

**From:** [Jennifer Rakowski](#)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Manager Manager](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Michele Pryor](#); [Greg Boller](#); [City Clerk](#); [Nishant Joshi](#); [Alan Kuboyama](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 5-E  
**Date:** Monday, April 14, 2025 10:59:39 PM

---

Dear City Council,

The careful review and reauthorization of police use of equipment under AB 481 is a solemn trust placed on you as elected officials.

I am sharing a few of my own thoughts from my review of this years report and related materials.

“24-02563: Alameda Police personnel discharged an AR-15 rifle in the City of Alameda to apprehend a dog that had mauled its owners.” Further clarity from the multiple level internal reviews of the firing of these 2 rounds, specifically any actions or recommendations that came out of those reviews once they are all complete would be helpful. Also, the annual report should broadly include any uses of force during deployment of the AR 15, not the narrower frame of only reporting on firing of the weapon.

“An equipment audit was completed in December 2024 and all equipment was accounted for and confirmed to be in its assigned storage areas.” This could be expanded to clarify for the community what steps are taken to check for and properly dispose of expired equipment. See below for a recent local incident that highlights community interest in seeing that equipment is properly checked for expiration dates and carefully used during training exercises.

“An audit of the use of the Emergency Response Vehicle determined the deployment for the 4th of July Parade was not reported as required by APD Policy 409.3. The Commander overseeing the operation received additional training and corrective action.” This is a useful example in the report of transparency and accountability. It's inclusion builds community trust.

On March 26th 2025 APD documented its first use of a uncrewed aerial system deployment. At this time APD does not yet have permission to fly over Bay Farm and a significant portion of the main island. City Council should continue to closely monitor the locations, types of situations and demographics of subject involved in these aerial deployments

I hope you find these reflections helpful and add your own thoughts and questions to this years assessment.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Rakowski

News on training incident:

<https://sfsheriff.com/sites/default/files/2024-05/Media%20Release%20Chemical%20Training%20Exercise.pdf>

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2024-05-31/nearly-30-school-children-fall-ill-from-chemical-agents-used-in-a-police-training-exercise-in-san-bruno>

RE: Item 5E City Council agenda for April 15, 2025

April 9, 2025

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,

I am writing to draw your attention to what I believe are deficiencies in the quality and content of the Report on the use of Military Equipment by our police department.

I am not especially concerned with the use of the equipment per se or whether or not the Military Equipment Report is accepted. I am concerned however with the quality and content of the report.

It appears that all the required boxes have been checked, but the information provided is, in my opinion, suboptimal in terms of adequately informing the public regarding the operation of the military equipment program.

The incidents that involved the use of the equipment are not adequately explained. The report does not include the names of the officers who authorized the use of the equipment are listed which I believe is a policy requirement.

The use of the equipment by other agencies, but the reasons for such use, are not adequately explained, nor is the process that is involved in such sharing of Alameda's military equipment. What is the process, and who is involved? Do the "other agencies" pay for the use; are they responsible for possible damage or destruction of the equipment; are they alone responsible for any legal actions that might result from such use; does the Chief do an after-action validation regarding the appropriateness and other elements of the use of the equipment?

The reports list concerns filed by the public, but there is no reporting of the responses. Are the concerns reviewed and signed off on by a non-APD person or relevant group or commission?

I would especially appreciate an explanation regarding the authorization for the use of an AR15 for the incident involving a dangerous dog. What was the process of receiving authorization for use of the rifle? Who authorized it? Do officers always carry such weapons when they respond to requests for officer involvement in public episodes, or did this particular officer just happen to have an AR15 with him? Did the discharge of the weapon in a public environment constitute a danger to members of the public who might have been in the vicinity of the activity? The limited detail in the statement in the staff report indicating that the AR15 was discharged is not sufficient. Was one bullet, or were multiple, bullets discharged? Was the dog injured or killed? Or perhaps the officer just threatened the dog. Is there an after-action summary documented and signed-off on by the Chief?

My real concern here is that the report is not optimally informative. In this regard, I recommend that a committee of community members be tasked with improving the quality of the report. In addition, I

noted that the organization of the APD website is such that it is difficult to find specific and detailed information. Note that there is only the 2024 report available. No prior year reports.

Thank you for your attention.

Jay Garfinkle

.