicle I kept asking names and one officer grabbed my

hair and shoved my face away from him so I couldn't see his badge number. They arrested all of us that night. Once in booking I was reminding everyone to remember names and badge numbers. I was then put in a holding cell for thirteen hours without a phone call, instead of being put in the booking room with the hundred other protesters who had been arrested. After finally being moved to booking (after 99% of the other protesters were released), I then still had to wait another four hours before they finally processed me out. Once out, I realized they had confiscated quite a few of my items and claimed I "never came in with them". I still have nerve damage to my hand over a month later that I may have for the rest of my life, along with ligature marks that I still have from the zip ties that were placed on my wrists. Besides physical, I also bear the mental scars due to the trauma I experienced thanks to the Santa Rosa Police Department. This was outrageous behavior by the SRPD and a clear abuse of power by a racist police force."

f. Anonymous protester reports to the Commission

1. "Night of June 1, 2020. Three witnesses saw protesters, possibly over 100, march down Morgan St at approximately 9:30pm. Later that night around 12:00am, protesters came running down Morgan St, many asking, "What street am I on?!" "How do I get out of here?!" Those questions made us believe the main group of protesters were not from Santa Rosa. The neighborhood was then teeming with police. There were riot police on College blocking the entrances to the 101 freeway. At approximately 1:30 am, June 2, 2020, we witnessed a Greyhound bus coming up Morgan St from the downtown area. The bus was full. The bus turned left onto College and was allowed access to the 101 freeway. Throughout the days of heavy protests, the protesters ended up on Morgan St several times. Tear gas was thick in the air of the neighborhood. We witnessed one young man on the corner of Morgan and Carrillo get lifted in the air by a riot police officer and thrown to the cement. He screamed in pain and lay there until an ambulance came and took him to hospital. The protester was white."
2. "I overheard a neighbor bragging to a friend about how they had arranged a Greyhound bus full of people to come in and 'deal with these protesters'."
3. "There was also a fake ambulance, full of men dressed in black. Was it a swat cover vehicle?"
4. "I was riding in the patrol car with a white protester. Their zip ties were taken off and they were given water, but they didn't take mine off or give me water."
5. "We asked them for their names and badge numbers, but they wouldn't tell us."

6. "My son was put into a cell with people with mental health issues or who had committed violent offenses. He said it was terrifying and he spent the whole night huddled under his jacket. He is traumatized from the experience."
7. "Officers were overheard congratulating each other on "taking out the medics" after targeting visibly marked volunteer street medics with teargas and projectiles."
8. "There were minors and families with children aged 12-17 in the crowd and they kettled and teargassed them anyway."
9. "A patient of mine had his tibia fractured when attacked by police last Monday night [June 1] during the protest. He also shared similar stories of cops taking off masks anytime they came near him."
10. "Some of the officers were coughing at us on purpose."
11. "I was followed all the way home from a peaceful protest by SRPD for no reason."

g. Arrest and Detention Conditions at Main Adult Detention Facility--Anonymous Member of H-Peace:

"Shortly after being arrested, our N95 masks were taken away from us and discarded and we were given less-protective masks instead. Arresting officers were not wearing masks. We were not read our rights nor were we told whether it was optional to answer the questions asked of us.

Many of our supplies including food, water, saline solution, etc. were thrown away. The rest of our items were taken to the police station for 'safe keeping.'

The officer who searched me took \$76 out of my pocket. He wrote on the form that I had \$20. I kept my eye on the bag of possessions (it included my phone, credit cards, and cash). At the jail, they recorded the amount of cash as \$76. I have both of these forms. I found that discrepancy interesting and am wondering if others have noticed similar discrepancies. I know at least one person reported not receiving back the full amount of cash he originally had.

The women in our group were placed in a crowded waiting room. We counted 45 women in a room that was approximately 20x25 feet. There were not enough chairs for us to sit in and many people were laying or sitting on the floor. It was difficult to keep even 1-2 feet distance between us and certainly impossible to keep 6 feet of distance.

