



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
PUBLIC SAFETY REFORM AND OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
VIRTUAL MEETING

Thursday, September 9, 2021

5:30 P.M.

Join the meeting at: <https://bluejeans.com/540059081/0079>

Call to Order

Roll Call

Swearing in of new Commissioners

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a regular meeting of the PUBLIC SAFETY REFORM AND OVERSIGHT COMMISSION will be held at 5:30 p.m., on THURSDAY, AUGUST 12, 2021, VIA TELECONFERENCE PURSUANT TO EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20 ISSUED BY, GOVERNOR GAVIN NEWSOM at <https://bluejeans.com/540059081/0079> for the purpose of only conducting the following business.

Please note that Agenda Items may be reordered during the meeting at the discretion of the body.

1. Special Agenda Items

- a. Welcome to new Commissioners Palazzolo and Ramirez
- b. Chair report re logistics for review of minutes for first four meetings.
- c. Chair report re process for community members to volunteer to assist Commission

2. Consent Calendar

- a. No items

3. Study Session

- a. Community listening session one: Group One's views on SMPD and suggestions for innovations in public safety and or improvements and

- reform of existing policy, training, and practices. Commissioner Q&A.
- b. Community listening session two: Group Two's views on SMPD and suggestions for innovations in public safety and or improvements and reform of existing policy, training, and practices. Commissioner Q&A.
- c. Community listening session three: Group Three's views on SMPD and suggestions for innovations in public safety and or improvements and reform of existing policy, training, and practices. Commissioner Q&A.
- d. Drafting session for written report and recommendations to City Council regarding OIR Group Report, SMPD Response, and Commission's intended work plan. Discussion of [SMPD July 29, 2021 Information](#) Item and SMPD Response to [OIR Group report](#) on May 31, 2020 events

4. Continued Items -

- a. Discuss

5. Administrative Proceedings - none

6. Staff Administrative Items

- a. Receive and file status update or staff report on the status of information requested by Commission re complaints, discipline and related matters (pending since June 16, 2021).
- b. Receive and file report on Commission's August 12 Request to City Manager or City Attorney to provide information on status of hiring Inspector General to support and work at the direction of the Commission, including selection process, conflicts of interest process and key contractual terms.
- c. Receive and file report on Commission's August 12 Request to City Manager to provide the Commission with regular status updates on the search for a new Police Chief.
- d. Receive and file status update or staff report on the status of recommendations from the Public Safety Reform Advisory Committee and provide direction to staff on next steps.
- e. Receive and file status update or staff proposal on structuring community engagement and community input into the Commission's work and provide direction to staff on next steps.
- f. Receive and file status update or staff report on proposed process for the Commission to evaluate issues relating to SMPD interaction with the unhoused population and provide direction to staff on next steps.
- g. Receive and file status update or staff report on identifying additional training opportunities for understanding racial equity and provide direction to staff on next steps.
- h. Receive and file status update or staff report identifying additional training

opportunities for oversight of law enforcement and provide direction to staff on next steps.

7. **Public Hearing** – none

8. **Resolutions** – none

9. **Written Communications**

10. **Public Safety Reform and Oversight Commission Member Discussion Items**

- a. Committee Reports: Operations, Staffing and Budget (G. Brown, D. Devermont, A. Scott)
- b. Discussion of recommendations and future written report regarding the agreement between the City and SMPOA relating to the operations of the Commission through September 27.

11. Public Input: The Commission will provide time for additional public input on matters within its purview on items that were not on the agenda. State law prohibits the Commission from taking any action on items not listed on the agenda, including issues raised under this agenda item.

Adjournment

STANDARDS OF BEHAVIOR THAT PROMOTE CIVILITY AT ALL PUBLIC MEETINGS:

- Treat everyone courteously
 - Listen to others respectfully
 - Give open-minded consideration to all viewpoints
 - Focus on the issues and avoid personalizing debate
1. Embrace respectful disagreement and dissent as democratic rights, inherent components of an inclusive public process, and tools for forging sound decisions

This agenda is available in alternate formats upon request. If you require any special disability related accommodations (i.e. sign language interpreting, language interpretation, etc.), please contact the City Manager's Office via

Lisa.Parson@smgov.net at least 1 day prior to the scheduled meeting.

