



February 13, 2014

Via electronic mail only

Hon. Desley Brooks (dbrooks@oaklandnet.com)
Hon. Noel Gallo (ngallo@oaklandnet.com)
Hon. Rebecca Kaplan (atlarge@oaklandnet.com)
Hon. Pat Kernighan (Pkernighan@oaklandnet.com)
Hon. Lynette McElhaney (lmcelhaney@oaklandnet.com)
Hon. Dan Kalb (dkalb@oaklandnet.com)
Hon. Larry Reid (lreid@oaklandnet.com)
Hon. Libby Schaaf (lschaaf@oaklandnet.com)
Oakland City Council
1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza
Oakland, CA 94612

re: Domain Awareness Center, Phase 2 Contract Award

Dear Honorable Members of the Oakland City Council,

The American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California writes in regard to Item 13 on the February 18, 2014 Agenda of the City Council, pertaining to the Oakland Domain Awareness Center. We urge you not to approve this item.

The specific question before the Council is whether to award the Phase 2 contract to Schneider Electric. While the ACLU takes no position on that specific matter, it raises critical issues with civil liberties and other urgent public policy impacts. The question of Schneider Electric's compliance or non-compliance with Oakland's Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance has engendered significant controversy and entailed substantial staff and City Council time. Staff expressed the view in the supplemental report on this item that the due diligence process associated with independently identifying nuclear weapons makers would have been "cumbersome and costly" and so a "self-certification" procedure was ultimately adopted. (February 18, 2014 "Supplemental Report – DAC Phase II" at page 3.) The self-certification procedure did not bring to light significant information that, whether or not ultimately disqualifying, should have been reviewed and vetted. If meaningful privacy safeguards for the Domain Awareness Center are ultimately adopted, the oversight and due diligence associated with ensuring compliance will dwarf in complexity the compliance issues associated with the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance. At this juncture, it is entirely unclear what privacy safeguards will apply to the DAC and what, if any, resources will be available to ensure that they enforced. The only thing that is clear is that privacy safeguards and resources to enforce them are urgently needed. We urge you not to let the DAC proceed with so many essential questions unanswered.

MICKEY WELSH, CHAIRPERSON | DENNIS McNALLY, AJAY KRISHNAN, MAGAN RAY, GEORGE PEGELOW, VICE CHAIRPERSONS | ALAN FRANCISCO-TIPGOS, SECRETARY/TREASURER

ABDI SOLTANI, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR | NATASHA MINSKER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR | CHERI BRYANT, DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
SHAYNA GELENDER, ORGANIZING & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT DIRECTOR | REBECCA FARMER, COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR

ALAN SCHLOSSER, LEGAL DIRECTOR | NOVELLA COLEMAN, MARGARET C. CROSBY, ELIZABETH GILL, LINDA LYE, JULIA HARUMI MASS, LINNEA NELSON, MICHAEL RISHER, JORY STEELE, STAFF ATTORNEYS
PHYLLIDA BURLINGAME, ALLEN HOPPER, NICOLE A. OZER, POLICY DIRECTORS | STEPHEN V. BOMSE, GENERAL COUNSEL

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

39 DRUMM STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111 | T/415.621.2493 | F/415.255.1478 | TTY/415.863.7832 | WWW.ACLUNC.ORG

Potential for abuse. Information recently obtained from the Oakland Police Department through a Public Records Act request underscores our concerns about the potential for abuse. These records show that OPD has targeted political protesters based on their political ideology. The DAC would serve as a powerful surveillance tool, allowing the government to single out and comprehensively track Oakland residents.