I was concerned about the fact that many women had been touching the water fountain in the room that was our only option for drinking water. In addition, all of us were sharing two small

bathrooms that were not adequately maintained. At one point, I observed vomit all over the floor of one of the bathrooms. When I mentioned this to others in the room, they said they had asked for it to be cleaned several times and that it had been there for over 5 hours. When I addressed this concern with an officer, she said “well, there’s not much we can do about it” and then ignored me. After asking a second officer to address the situation, a janitor was sent to clean the bathroom.

Due to concerns about crowded conditions in the room and people all sharing one water fountain and two small bathrooms, I spoke to two different officers requesting that we be provided with hand sanitizer. I was denied both times and told it wasn’t available. When I pointed out that I could see Clorox wipes sitting on the counter, I was told ‘those aren’t for you.’

I observed a young woman who appeared to be in pain. She stated that she had fallen during the protest and I could see abrasions on one leg and swelling on the other. She said she had requested medical attention several times and was told she was “fine.” It was only after a healthcare professional spoke with the nurse that the woman was provided with an ice pack.

Most people in our group weren’t allowed to make a phone call until 3-5 hours after being arrested. Several young women stated that they had been unable to contact their parents to let them know where they were.

The men were detained in a holding cell and were denied the ability to make phone calls. I overheard one of the men requesting to make a phone call after receiving the code he needed to call out. The officer said “later.” The man reported that he was never provided with an opportunity to make a call nor were any of the 7 other men in the 10x10 holding cell. The cell had a water fountain, but it was not functioning. They reported only receiving water once during the 12 hours they were held there.

Frequently when one of the people in the room attempted to address a concern such as sanitation issues or lack of sufficiently warm clothing, they were told “you should have thought about that before you got arrested” or something similar.

Treatment of detainees was subjective and punitive at times. A young woman who reported she had anemia was shivering and requested sweatpants. She was denied several times. One of the doctors asked the officer for sweatpants for the young woman and explained that she was not able to thermoregulate due to anemia. The officer grabbed her arm and took her from the main waiting room and put her in a cell. I was told that when people inquired about why this happened, the officer allegedly said the doctor was being ‘disruptive.’

I witnessed at least 20 women with lacerations, abrasions, bruises, and swelling due to the zip tie cuffs put on them when they were arrested. Multiple women independently told me that the cuffs had been on them for 3 to 4 hours. I have been told there are pictures of these injuries. One woman told me she has nerve damage from the cuffs.

My personal opinion is that the worst abuses happened at the hands of the SRPD. The officers

at the jail were better about wearing masks and I did not witness any physical abuse occurring. There were certainly officers at the jail who were negligent and punitive. However, several were not. I did repeatedly hear from officers at the jail that they did not have the staff nor capacity to hold 120 people and many of the health/sanitation concerns occurred because the facility simply wasn't equipped to hold 120 people. My question is – if they knew that was the case, why didn't they transfer people to different facilities in order to allow for safer conditions; or why didn't the SRPD and Sheriff's office coordinate with one another? The fact that SRPD chose to arrest medics, people trying to get home from work, and peaceful protestors is the reason we ended up in the situation that occurred at the jail.

Finally, after being arrested, SRPD took us to an outdoor location where we had our information recorded, possessions taken, and pictures taken (later this all happened again at the jail). I was searched by a male officer in a way that I found uncomfortable and invasive. He put his hand into my pants pocket 5 times and moved his hand around allegedly looking for items, however the last 2 or 3 times (at least 2, may have been 3) he did not find anything in my pocket. After not finding anything else in my pocket, it felt unnecessarily invasive that he continued to put his hand in my pocket. I was not given the option of being searched by a female officer, even though several were present. When searched at the jail, I was searched by female officers and the search was significantly quicker and less invasive.”

