



CITY OF OAKLAND

CITY HALL • 1 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612

Police Commission

To: Oakland Police Commission
 From: Equipment Policy Ad Hoc Committee
 Date: 07 June 2020
 RE: Police Equipment Policy

Dear Colleagues on the Oakland Police Commission and Members of the Public,

RECOMMENDATION

The Equipment Policy Ad Hoc Committee (Committee) requests that the Oakland Police Commission (Commission) waive further policy development requirements, endorse the proposed draft ordinance regulating the acquisition and use of controlled equipment by the Oakland Police Department, and forward the draft ordinance to City Council with a request for immediate adoption.

BACKGROUND

In October 2019 Henry Gage III (then a member of the public) introduced a draft ordinance to regulate the Oakland Police Department's acquisition and use of militarized equipment. This draft ordinance was the result of many hours of diligent work by community advocates who want to ensure that the tools and tactics deployed by the police are subject to appropriate oversight, and reasonable checks and balances.

The Commission tabled discussion of this draft until November 2019. During a November 14, 2019 meeting the Commission created an ad hoc committee to manage the creation of this draft legislation, and to make recommendations to the Commission for further action. This ad hoc is comprised of Vice Chair Gage, Alternate Commissioner David Jordan, and Alternate Commissioner Chris Brown.

The Committee met with community advocates, elected officials, and police department staff to discuss the proposed ordinance, gather policy feedback, hear practical concerns about implementation, and review proposed amendments. Community advocates organized and produced a townhall on militarized policing, and recorded testimony from Oakland residents. These meetings guided the development of working drafts, which were first presented to the Police Commission for review and comment during the Commission's November 14, 2019 meeting. Discussion on updated drafts were continued on a number of occasions, and some feedback has been received from Commissioners and members of the public.

In response to the growing COVID-19 pandemic, and in recognition of the need for immediate resource realignment, in April 2020 the Committee recommended that work on the proposed ordinance be temporarily suspended. In a few short weeks, circumstances have changed dramatically. The Oakland Police Department, supported by a host of mutual aid partners, has been video recorded using teargas, armored vehicles, riot equipment, and flashbangs against non-violent demonstrators. The Committee has deemed that the need for immediate regulation requires that this ordinance be submitted for consideration by the Commission.

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

This legislation is being offered to regulate the Oakland Police Department ability to acquire and use certain categories of equipment. The structure created by this legislation models the Oakland Surveillance Ordinance in terms of workflow and it models California Assembly Bill 3131, a prior attempt to establish statewide requirements for the regulation of military equipment,¹ in terms of subject matter.

The primary concepts of the proposed Ordinance are as follows:

1. Controlled Equipment Use Policies and Controlled Equipment Impact Reports must be reviewed and adopted before the use of Controlled Equipment may be authorized.
2. Requires the Police Department to submit Controlled Equipment Use Policies and Controlled Equipment Impact Reports to the Police Commission for review and recommendation.
3. Requires the Police Commission to review submissions at a public hearing and determine whether such submissions warrant a recommendation to Council for adoption or rejection.
4. Requires the City Council to ratify or reverse the Police Commission's recommendations following the Commission's review of Controlled Equipment Use Policies.
5. Requires the Police Department to submit an annual report describing the use of authorized Controlled Equipment during the year prior.
6. Requires the Police Commission to review the annual Controlled Equipment report, determine whether covered equipment has complied with the standards for approval, and recommend renewal or modification of Use Policies, or the revocation of authorization for use.
7. Requires the City Council to ratify or reverse the Police Commission's recommendations following the Commission's review of the Controlled Equipment annual report.

ANALYSIS

The acquisition and use of military equipment adversely affects the public's safety and welfare, and creates severe and continuing risks to civil rights, civil liberties, and the physical and psychological well-being of the public. Legally enforceable safeguards, including transparency, oversight, and accountability measures, must be in place to protect the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties before certain categories of equipment are funded, acquired, or used.