This agenda is subject to change up to 72 hours prior to a regular meeting. Please check the agenda for prior to the meeting for changes.

Transportation Information: This meeting is being held virtually. No in person access is available.

Public Safety Reform and Oversight Commission

September 9, 2021 Regular Meeting

Chair Report

Agenda item 10.b.

Agreement between City and POA

Drafted by George Cardona, interim City Attorney

Approved by City Council on August 24, 2021

"In conjunction with negotiations to attempt to arrive at a resolution of the claims set out by the Santa Monica Police Officers' Association in *SMPOA v. City of Santa Monica*, Public Employment Relations Board, Case No. LA-CE-1535-M (the "Pending Matter"), the City agrees that through 5:00 pm on September 27, 2021:

1. The City may proceed with and complete the hiring of a contractor to serve as the Inspector General. The Inspector General, however, will not be provided with access to any SMPD disciplinary records and personnel files. The Inspector General may be provided with access to SMPD data and records regarding uses of force, stops, arrests, and convictions, and either the City or the Inspector General may provide to the Commission aggregate information not identifiable to actions of any particular SMPD officer derived from the data and records.
2. The Commission will not receive from the City or the Inspector General any information relating to any violations of procedures or policies in connection with disciplinary investigations, proceedings, and actions, and will not make any recommendations regarding any such violations, or regarding discipline or investigation of any particular conduct by any particular SMPD officer, to the Police Chief, City Manager, City Council, or any City Board or Commission.
3. Neither the Commission nor any individual Commissioner or group of Commissioners purporting to act on behalf of the Commission will make any recommendations with respect to transparency or availability of SMPD disciplinary records and personnel files to the Police Chief, City Manager, City Council, or any City Board or Commission.
4. Neither the Commission nor any individual Commissioner or group of Commissioners purporting to act on behalf of the Commission will make any recommendations regarding the proposed budget for the SMPD to the Police Chief, City Manager, City Council, or any City Board or Commission.

5. Neither the Commission nor any individual Commissioner or group of Commissioners purporting to act on behalf of the Commission will make any recommendations regarding SMPD policies and practices, including any proposed reforms for handling complaints regarding SMPD conduct, to the Police Chief, City Manager, City Council, or any City Board or Commission. The Commission may continue with its review of SMPD policies and practices.
6. The Commission will not make any written reports to the City Council. The Commission, however, may proceed with (a) reviewing the information item submitted by SMPD setting out a plan for implementation of the OIR Report's recommendations and (b) based on that review preparing and submitting for City Council consideration a work plan for consolidating their consideration of other policing issues, as required by the deadline of September 27, 2021 set by the City Council.
7. Commission inquiries to SMPD for information regarding policies and practice will be made through the staff liaison to SMPD command staff. Individual Commissioners will not make individual requests for information to individual SMPD officers.
8. The Commission may proceed with the training it is receiving in accordance with SMMC 2.50.020(e). City staff will schedule training sessions only if two or more Commissioners have committed to attendance, and will cancel no later than 24 hours in advance if Commissioners have failed to confirm their attendance. The completion of training will not serve as a basis for the City to reject a proposal by the POA to alter or expand the membership of the Commission, though the City reserves its right to reject such a proposal for any other reasons.

Subject to these limitations, the Commission and its various committees will continue their work, and SMPOA agrees that, through the earlier of (a) September 17, 2021 or (b) the date on which the parties agree that they are unable to reach agreement on a negotiated resolution of the claims in the Pending Matter (the "Stay Date"), SMPOA will not file, either with the Public Employment Relations Board ("PERB") or in any other forum or court, any motion seeking declaratory, injunctive, or other relief to prevent or limit the Commission and its various committees from meeting and continuing their work. If the parties have arrived at a proposed resolution of the claims in the Pending Matter as of September 17, 2021, the parties shall work out terms for implementing that resolution that may include a different agreement regarding Commission activities. If the parties have not arrived at a proposed resolution of the claims in the Pending Matter as of the Stay Date, the parties will remain free to agree on a modification or extension of the terms above to permit further negotiations, or SMPOA may move forward with seeking relief from a court or other forum regarding the Commission's ongoing activities, with the terms above remaining in place through September 27, 2021, after which, in the absence of such relief, the Commission will resume its full activities, unlimited by the terms above. SMPOA also agrees that it will not object to a request by the City to extend for 60 days the time for the City to file with the

PERB its position statement in response to the unfair practice charge in the Pending Matter."