IV. Commission Recommendations Supporting Injured Protester Demands

- a. The City of Santa Rosa shall engage an independent, comprehensive review of 1) SRPD use-of-force policies, practices, and training; 2) SRPD use of military grade weaponry on adult and minor citizens; and 3) the human rights abuses detailed in this report and others yet to emerge. The independent review shall be conducted by an individual of impeccable and publicly recognized independence and integrity. The review shall be conducted in compliance with the standards for accountability laid out in the United Nations standards included in this report. The results of the independent review shall be presented in a completely public and transparent report that shall be released both to the public and the press, as well as be subject to a public hearing before the Santa Rosa City Council in public session.
- b. The Santa Rosa Police Department, under the leadership of Chief Rainer Navarro, shall initiate disciplinary action towards the officers responsible for the human rights abuses detailed in this report, with a minimum standard of termination of employment. The Commission notes that cases currently in litigation may also include this stipulation at the discretion of legal counsel. The Commission notes that some of the human rights violations reported likely would warrant criminal investigations of the involved SRPD officers, whose identities have yet to be released by Chief Navarro.
- c. The City of Santa Rosa, and in best practice, the County of Sonoma, shall ban the use of military equipment such as teargas, rubber bullets, grenades, and projectiles by law enforcement on the public, especially during peaceful protests.
- d. The City of Santa Rosa, and in best practice, the County of Sonoma, shall ban the practice known as kettling, an aggressive tactic which corrals protesters into an increasingly tighter space with no exit, inducing terror and panic, and increasing the likelihood that significant force will be used. SRPD engaged in widespread use of kettling, trapping individuals and families and not allowing them to disperse while simultaneously ordering them to disperse, even while many requested permission to leave the area in compliance.

V. International Human Rights Law Violations

The City of Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa Police Department, Sonoma County Sheriff's Department and all local LEAs are subject, through International Law and treaties, to the principles of the following declarations. It is the opinion of this Commission that SRPD, SCSO and other LEAs are in direct violation of the following international human rights protections guaranteed to citizens. Additionally, the City of Santa Rosa and County of Sonoma, through its contracts with LEAs, are also in violation of the following international human rights protections by allowing the police tactics and human rights abuses detailed in this report. Please note that the Commission has altered the original text from masculine only to inclusive, gender neutral pronouns (they/them/theirs):

I. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is a milestone document in the history of human rights. Drafted by representatives with different legal and cultural backgrounds from all regions of the world, the Declaration was proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on 10 December 1948 (General Assembly resolution 217 A) as a common standard of achievements for all peoples and all nations. It sets out, for the first time, fundamental human rights to be universally protected and it has been [translated into over 500 languages.](#)”

The information contained in this report is attributed to and upheld by, but not limited to, the following articles of the UDHR:

Article 5.

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 7.

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 9.

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 12.

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with their privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon their honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 20.

- (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
- (2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 30.

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

II. Guidance On Less-Lethal Weapons In Law Enforcement, UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, July 2020.

2. GENERAL PRINCIPLES ON THE USE OF FORCE

2.1 Law enforcement officials shall at all times respect and protect fundamental human rights and freedoms, in particular when they are considering the use of force of any kind. The rights of law enforcement officials to life and to security shall also be respected and ensured.¹⁴

2.2 In carrying out their duties, law enforcement officials shall, as far as possible, make use of non-violent means before resorting to the use of force or firearms. They may use force only if other means appear ineffective or without any promise of achieving the intended result. Where necessary, law enforcement officials shall be equipped with appropriate personal protective equipment, ¹⁶ such as helmets, shields, stab-resistant gloves and vests and bullet-resistant vests. Such appropriate personal protective equipment may decrease the need for law enforcement officials to use weapons of any kind.

2.3 Any use of force by law enforcement officials shall comply with the principles of legality, precaution, necessity, proportionality, non-discrimination and accountability.