In his 2016 book, To Protect and Serve, former Seattle Police Chief Norm Stamper notes that:

“Although there is a time and a place for military-like tactics, weaponry, and equipment, it's indisputable that the nation's police have often misused and abused the ‘military approach.’ In many jurisdictions there seems to be a ‘boys with toys’ mentality; if you have these ‘toys’ on hand, you want to use them, ‘play’ with them. And where personal and organizational discipline is lacking, people get hurt, cops and citizens alike.”²

The Oakland Police Commission is the institution best suited to ensure that the Police Department's acquisition and use of military equipment is subject to close oversight. By adopting the proposed ordinance, the City of Oakland can create a procedure to determine the necessity and use of equipment that, if misused or abused, will likely cause irreparable harm.

///

¹ This bill passed the Legislature, but was vetoed by then-Governor Jerry Brown

² Norm Stamper, To Protect and Serve: How to Fix America's Police 83, (2016)

CONCLUSION

For questions regarding this report, please email Vice Chair Henry Gage, at:

hgage@oaklandcommission.org.

Sincerely,

Henry Gage III
Vice Chair, Oakland Police Commission

Oakland Police Commission
11 June 2020
Item: _____

DRAFT ORDINANCE ON ACQUISITION AND USE OF CONTROLLED EQUIPMENT

(As amended by Oakland Police Commission, June 25, 2020)

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the acquisition of military and militaristic equipment and its deployment in Oakland can adversely impact the public's safety and welfare, including introducing significant risks to civil rights, civil liberties, and physical and psychological well-being, and incurring significant financial costs; and

WHEREAS, the Law Enforcement Equipment Acquisition Working Group created by President Barack Obama in Executive Order 13688 (later rescinded by President Donald Trump) recommended requiring "local civilian government (non-police) review of and authorization for law enforcement agencies' request for or acquisition of controlled equipment," and that such review included detailed justification for the acquisition and collecting information on and reporting on its use; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the public has a right to know about any funding, acquisition, or use of military or militaristic equipment by the City of Oakland, as well as a right to participate in any City decision to fund, acquire, or use such equipment; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that decisions regarding whether and how military or militaristic equipment is funded, acquired, or used should give strong consideration to the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties, and should be based on meaningful public input; and

WHEREAS, several studies indicate that police departments in the United States that acquire military-grade equipment are more likely to use violence and are no more successful in reducing crime than those that acquire less such equipment;¹ and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that legally enforceable safeguards, including transparency, oversight, and accountability measures, must be in place to protect the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties before military or militaristic equipment is funded, acquired, or used; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the lack of a public forum to discuss the acquisition of military or militaristic equipment jeopardizes the relationship police have with the community, which can be undermined when law enforcement is seen as an occupying force rather than a public safety service; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that if military or militaristic equipment is acquired, reporting measures must be adopted that empower the City Council and public to verify that mandated civil rights safeguards have been strictly adhere to.

¹ Jonathan Mummolo, "Militarization fails to enhance police safety or reduce crime but may harm police reputation," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, September 11, 2018 (37) 9181-9186; Casey Delehanty, Jack Mewhirter, Ryan Welch and Jason Wilks, "Militarization and police violence: The case of the 1033 program," *Research and Politics*, April-June 2017, 1-7; and Edward Lawson Jr., "Police Militarization and the Use of Lethal Force," *Political Research Quarterly*, 2018, 1-13.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OAKLAND DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Name of Ordinance.

(A) This Ordinance shall be known as the Police Equipment and Community Safety Ordinance.

SECTION 2. Definitions.

(A) **“Controlled Equipment”** means equipment that is military or militaristic in nature, or is likely to be perceived as military or militaristic in nature, and includes, but is not limited to, all of the following:

- (1) Special-purpose wheeled vehicles that are built or modified to provide ballistic protection to their occupants, such as mine-resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicles or armored personnel carriers.
 - (a) Police versions of standard patrol vehicles are specifically excluded from this section.
- (2) Multi-purpose wheeled vehicles that are built to operate both on-road and off-road, such as a high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV), commonly referred to as a Humvee, a two and one-half-ton truck, or a five-ton truck, or vehicles built or modified to use a breaching or entry apparatus as an attachment.
 - (a) Unarmored all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and motorized dirt bikes are specifically excluded from this section.
- (3) Tracked vehicles that are built or modified to provide ballistic protection to their occupants and utilize a tracked system instead of wheels for forward motion.
- (4) Weapon-bearing aircraft, vessels, or vehicles of any kind, whether manned or unmanned.
- (5) Breaching apparatus designed to provide rapid entry into a building or through a secured doorway, including equipment that is mechanical, such as a battering ram, equipment that is ballistic, such as a slug, or equipment that is explosive in nature.
- (6) Firearms of .50 caliber or greater.
- (7) Ammunition of .50 caliber or greater.
- (8) Specialized firearms and associated ammunition of less than .50 caliber, as defined in Sections 30510 and 30515 of the California Penal Code.
- (9) Projectile launch platforms and their associated munitions, such as 40 millimeter projectile launchers, beanbag, rubber bullet, or specialty impact munition weapons, and riot guns used to disperse chemical agents.
- (10) Any knife designed to be attached to the muzzle of a rifle, shotgun, or long gun for purposes of hand-to-hand combat.
- (11) Explosives and pyrotechnics, such as phosphorous grenades and explosive breaching tools, and chemical weapons such as tear gas, CS gas, pepper spray, and pepper balls.
- (12) Crowd-control equipment, such as riot batons, riot helmets, and riot shields, but excluding service-issued telescopic or fixed-length straight batons.
- (13) Active area denial weapons, such as the Taser Shockwave, microwave weapons, water cannons, and the Long-Range Acoustic Device (LRAD).

- (a) Only LRAD use as an area denial tool shall trigger the reporting requirements of this ordinance.
- (14) Any other equipment as determined by the City Council to require additional oversight.
- (B) **"City"** means any department, agency, bureau, and/or subordinate division of the City of Oakland as provided by Chapter 2.29 of the Oakland Municipal Code.
- (C) **"City Staff"** means City personnel authorized by the City Administrator or designee to seek City Council approval of the acquisition of Controlled Equipment in conformance with this Ordinance.
- (D) **"Controlled Equipment Impact Statement"** means a publicly released, written document that includes, at a minimum, all of the following:
- (1) **Description:** A description of each type of Controlled Equipment, the quantity sought, its capabilities, expected lifespan, intended uses and effects, and how it works, including product descriptions from the manufacturer of the Controlled Equipment.
 - (2) **Purpose:** The purposes and reasons for which the Oakland Police Department (hereinafter, "Police Department") proposes to use each type of Controlled Equipment.
 - (3) **Fiscal Cost:** The fiscal cost of each type of Controlled Equipment, including the initial costs of obtaining the equipment, the estimated or anticipated costs of each proposed use, the estimated or anticipated costs of potential adverse impacts, and the estimated or anticipated annual, ongoing costs of the equipment, including operating, training, transportation, storage, maintenance, and upgrade costs.
 - (4) **Impact:** An assessment specifically identifying any potential impacts that the use of Controlled Equipment might have on the welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties of the public, and what specific affirmative measures will be implemented to safeguard the public from potential adverse impacts.
 - (5) **Mitigations:** Specific, affirmative technical and procedural measures that will be implemented to safeguard the public from such impacts.
 - (6) **Alternatives:** Alternative method or methods by which the Police Department can accomplish the purposes for which the Controlled Equipment is proposed to be used, the annual costs of alternative method or methods, and the potential impacts of alternative method or methods on the welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties of the public.
 - (7) **Location:** The location(s) it may be used, using general descriptive terms.
 - (8) **Third Party Dependence:** Whether use or maintenance of the Controlled Equipment will require the engagement of third-party service providers.
 - (9) **Track Record:** A summary of the experience (if any) other entities, especially government entities have had with the proposed Controlled Equipment, including, if available, quantitative information about the effectiveness of the Controlled Equipment in achieving its stated purpose in other jurisdictions, and any known adverse information about the Controlled Equipment (such as unanticipated costs, failures, or civil rights and civil liberties abuses).