//

Public Safety Reform and Oversight Commission

September 9, 2021 Regular Meeting

Chair Report for Agenda Item 3.d.

Subject: Commission's work in progress on Written Report and Recommendations to City Council regarding OIR Group Report on May 31, 2020 events.

Earlier this year, our City Council received and reviewed the OIR Group Report and discussed its implications. The OIR Group Report contained sharp criticism of SMPD on numerous topics, including critiques of the leadership, communications, policy flaws, and violations of policy and other potential misconduct by officers during the May 31, 2020 protests, opportunistic looting, and related events. The City Council asked the SMPD to provide a detailed response to the OIR Group Report within sixty days, and asked our Commission to provide a report back to City Council reflecting our assessment and how the Commission plans to incorporate the recommendations into the Commission's overall work plan. That report was scheduled to be completed by late September.

Over the months since its inception, the Commission has been reviewing and discussing the OIR Group report and its implications for our work on oversight and reform of policing in Santa Monica and reimagining public safety. The Commission received an ad hoc committee report with that committee's initial review and recommendations on major themes and priorities they observed. We have had discussions at our regular Commission meetings to solicit individual Commissioner input and public input. In addition, the Operations, Staffing and Budget Committee had been holding weekly special meetings for the purpose of ensuring each Commissioner has had opportunities to provide input and their opinions about the OIR Group Report and to help shape our conclusions and work plan going forward.

We will continue having weekly working sessions, likely through special meetings of the full Commission, to further develop ideas for inclusion in our written report to City Council. All Commissioners are encouraged to attend these weekly public meetings and contribute to the discussion.

Current Outline of Themes, Issues and Recommendations

1. What issues raised by the OIR Group report are the most important for the Commission to include in its work?

Body worn camera compliance issues. There is concern that there has been insufficient detail provided about the lack of compliance with the BWC policy by SMPD officers on May 31, 2020. We don't know the details about the officers disciplined, such as the specific conduct, and what the discipline was. We don't have sufficient information about the conduct of the officers who did not comply and were not disciplined. We don't have information on the policy or how it is enforced, or what changes have been made to the policy or procedures in response to the OIR Group report.

Accountability and discipline. There is concern that the systems of accountability and discipline need to be strengthened.

Leadership. The OIR Group Report flagged substantial weaknesses in the overall leadership of SMPD that were manifest because of the urgent and emergency situations that unfolded on May 31, 2020. We are concerned that these leadership challenges persist within the department and further work needs to be done.

Leadership infrastructure. We would like to understand how the SMPD leadership will organize its response to future incidents similar to the events of May 31, 2020.

False narrative. There is concern that the SMPD and other City officials have used evasive and untrue language when communicating to the public about matters of concern. That conduct has not been limited to the former leadership of SMPD and we are concerned that the practice has continued to the present.

Involvement of outside law enforcement agencies on May 31, 2020. There is interest in learning more about the role of outside law enforcement agencies during the events on May 31. There is insufficient information about efforts to obtain BWC footage from those agencies or what efforts were made to evaluate the conduct of those outside agencies during the protests.

Lawful assembly best practices. It is important to understand what are the best practices for lawful assembly and First Amendment related activities.

Use of Force during protests. There are concerns about the various uses of force that occurred during the May 31, 2020 events. The OIR Group identified numerous examples of potential misconduct that should have been investigated by SMPD. In addition, the OIR Group Report reveals significant issues regarding the policies and training on Use of Force by SMPD.

Transparency. There are concerns about transparency between SMPD, the City Attorney's Office and the community.

2. What work should the Commission do to address these important issues? Please be specific.

Body worn camera recommendations:

- Commission should seek assistance of Inspector General to follow up on details of noncompliance;
- Commission should obtain camera footage and audio from outside agencies who participated in May 31, 2020 activity in Santa Monica;
- Commission should demand immediate receipt and publication of SMPD's body worn camera policy;
- Commission should insist that training and policy on use of cameras be evaluated with a goal of adopting the latest best practices for use of such cameras to enhance their legitimacy and trust within the community.
-

Accountability Recommendations:

- consider modifications to the Commission ordinance to provide further accountability mechanisms and enhance the involvement of the Commission in the accountability process.
- evaluate whether the Commission should have subpoena power.
- evaluate revisions to the discipline procedures for the SMPD.
- continue to invite the Police Chief and SMPD leadership to respond to Commission questions and provide specific answers.