LEGALITY

2.4 The use of force shall be regulated by domestic law and administrative regulations in accordance with international law. The use of force can be justified only when it is used with the aim of achieving a legitimate law enforcement objective.¹⁸ National policies that comply with international law and standards shall be adopted on the use of force by law enforcement agencies and officials. The relevant State legislation must be clear enough to ensure that its legal implications are foreseeable, and must be widely published to ensure that it is easily accessible to everyone. Force in law enforcement shall never be used punitively.¹⁹

2.5 Only weapons and weapons systems duly authorized by the relevant State authorities for use in law enforcement may be deployed by law enforcement agencies and used by law enforcement officials. Domestic law and regulations shall specify conditions for the use of less-lethal weapons and related equipment, and shall impose limitations on their use in order to minimize the risk of injury.

PRECAUTION

2.6 Law enforcement operations and actions shall be planned and conducted while taking all necessary precautions to prevent or at least minimize the risk of recourse to force by law enforcement officials and members of the public, and to minimize the severity of any injury that may be caused.²⁰ Law enforcement officials should delay direct contact or engagement with members of the public if that would make the need to use force, or the potential for violent outcomes, less likely, and if the delay causes no danger to the individual posing the threat or to others.²¹ Training law enforcement officials, equipping them with adequate protective equipment and an appropriate range of less-lethal weapons, and making these officials available are essential precautionary measures if unnecessary or excessive harm is to be prevented.

2.7 Law enforcement policies, instructions and operations must give special consideration to those who are particularly vulnerable to the harmful consequences of the use of force in general and to the effects of specific less lethal weapons; such persons include children, pregnant women, the elderly, persons with disabilities, persons with mental health problems and persons under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

NECESSITY

2.8 In carrying out their duty, law enforcement officials may use force only when strictly necessary and only to the extent required for the performance of their duty. In other words, law enforcement officials should use force only when, in the circumstances, it is absolutely necessary in order to achieve a lawful and legitimate law enforcement objective.²²

2.9 The principle of necessity requires that, to achieve a legitimate law enforcement objective, no reasonable alternative appears available at that moment other than resorting to the use of force.²³ In particular, law enforcement officers must seek to de-escalate situations, including by seeking a peaceful resolution to a dangerous situation whenever possible. Depending on the circumstances, unnecessary or excessive use of force may even amount to torture or ill-treatment.²⁴ When the use of force is reasonably necessary in the circumstances, only the minimum force required to achieve that objective shall be used. The use of force must cease as soon as it is no longer necessary.²⁵

PROPORTIONALITY

2.10 The type and level of the force used and the harm that may reasonably be expected to result from it shall be proportionate to the threat posed by an individual or group of individuals or to the offence that an individual or group is committing or is about to commit.²⁶ In no case should the force used be excessive in relation to the legitimate objective to be achieved.²⁷ For example, force that is likely to result in moderate or severe injury – including when applied by less-lethal weapons – may not be used simply to obtain compliance with an order by a person who is only passively resisting. At all times, law enforcement officials should consider and minimize the possible incidental impact of their use of force on bystanders, passers-by, medical personnel and journalists. They shall not direct force against such persons, and any incidental impact must be strictly proportionate to the legitimate objective to be achieved.

NON-DISCRIMINATION

2.11 In performing their duties law enforcement officials shall not discriminate against any person on the basis of race, ethnicity, color, sex, sexual orientation, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, disability, property or birth, or other similar criteria.²⁸ In order to ensure non-discrimination and de facto equal treatment of persons subject to the use of force, a heightened level of care and precaution shall be exercised with respect to individuals who are known or are likely to be especially vulnerable to the effects of a particular weapon.²⁹ Monitoring the use of force, including with reference to appropriate information about those against whom force is used, is a critical element in efforts to ensure that force is not used in a discriminatory manner.

ACCOUNTABILITY

3.1 Under international human rights law and international principles on the use of force, States are under an obligation to ensure that law enforcement officials are held accountable for their actions, including any decision to use force. As law enforcement officials are required to protect the public, in certain circumstances States are also obliged to hold them accountable for omissions.³⁰ To ensure effective accountability, law enforcement agencies shall establish sufficiently independent and effective internal accountability mechanisms, and States should consider the establishment of an adequately resourced external oversight body, in the absence of which an ombudsman or national human rights institution should fulfil this external oversight function.³¹

3.2 Effective accountability for law enforcement officials involves many different actors: government representatives, parliament, the judiciary, civil society actors and independent oversight bodies, including national human rights institutions or ombudspersons' offices.