- (E) **“Controlled Equipment Use Policy”** means a publicly released, legally enforceable written document governing the use of Controlled Equipment by the Oakland Police Department that addresses, at a minimum, all of the following:
- (1) Purpose: The specific purpose or purposes that each type of Controlled Equipment is intended to achieve.
 - (2) Authorized Use: The specific uses of Controlled Equipment that are authorized, and rules and processes required prior to such use.
 - (3) Prohibited Uses: A non-exclusive list of uses that are not authorized.
 - (4) Training: The course of training that must be completed before any officer, agent, or employee of the Police Department is allowed to use each specific type of Controlled Equipment.
 - (5) Auditing and Oversight: The mechanisms to ensure compliance with the Controlled Equipment Use Policy, including which independent persons or entities have oversight authority, and what legally enforceable sanctions are put in place for violations of the policy.
 - (6) Transparency: The procedures by which members of the public may register complaints or concerns or submit questions about the use of each specific type of Controlled Equipment, and how the Police Department will ensure that each complaint, concern, or question receives a response in a timely manner.
- (F) **"Police Area"** refers to each of the geographic districts assigned to a police commander and as such districts are amended from time to time.

SECTION 3. Acquisition and Use of Controlled Equipment.

- (A) Restrictions Prior to Submission and Approval
- (1) The Oakland Police Department shall submit to the Oakland Police Commission (hereinafter “Police Commission”) a Controlled Equipment Impact Report and a Controlled Equipment Use Policy prior to engaging in any of the following:
 - (a) Requesting the transfer of Controlled Equipment pursuant to Section 2576a of Title 10 of the United States Code.
 - (b) Seeking funds for Controlled Equipment, including, but not limited to, applying for a grant, soliciting or accepting private, local, state, or federal funds, in-kind donations, or other donations or transfers.
 - (c) Acquiring Controlled Equipment either permanently or temporarily, including by borrowing or leasing.
 - (d) Collaborating with another law enforcement agency, such as commanding, controlling, or otherwise directing that agency or its personnel, in the deployment or other use of Controlled Equipment within Oakland.
 - (e) Using any new or existing Controlled Equipment for a purpose, in a manner, or by a person not previously approved by the governing body pursuant to this Ordinance.
 - (f) Soliciting or responding to a proposal for, or entering into an agreement with, any other person or entity to seek funds for, apply to receive, acquire, use, or collaborate in the use of, Controlled Equipment.

Text

Police Commission added paragraph 3 to this section: "The Police Department shall not cooperate with law enforcement agencies or mutual aid partners that deploy controlled equipment that would be subject to this ordinance unless said cooperation and deployment of controlled equipment by such agency or mutual aid partner is consistent with the restrictions, use policies, and reporting requirements established by this ordinance."

- (2) The funding, acquisition, or use of Controlled Equipment by the Police Department shall not be permitted without the review and recommendation, by the Police Commission, and approval, by City Council, of a Controlled Equipment Impact Report and a Controlled Equipment Use Policy submitted pursuant to this Ordinance.
 - (a) The Chair of the Police Commission, in consultation with the Vice Chair, may provide limited approval, in writing, for the Department to solicit funding for Controlled Equipment prior to the submission of a Controlled Equipment Impact Report and a Controlled Equipment Use Policy.
 - (b) Controlled Equipment funded under the exception provided by this subsection shall not be used unless a Controlled Equipment Impact Report and Controlled Equipment Use Policy is subsequently submitted to the Police Commission for review and subsequently approved by City Council, pursuant to the general requirements of this section.

(B) Submission to Police Commission

- (1) When seeking the review and recommendation of the Police Commission, the Police Department shall submit to the Police Commission a Controlled Equipment Impact Report and a Controlled Equipment Use Policy.
- (2) At least 15 days prior to any public hearing concerning the Controlled Equipment at issue, the Department shall publish the Controlled Equipment Impact Report and Controlled Equipment Use Policy for public review. Publishing to the Department's website shall satisfy the requirements of this subsection.
- (3) In order to facilitate public participation, Controlled Equipment Impact Reports and Controlled Equipment Use Policies shall be made publicly available on the Department's website for as long as the Controlled Equipment is proposed or approved for use.
- (4) The Police Commission shall consider Controlled Equipment Impact Reports and Controlled Equipment Use Policies as an agenda item for review at an open session of a regularly noticed meeting.