Leadership Recommendations:

- PSROC should be meaningfully included in search for new Police Chief;
- PSROC should provide a list of characteristics, skills and experience to look for in the next Police Chief;
- City Manager should require Police Chief to develop a plan for positively interacting with the Commission and collaborating on policy and other matters of public safety;
- City Council should insist that contract with new Police Chief contains goals for accountability of the department and its officers;
- City Manager should design performance goals for the new Police Chief that include measures for community engagement and cooperation with the Commission.

False Narrative Recommendations:

- City Council and City Manager should insist that SMPD become more transparent about all aspects of SMPD activities;

- Commission should evaluate the operation and structure of public communications within the SMPD and consider ideas for improvement.

3. How can the Commission best obtain the cooperation of the SMPD and its leaders as we pursue our work?

- Request the Chief to appear and answer questions;
- Find ways to receive information requested by the Commission in a timely manner;
- Emphasize to the City leadership the importance of the Chief selection and that the Commission should have a greater role in the selection process;

4. What additional matters should be addressed in our report to City Council in September?

- The lack of sufficient resources provided to support the Commission;
- The insufficient responsiveness of the City in providing requested information;
- The need for Commission input in the selection of new SMPD Chief.
- We should remind the City Council of the widespread support for civilian oversight; the rationale behind civilian oversight, the fact that it is a widely acknowledged best practice for community oriented policing.
- We should explain why the police cannot be entrusted to police themselves, using examples from the recent past.
- Concerns about the SM POA and actions that are inconsistent with civilian oversight and with fundamental democratic values.

//

Date: August 30, 2021

Subject: Agreement between City and SM POA to Restrict Public Safety Reform Oversight Commission

Dear Council Members:

I learned recently from interim City Attorney Cardona that the City Council voted in private on August 24, 2021 to deliver a gut punch to civilian oversight in Santa Monica, and an insult to the many community members who have worked hard to bring improvements to public safety over many years. I assume Council acted in good faith, based on information provided by the interim City Attorney, and that the Council believes in the goals of independent civilian oversight.

Nevertheless, the agreement leaves the Public Safety Reform and Oversight Commission unable to fulfill its duties under the Ordinance that established it. Council agreed to a negotiated agreement with the Santa Monica Police Officers' Association that amounts to a total capitulation to the POA's demands for injunctive relief. The agreement is vastly more intrusive than was required and ties the hands of the Commission in numerous ways, both absurd and telling, purporting to prohibit the Commission from:

- making written reports to the City Council;
- making any recommendations (to the Police Chief, City Council or City Manager) regarding any SMPD policies and practices;
- making any recommendations regarding the proposed SMPD budget;
- seeking any information from any SMPD officer.

What are they afraid of? While the POA claims to be in support of civilian oversight, their actions belie their true intention. POA members participated in the work of an advisory committee last year, and, in my opinion, worked from the outset to undermine any attempts at reform or oversight. They had full access to City officials, and ample opportunity to express their objections. I continue to marvel at how the POA and SMPD leadership claim to be proud of their purported progressive best-in-class policing, yet work so hard to prevent anyone from actually looking inside to see what is really happening.

Despite significant resistance from SMPD, the City Council last year unanimously

adopted the recommendations of the advisory committee formed in the wake of George Floyd's murder by Minneapolis police and the massive nationwide protests that followed. The Santa Monica community overwhelmingly expressed the view that our city should be on the side of ending systemic racism and taking numerous steps to re-examine longstanding institutional and structural mechanisms that contribute to inequities in our city. The City Council agreed. Civilian oversight of the SMPD was one of the significant recommendations that emerged from that process, reflecting a demand from the community that had existed since at least 1993.