Primarily, however, it concerns the police and other law enforcement agencies themselves.³² Members of the Government and other political authorities should promote a culture of accountability for law enforcement and must be held responsible if they encourage or enable unlawful behaviour. States' domestic law must comply with international law in regulating and controlling the actions of private security companies operating on or from their territory.

3.3 Monitoring, reporting and transparency are essential components of accountability. Law enforcement officials should be identifiable, for example by wearing nametags or individually assigned service numbers. All weapons³³ (and, where feasible, ammunition, munitions, batons and projectiles) should be uniquely marked. Accountability is further facilitated by keeping a record of the equipping of law enforcement officials with less-lethal weapons, combined with the prompt, comprehensive reporting of incidents where officials have used force.³⁴ In this regard, States should consider requiring all law enforcement agencies to document every use of force involving less lethal weapons or related equipment.

3.4 In the event of injury, a report should contain sufficient information to establish whether the use of force was necessary and proportionate, and should set out the details of the incident, including the circumstances; the characteristics of the victim; the measures taken to avoid the use of force and to de-escalate the situation; the type and manner of force employed, including specific weaponry; the reasons for the use of force, and its effectiveness; and the consequences. The report should conclude whether the use of force was lawful and, in any event, should identify any lessons learned from the incident.

3.5 Where death or injury is caused by the use of a less-lethal weapon or related equipment by a law enforcement official, the incident shall be reported promptly to the official's superiors.³⁵ This obligation also applies to any private security company undertaking law enforcement activities. All deaths and injuries resulting from the use of less-lethal weapons or related equipment — and not only where they result from an apparently or potentially unlawful use of force or a breach of the present Guidance — should be reported without delay to a judicial or other competent authority. This independent authority shall be mandated to conduct prompt, impartial and effective investigations into the circumstances and causes of such cases.

3.6 The use of force in a custodial setting should be reported immediately to the director of the institution or to an individual of equivalent authority, as appropriate.³⁶ Regardless of the opening of any internal investigation, the prison director shall report to a judicial or other competent authority, without delay, any custodial death, disappearance or serious injury or any incident in which there are reasonable grounds to believe that torture or other

cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment has been committed. This authority shall be independent of the prison administration and mandated to conduct prompt, impartial and effective investigations into the circumstances and causes of such cases.³⁷

3.7 Every law enforcement official is responsible for his or her decisions and actions, including a commander. Each use of force must be justified and justifiable.³⁸ Obedience to a manifestly unlawful order from a superior to use force does not excuse any illegal act.³⁹ Governments and law enforcement agencies shall ensure that no criminal or disciplinary sanction is imposed on a law enforcement official who refuses to carry out an illegal order to use a less-lethal weapon or who reports such illegal orders or such use of force by other officials.

3.8 Under international human rights law, there is an obligation on the State to investigate all alleged or suspected violations of human rights, in particular the rights to life, and security, and to freedom from torture or other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.⁴¹ Such investigations shall be impartial, independent and effective, and shall be conducted in a prompt and transparent manner. All law enforcement officials shall cooperate fully with any such investigation, and investigators shall be able to compel the production of evidence. Such investigative powers should be given to independent police oversight mechanisms which strengthen the accountability of law enforcement agencies and officials. Medical professionals involved in any investigation shall act in accordance with professional ethics, including the duty to act impartially with a view to facilitating justice.