(C) Criteria for Police Commission Recommendations

- (1) The Police Commission shall only recommend approval of a request to fund, acquire, or use Controlled Equipment pursuant to this chapter if it determines all of the following:
 - (a) The Controlled Equipment is needed despite available alternatives.
 - (b) The Controlled Equipment Use Policy will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties.
 - (c) The use of Controlled Equipment will not be used based on race, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, political viewpoint, or disability, or disproportionately impact any community or group.
 - (d) The use of Controlled Equipment is the most cost-effective option among all available alternatives.
- (2) If the submitted Controlled Equipment Impact Report identifies a risk of potential adverse effects on the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, or civil liberties, a recommendation for approval for the funding, acquisition, or use of

Controlled Equipment by the Police Commission pursuant to this Ordinance shall not be deemed an acquiescence to those effects, but instead an acknowledgment of the risk of those effects and the need to avoid them proactively.

- (E) Police Commission Review Required Before City Council Consideration of Approval.
- (1) The Police Commission shall recommend that the City Council adopt, modify, or reject the proposed Controlled Equipment Use Policy.
 - (a) If the Police Commission proposes that the Controlled Equipment Use Policy be modified, the Police Commission shall propose such modifications to City Staff. City Staff shall present such modifications or notice of rejection to City Council when subsequently seeking City Council approval pursuant to this Ordinance.
 - (b) Failure by the Police Commission to make its recommendation on a proposal within ninety (90) days of submission shall enable City Staff to proceed to the City Council for approval of the proposal.
- (F) Police Commission Review of Prior Recommendations
- (1) The Police Commission shall review any recommendation that it has adopted pursuant to this Ordinance approving the funding, acquisition, or use of Controlled Equipment at least annually and vote on whether to recommend renewal of the approval.
 - (2) A Police Commission recommendation to City Council that a prior approval be revoked shall be presented to Council for immediate consideration. If City Council has not reviewed and taken action on a Police Commission recommendation that a prior approval be revoked within four (4) City Council meetings from when the item was initially scheduled for City Council consideration, the City shall cease its use of the Controlled Equipment.
- (G) Review Process for Previously-Acquired Equipment
- (1) The Police Department shall have one year from the date of passage of this Ordinance to submit Controlled Equipment Use Policies and Controlled Equipment Impact Statements for approval pursuant to this Ordinance if the Department wishes to continue the use of Controlled Equipment acquired prior to the passage of this Ordinance. The Department shall cease the use of Controlled Equipment acquired prior to the date of passage of this ordinance if, after one year, no approval, pursuant to the requirements of this Ordinance, has been granted.
 - (2) In order to ensure that the review of previously-acquired Controlled Equipment is appropriately prioritized, the Police Department shall provide a prioritized ranking of Controlled Equipment possessed and/or used by the City, and the Police Commission shall consider this ranking in determining order in which previously-acquired Controlled Equipment is agendized for review.
- (H) City Council Review Process
- (1) After the Police Commission Notification and Review requirements have been met, City Staff seeking City Council approval shall schedule for City Council

- consideration a package containing the Controlled Equipment Impact Report, Controlled Equipment Use Policy, and Police Commission recommendations, at least fifteen (15) days prior to a public meeting.
- (2) The City Council shall only approve a proposed Controlled Equipment Impact Report and proposed Controlled Equipment Use Policy after first considering the recommendation of the Police Commission, and subsequently making a determination that the City's interest in community safety outweighs the potential adverse affects of using Controlled Equipment.
 - (3) For approval of existing Controlled Equipment for which the Police Commission has failed to make a recommendation within ninety (90) days as provided by this Section, if the City Council has not reviewed and approved such item within four (4) City Council meetings from when the item was initially scheduled for City Council consideration, the City shall cease its use of the Controlled Equipment until such review and approval occurs.

SECTION 4. Reports on the Use of Controlled Equipment.