Following the September 8, 2020 City Council approval, City and SMPD officials resisted the recommendations in several ways. No attempt was made to continue engagement with the community members who had fashioned the numerous recommendations. Significant delays were experienced in preparing the ordinance to create the Commission, and more delays were involved in getting the initial Commissioners appointed. After that, the Commission has been under-resourced, with extremely limited staff support, and the promised Inspector General has not been hired. SMPD leadership and the City Attorney have refused to provide information reasonably requested by the Commission, and the City has provided little to no help to support the Commission's needs. Despite some happy talk, the interim Chief and her leadership team have made no attempt to develop a working relationship or plan to ensure the Commission's success. In short, the City has behaved in a manner that makes the Commission's job difficult.

Notwithstanding these roadblocks, the Commission has been proceeding with its work. We have pressed ahead in evaluating the OIR Group report, which detailed in chapter and verse the problems that were inherent in the SMPD that were manifest under the stress of an emergency situation, as it unfolded last year on May 31. We have pressed for information on the handling of widespread noncompliance with body-worn cameras, for example. Under close questioning, the interim Chief finally revealed details about how many officers were actually subjected to some form of discipline, but has been evasive on follow up questions.

We have pressed for information about the complaints process, and for public records concerning complaints, discipline, and misconduct that are required to be made public under State law. We are moving forward on potential recommendations for changes to the system of accountability. SMPD's resistance to our efforts helps reveal why reform is necessary, and why some form of oversight is sorely needed. Civilian oversight is a fundamental tenet of contemporary policing practice. It is essential to building legitimacy and trust within any community. Civilian oversight is also a widely accepted best practice

among law enforcement policy organizations and officials. Indeed, the absence of a civilian oversight mechanism is a sign of potential weakness in a given community's system of public safety.

Independent civilian oversight is also a tool of good governance for local city government, and essential to maintaining a vigorous well-functioning local democratic institution. There is an inherent tension built into law enforcement. We, the citizens, grant the police the power to use state sanctioned violence to keep us safe. Yet, these same powers can be used improperly, and can lead to police having disproportionate political influence. Civilian oversight is a check and balance against these anti-democratic tendencies.

The presence and growth of police unions over the past several decades has also become a threat to democratic process. The unions have developed substantial and disproportionate political influence and have achieved legislative protections, not to mention Supreme Court cover, that makes it very difficult to hold officers accountable for even egregious abuses of their power. Civilian oversight is an essential element of providing local communities and their governing elected bodies additional opportunities to help mitigate these anti-democratic tendencies. The POA and others have suggested that no reform is necessary. That Santa Monica is different. That SMPD is progressive and does everything well, and so no one needs to double check or confirm what they are doing, or how they are doing it. But those assertions ring hollow in the face of the activities of SMPD over the past year. Civilian oversight is the beginning of reform.

The community should rally and demand that the City Council take a strong stand in support of independent civilian oversight. You should not be cowed by the union. You should not be deterred

in your quest to make our city better, safer and more welcoming for all.

The agreement purporting to deny rights and powers to the Commission (and conflicting with the City's Ordinance) nominally expires on September 27, 2021. But its terms allow an indefinite extension.

The City Council should act immediately to fix the problems created by the agreement approved behind closed doors. Council should empower the Public Safety Reform and Oversight Commission to conduct its business in accordance with the Ordinance creating the Commission, which Ordinance was not altered by the agreement. I urge you to:

- Conduct a public session for community input on this matter with the maximum transparency allowed under relevant laws
- Vote to modify the agreement to reinstate PSROC's intended powers and enable the

Commission to conduct its activities in the fullest and most effective manner possible

- Authorize City staff to expedite the hiring of the Inspector General.

In taking these steps, the Council will reaffirm its support for public safety reform and oversight and respect the constituent engagement that led to the Commission's creation. Indeed, your actions will support the SMPOA's own website Policy Platform: "We want our department to be a model of the kind of meaningful reform that can be achieved through a call to community collaboration." We and the Santa Monica community look forward to your transparency and leadership on these critical matters.

Respectfully yours,
George Brown
Commissioner and Chair, Public Safety Reform and Oversight Commission

Date: September 2, 2021

Subject: Status of the Public Safety Reform Oversight Commission

Dear Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem and Councilmembers;
Thank you for the opportunity to serve as a member of our city's newly formed Public Safety Reform and Oversight Commission (PSROC).
I write today in support of the central points raised in Commission Chair George Brown's recent letter to you in which he expresses deep concern about the "temporary" agreement reached which blocks meaningful work by the Commission.