3.9 When law enforcement officials deprive an individual of liberty, for instance by detaining that person or placing him or her in custody, they assume a greater responsibility to protect that individual's rights, in particular the rights to life and to physical integrity. Where a person dies in custody, including as a result of the use of less-lethal weapons, there is a presumption of responsibility of the State, and the burden of proof rests upon the State to prove otherwise. In any event, a prompt, impartial, independent, effective and transparent investigation must be carried out by an independent body.⁴²

3.10 Where an investigation into the use of force by law enforcement officials reveals evidence that a death or injury may have been caused unlawfully, the State should ensure that perpetrators are prosecuted through a judicial process and, if convicted, given appropriate punishment.⁴³ Punishment for the unlawful use of force by law enforcement officials shall be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. Where domestic or international law or an administrative regulation is violated, retraining or requalification may be required in addition to any criminal law or disciplinary sanction or any civil law penalty that may be imposed on the law enforcement officials responsible.

3.11 States should ensure, including through an internal periodic review, that lessons learned from situations where the exercise of human rights has been negatively affected by the use of less-lethal weapons or related equipment are fully reflected in policies, procedures and training.⁴⁴

3.12 Victims of the unlawful use of force by law enforcement officials shall have the right to an effective remedy.⁴⁵ Forms of remedy include compensation, guarantees of non-repetition, rehabilitation, reparation, restitution and satisfaction. The right of victims to participate in any investigation should be respected.

3.13 Accountability for the unlawful use of force by law enforcement officials is supported by United Nations human rights mechanisms, such as the treaty bodies and the special procedures of the Human Rights Council. In the absence of State compliance, accountability may be ensured or promoted by international judicial mechanisms, such as regional human rights courts or international criminal tribunals, and, in exceptional circumstances, by the International Criminal Court. Accountability for the unlawful use of force in law enforcement contexts has also been promoted by international commissions of inquiry and fact-finding missions, and in country and thematic reports of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).

III. Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners – UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner

“Part I of the rules covers the general management of institutions, and is applicable to all categories of prisoners, criminal or civil, untried or convicted, including prisoners subject to “security measures” or corrective measures ordered by the judge.”

The information contained in this report is attributed to and upheld by, but not limited to, the following articles of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners:

Basic principle

Part I

RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION

Basic principle

6. (1) The following rules shall be applied impartially. There shall be no discrimination on grounds of race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Separation of categories

8. (b) Untried prisoners shall be kept separate from convicted prisoners;

(c) Persons imprisoned for debt and other civil prisoners shall be kept separate from persons imprisoned by reason of a criminal offence;

Accommodation

9. (1) Where sleeping accommodation is in individual cells or rooms, each prisoner shall occupy by night a cell or room by themselves. If for special reasons, such as temporary overcrowding, it becomes necessary for the central prison administration to make an exception to this rule, it is not desirable to have two prisoners in a cell or room.

(2) Where dormitories are used, they shall be occupied by prisoners carefully selected as being suitable to associate with one another in those conditions. There shall be regular supervision by night, in keeping with the nature of the institution.

10. All accommodation provided for the use of prisoners and in particular all sleeping accommodation shall meet all requirements of health, due regard being paid to climatic conditions and particularly to cubic content of air, minimum floor space, lighting, heating and ventilation.

Clothing and bedding

17. (1) Every prisoner who is not allowed to wear their own clothing shall be provided with an outfit of clothing suitable for the climate and adequate to keep them in good health. Such clothing shall in no manner be degrading or humiliating.

(2) All clothing shall be clean and kept in proper condition. Underclothing shall be changed and washed as often as necessary for the maintenance of hygiene.

18. If prisoners are allowed to wear their own clothing, arrangements shall be made on their admission to the institution to ensure that it shall be clean and fit for use.

19. Every prisoner shall, in accordance with local or national standards, be provided with a separate bed, and with separate and sufficient bedding which shall be clean when issued, kept in good order and changed often enough to ensure its cleanliness.

Food

20. (1) Every prisoner shall be provided by the administration at the usual hours with food of nutritional value adequate for health and strength, of wholesome quality and well prepared and served.

(2) Drinking water shall be available to every prisoner whenever they need it.