(A) Annual Report on Controlled Equipment

- (1) The Oakland Police Department shall submit to the Police Commission an annual report on Controlled Equipment to the Police Commission within one year of approval, and annually thereafter for as long as the Controlled Equipment is available for use. The annual report shall be provided no later than March 15th of each year, unless the Police Commission advises the Police Department that an alternate date is preferred. The Police Department shall make each annual report required by this section publicly available on its website for as long as the Controlled Equipment is available for use. The annual report shall, at a minimum, include the following information for the immediately preceding calendar year:
 - (a) Production descriptions and specifications for Controlled Equipment and inventory numbers of each type of Controlled Equipment in the Police Department's possession.
 - (b) A summary of how Controlled Equipment was used.
 - (c) If applicable, a statement of whether any uses of Controlled Equipment were conducted in combination with judicial warrants.
 - (d) A summary of any complaints or concerns received concerning Controlled Equipment.
 - (e) The results of any internal audits, any information about violations of Controlled Equipment Use Policies, and any actions taken in response.
 - (f) The estimated annual cost for each type of Controlled Equipment, including acquisition, personnel, training, transportation, maintenance, storage, upgrade, and other ongoing costs, and from what source funds will be provided for Controlled Equipment in the calendar year following submission of the annual report.
- (2) Within 60 days of the Police Department submitting and publicly releasing an annual report pursuant to this section, the Police Commission shall place the report as an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting. After review and approval by the Police Commission, City Staff shall submit the annual report to City Council.

(C) Compliance & Revocation of Approval

- (1) The Police Commission shall determine, based on the annual report submitted pursuant to Section 4, whether each type of Controlled Equipment identified in that report has complied with the standards for approval set forth in Section 3. If the Police Commission determines that any Controlled Equipment identified in the annual report has not complied with the standards for approval set forth in Section 3, the Police Commission shall either recommend revocation of the authorization for that piece of Controlled Equipment or modify the Controlled Equipment Use Policy in a manner that will resolve the lack of compliance. Recommendations for revocations pursuant to this section shall be forwarded to City Council in accordance with the approval process in Section 3.

SECTION 5. Enforcement.**(A) Remedies for Violations of this Ordinance**

- (1) Any violation of this Ordinance, or of a Controlled Equipment Use Policy promulgated under this Ordinance, constitutes an injury and any person may institute proceedings for injunctive relief, declaratory relief, or writ of mandate in the Superior Court of the State of California to enforce this Ordinance. An action instituted under this paragraph shall be brought against the respective city department, and the City of Oakland, and, if necessary to effectuate compliance with this Ordinance or a Controlled Equipment Use Policy, any other governmental agency with possession, custody, or control of Controlled Equipment subject to this Ordinance, to the extent permitted by law.
- (2) Any person who has been subjected to the use of Controlled Equipment in violation of this Ordinance may institute proceedings in the Superior Court of the State of California against the City of Oakland and shall be entitled to recover actual damages (but not less than liquidated damages of one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) or one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per day for each day of violation, whichever is greater).
- (3) A court shall award costs and reasonable attorneys' fees to the plaintiff who is the prevailing party in an action brought under subpart (1) or (2) above.
- (4) Violations of this Ordinance by a city employee may result in consequences that may include retraining, suspension, or termination, subject to due process requirements.

SECTION 6. Transparency.**(A) Disclosure Requirements**

- (1) It shall be unlawful for the City to enter into any Controlled Equipment-related contract or other agreement that conflicts with the provisions of this Ordinance, and any conflicting provisions in such future contracts or agreements, including but not limited to non-disclosure agreements, shall be deemed void and legally unenforceable.
- (2) To the extent permitted by law, the City shall publicly disclose all of its Controlled Equipment-related contracts, including any and all related non-disclosure agreements, if any, regardless of any contract terms to the contrary.

SECTION 7. Whistleblower Protections.

(A) Protections Against Retaliation

(1) Neither the City nor anyone acting on behalf of the City may take or fail to take, or threaten to take or fail to take, a personnel action with respect to any employee or applicant for employment, including but not limited to discriminating with respect to compensation, terms and conditions of employment, access to information, restrictions on due process rights, or civil or criminal liability, because:

- (a) The employee or applicant was perceived to, about to, or assisted in any lawful disclosure of information concerning the funding, acquisition, or use of Controlled Equipment based upon a good faith belief that the disclosure evidenced a violation of this Ordinance; or
- (b) The employee or applicant was perceived to, about to, or assisted or participated in any proceeding or action to carry out the purposes of this Ordinance.
- (c) It shall be grounds for disciplinary action for a city employee or anyone else acting on behalf of the city to retaliate against another city employee or applicant who makes a good-faith complaint that there has been a failure to comply with any Controlled Equipment Use Policy or administrative instruction promulgated under this Ordinance.
- (d) Any employee or applicant who is injured by a violation of this Section may institute a proceeding for monetary damages and injunctive relief against the city in any court of competent jurisdiction.

DRAFT