As a lifelong supporter of the labor union movement and former organizer for a public employee union, I strongly identify with the ideals of organized labor and support many of the aims of SMPOA with regard to salary, benefits, and working conditions for our police officers.

On the specific issue of the SMPOA seeking to preserve here in Santa Monica the demonstrably flawed status quo of 'the police alone policing the police,' SMPOA is on the wrong side of history; is taking a position contrary to the interests of working-class people; and I respectfully urge that the Council not join them in that. My father was a Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriff when I was born. My favorite uncle was a longtime member of the Culver City Police Department before he went on to become a police chief in Orange County. They both knew that most cops are good cops, and so do I.

The truth is that good cops, like the communities they serve, benefit from real civilian oversight. A key to rebuilding damaged community support for SMPD is to demonstrate actual change and not just settle for "happy talk" as Chair Brown calls it in his letter.

Chair Brown stated in a recent Commission meeting that he believes police reform in Santa Monica should be viewed and conducted "through the lens of social justice." I strongly agree. I believe that this City Council agrees as well. I hope that together, as a city, we will act on that shared view with the earnestness and determination that this moment requires of us.

Sincerely,
Craig R. Miller
Member of Santa Monica Public Safety
Reform and Oversight Commission

September 3, 2021

Subject: Agreement between City and SMPOA to Temporarily Restrict Action by Public Safety Reform Oversight Commission

Dear Council Members: After reading Commission Chair Brown's letter to you, dated August 30, 2021, I am compelled to write and express my support for your decision to accept the advice of the City Attorney's Office in reference to the agreement between the City of Santa Monica and the Santa Monica Police Officers' Association to place temporarily limitations on the Public Safety Reform Oversight Commission.

In Commissioner Brown's letter, he purports to question the decision by the City Attorney to provide guidance to the Police Commission while the lawsuit is litigated. I believe the best offense is to provide a solid defense - one that does not have to justify or apologize for ill-advised actions taken by the Police Commission, despite the advice of legal counsel. To date, from my perspective, the Police Department has been very transparent in sharing what the current policies and practices have been, where improvement needs to be made, and collaboratively working with the Commission to make those changes. Where they have not shared information or documents, and for good reason, is in the area of clear confidential documents that may relate to disciplinary action taken on any particular police officer or police employee. These documents are deemed confidential by law, and to release those documents would be a violation of the law.

I believe Chief Seabrooks and the Police Department have been more than accommodating in meeting the needs of the Commission. Chief Seabrooks has attended almost all Commission meetings and some committee meetings to provide input, transparency and guidance. I believe it would have been a practice in good faith had Commissioner Brown expressed his position to Chief Seabrooks in our meetings and allowed her to respond accordingly. As a member of the Commission, I would have appreciated the opportunity to provide input. Likewise, the City Attorney's Office has provided legal guidance to the Commission in an effort to avoid a potential claim of injunctive relief.

While Police Oversight Commissions are a contemporary entity of police best practices and governance, as with any new entity, all legal and operational ambiguities need to be identified, modified, and argued so that there is true justice for everyone. Police respond to calls for service because people, businesses, or families have run out of solutions to the facing problem. They need help. The police are called to keep the September 3, 2021 peace and find a solution. They are expected to serve the community with sensitivity, professionalism, and impartiality. To describe police enforcement as "violence" is inflammatory and a misrepresentation of force necessary to keep an officer or another person safe. Force used by officers should never be intended to hurt or kill another person. It is used when necessary to stop the violent criminal act by a person who, if allowed to continue, will likely result in injuring or potentially killing an innocent victim.

I believe the City Attorney's recommendation to stay the action of the Police Commission was prudent considering the successful similar lawsuit in Sonoma County Deputy Sheriffs' Association, et al. v. County of Sonoma, Case Nos. SF-CE-

1816-M, SF-CE- 1817-M, which was issued June 23, 2021. I respectfully recommend that the City Council trust the City Attorney's Office and advise the Commission to be patient and allow the City Attorney's Office to successfully litigate the lawsuit. In the end, I believe the City Attorney's Office and the City's position will prevail and the Commission can again continue the important work ahead. Commissioner George Centeno Cc: Mayor and Members of City Council Interim Chief Seabrooks Members of the Public Safety Reform Oversight Commission