Medical services

22. (1) At every institution there shall be available the services of at least one qualified medical officer who should have some knowledge of psychiatry. The medical services should be organized in close relationship to the general health administration of the

community or nation. They shall include a psychiatric service for the diagnosis and, in proper cases, the treatment of states of mental abnormality.

(2) Sick prisoners who require specialist treatment shall be transferred to specialized institutions or to civil hospitals. Where hospital facilities are provided in an institution, their equipment, furnishings and pharmaceutical supplies shall be proper for the medical care and treatment of sick prisoners, and there shall be a staff of suitable trained officers.

(3) The services of a qualified dental officer shall be available to every prisoner.

24. The medical officer shall see and examine every prisoner as soon as possible after their admission and thereafter as necessary, with a view particularly to the discovery of physical or mental illness and the taking of all necessary measures; **the segregation of prisoners suspected of infectious or contagious conditions**; the noting of physical or mental defects which might hamper rehabilitation, and the determination of the physical capacity of every prisoner for work.

25. (1) The medical officer shall have the care of the physical and mental health of the prisoners and should daily see all sick prisoners, all who complain of illness, and any prisoner to whom their attention is specially directed.

(2) The medical officer shall report to the director whenever they consider that a prisoner's physical or mental health has been or will be injuriously affected by continued imprisonment or by any condition of imprisonment.

26. (1) The medical officer shall regularly inspect and advise the director upon:

- (a) The quantity, quality, preparation and service of food;
- (b) The hygiene and cleanliness of the institution and the prisoners;
- (c) The sanitation, heating, lighting and ventilation of the institution;
- (d) The suitability and cleanliness of the prisoners' clothing and bedding;
- (e) The observance of the rules concerning physical education and sports, in cases where there is no technical personnel in charge of these activities.

(2) The director shall take into consideration the reports and advice that the medical officer submits according to rules 25 (2) and 26 and, in case they concur with the recommendations made, shall take immediate steps to give effect to those recommendations; if they are not within their competence or if they does not concur with them, they shall immediately submit their own report and the advice of the medical officer to higher authority.

Discipline and punishment

31. Corporal punishment, punishment by placing in a dark cell, and all cruel, inhuman or degrading punishments shall be completely prohibited as punishments for disciplinary offences.

Information to and complaints by prisoners

35. (1) Every prisoner on admission shall be provided with written information about the regulations governing the treatment of prisoners of their category, the disciplinary requirements of the institution, the authorized methods of seeking information and making complaints, and all such other matters as are necessary to enable them to understand both their rights and their obligations and to adapt themselves to the life of the institution.

(3) Every prisoner shall be allowed to make a request or complaint, without censorship as to substance but in proper form, to the central prison administration, the judicial authority or other proper authorities through approved channels.

(4) Unless it is evidently frivolous or groundless, every request or complaint shall be promptly dealt with and replied to without undue delay.

Contact with the outside world

37. Prisoners shall be allowed under necessary supervision to communicate with their family and reputable friends at regular intervals, both by correspondence and by receiving visits.

VI. Appendix of Media Coverage and Supportive Evidence of Protester Accounts

Section II. Recent Notable Local Incidents Related to Police Violence

a. Sonoma County Jail “Yard Counseling” Torture Incidents

["Yard counseling" incident - 5:28 Highlight](#) Isaak Schwaiger, Attorney at Law

h. Deficient Investigations of Attacks & Intimidation Against Peaceful Protesters by SRPD and SCSO

1. 6/4/20 [Santa Rosa teen arrested on suspicion of driving pickup into crowd at George Floyd protest](#) Chantelle Lee, Press Democrat
2. 6/21/20 (7:29am) [Protester Evidence Video of White Porsche Assault](#) Rigel Bowen, public social media post
3. 6/21/20 (12:38pm) [Vehicle Vandalism and Assault during Planned Protest](#) Sgt. Summer Gloeckner, SRPD Field Services Division Press Release(see public comments disputing press release content)
4. 6/22/20 [Protesters Allege Motorist Tried to Hit Them - Police Claim Motorist is the Victim](#) Chelsea Kurnick, North Bay Bohemian
5. 6/22/20 [Santa Rosa protesters accuse motorist of trying to hit them during Saturday night march](#) Austin Murphy, Press Democrat
6. 6/26/20 [Lawsuit: Sonoma Deputy Assaulted Black Man Sleeping in Car, Then Covered It Up](#) Alex Emslie, KQED (2019 incident. The article states the “county has refused to make the footage public despite state law and Sheriff’s Office protocol indicating it should be released.”)
7. 7/9/20 [Focus of SR Police’s Investigation Into Porsche-Protester Incident Remains Unclear](#) Chelsea Kurnick, North Bay Bohemian
8. List of vehicular assault eyewitness reports to the Commission as of the release of this report(chronological), starting May 30, 2020:
 - Red Truck (arrested after intense community pressure)
 - Prius or Mini Cooper (Youth March—vehicle type/possible multiple events not confirmed)
 - White Chevy Colorado (Youth March--medium pickup, brandished shotgun)
 - Burgundy/Brown White Stripe Ford F-150 (Youth March)
 - Chevy Silverado (Silent March--Punisher/American flag shield decal on rear window)
 - White Porsche SUV Cayenne (24 Hour Protest)
 - White Dodge Ram Pickup (Healdsburg)
 - Dark Pewter/Gray Dodge Ram Pickup (Healdsburg)

Section III. Protest Related Human Rights Violations Reported to the Commission on Human Rights

a-f. Injured Protester Accounts – Attributed and Anonymous

1. Names of officers responsible for human rights violations, abuses and assaults provided to the Commission. Note: as officers refused to give names and badge numbers, protesters were only able to identify partial names in some cases, and have stated that verification is needed by SRPD Chief Navarro to confirm the identities of these officers:

Officer L. Alexander
Officer J. Anguiano(name visible)
Officer Benned
Office Borrusa
Officer Box
Officer Nahine
Officer Cody Sousa

2. 6/2/20 [Police Assault of Nicole Jordan](#) Gabe Meline, Twitter, stating assault of Nicole Jordan occurred simultaneously as item #2 showing calm and restraint by officers.
3. 6/2/20 [Protesters Being Arrested in Santa Rosa](#) Press Democrat live video
4. 6/4/20 [Man's Jaw Fractured, Teeth Knocked Out By Law Enforcement During Protest](#) Will Carruthers, North Bay Bohemian
5. 6/7/20 [Anger, concern mount over Santa Rosa police use of rubber bullets, other less-lethal control devices on protesters](#) Austin Murphy, Press Democrat
6. 6/9/20 [Santa Rosa police investigating complaints filed by protesters injured by projectiles](#) Julie Johnson, Press Democrat
7. 6/23/20 [Santa Rosa police sued by protesters injured in Black Lives Matter demonstration](#) Julie Johnson, Press Democrat
8. 6/7/20 ['The reopening of a wound that never healed': Why one man protested in Santa Rosa](#) (Omar Paz re: Andy Lopez and Protest account) Phil Barber, PressDemocrat
9. 6/9/20 [Eight Nights in the Streets of Santa Rosa](#) Gabe Meline, KQED
10. Anonymous Protester Account #3 - Ambulance with unidentified men dressed in black inside.



g. Anonymous Member of H-Peace - Detention Conditions at Main Adult Detention

Facility:

1. 6/8/20 [Over One Hundred Held Overnight In Unsafe Conditions](#) Chelsea Kurnick, North Bay Bohemian
2. 6/10/20 [Sonoma County's Mayors and Police Chiefs Joint Press Conference-Version 1](#) City of Santa Rosa
3. 6/10/10 [Version 2: June 10 Sonoma County's Mayors and Police Chiefs Joint Press Conference \(improved audio\)](#) City of Santa Rosa

NOTE:

The Commission may consider releasing an additional, supplemental section with US law citations on potential constitutional violations that may be implicated by the protest policing actions detailed in this report.