We obtained OPD records related to political demonstrations on October 25, 2013. The day's events included a protest against "Urban Shield," one of the nation's largest security conferences and weapons shows, and a commemoration of OPD's removal of Occupy Oakland from Frank Ogawa Plaza. The operations plan instructed OPD personnel to identify and cite individuals committing crimes; officers were explicitly instructed to enforce all traffic laws. While that is entirely lawful and appropriate, the records also show that OPD engaged in selective enforcement. Numerous bicyclists associated with the Occupy Oakland protest and "FTP" symbols were cited for vehicle code violations such as running red lights. At the same time, a bicyclist who was seen committing identical vehicle code violations (running two red lights), but who "stated that he was anti-occupy and that he was in the area to try and dissuade any protest," was instead let off with a warning and *not* issued any citation.¹ Selective enforcement of criminal laws based on political ideology violates the equal protection guarantees of the Constitution. *See Murgia v. Municipal Court*, 15 Cal.3d 286, 302 (1975) ("a conscious policy of selective enforcement directed against members or supporters of a particular labor organization are clearly sufficient to support a claim of invidious discrimination which is prima facie invalid under the equal protection clause").

Experience teaches that surveillance systems can and will be used in a discriminatory fashion. Studies of video surveillance in Britain, where video surveillance is pervasive, have shown that "the young, the male and the black were systematically and disproportionately targeted, not because of their involvement in crime or disorder, but for 'no obvious reason.'" European Parliament Directorate General Internal Policies, "A Review of the Increased Use of CCTV and Video-Surveillance for Crime Prevention Purposes in Europe," p. 15 (2009).² In particular, "*black people were twice as likely (68%) to be surveilled for 'no obvious reasons' than whites.*" *Id.* (emphasis added). Studies in other countries have similarly found that "reliance on categorical suspicion intensifies the surveillance of those already marginalized and increases, yet further, their chance of official stigmatization." *Id.* at 16.

In short, respected studies have shown that surveillance systems, such as closed circuit television, lend themselves to discrimination. The DAC is far more powerful than any single surveillance system because it would aggregate surveillance and sensor feeds – allowing the assembly of an entire mosaic from individual tiles. With that greater power, comes greater potential for abuse. Unfortunately, our concerns that the Oakland Police Department might use the DAC to target individuals based on ideology or other inappropriate factors are grounded in recent, actual events.

While the recently released draft privacy framework states that the DAC shall not be used to track individuals "unless there is a reasonable suspicion of criminal wrongdoing," this provision does not safeguard against privacy invasions or selective enforcement. Jaywalking and

¹ Police reports documenting this selective enforcement are attached to this letter.

² Available at <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2009/apr/ep-study-norris-cctv-video-surveillance.pdf>.

maliciously obstructing a sidewalk are both “crimes.” As a result, virtually every political protest involves reasonable suspicion of criminal wrongdoing and would thus trigger monitoring by the DAC under the draft privacy policy.

Need for oversight. Particularly with a project that has dramatic civil liberties impacts, legislative oversight serves as an essential check in our system of government. The DAC resolution (84593) adopted by the City Council last July was a step in the right direction by requiring the development of a privacy policy and specifying the surveillance systems that could be included in the DAC. But it did not go far enough. In particular, the City Council – and the public – lacks essential information that is necessary to engage in meaningful oversight.

First, a draft of the privacy policy has only this week been released – even though the City Council instructed staff to draft a policy over six months ago and the deadline for presenting a policy to the Council is rapidly approaching (March 2014). The safeguards contained in whatever privacy policy is ultimately adopted will dramatically change the civil liberties impacts of the project (for what purposes will records be recorded; how long will records be retained; with whom will records be shared). The privacy policy needs to be fully vetted first. Without a vetted privacy policy, the City Council lacks sufficient information to meaningfully evaluate the DAC and whether to grant the further approvals necessary for it to be built.

Moreover, even after a privacy policy is in place, it must be enforced. This takes resources. What resources will the City invest to ensure rigorous compliance? The difficulty of ensuring compliance with Oakland’s Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance provides a cautionary tale.

Second, the intended purposes of the DAC still remain opaque. Clear specification of the DAC’s purposes is critical to prevent the alarming but common phenomenon of “mission creep.” In other words, the DAC should not be “sold” to the City Council and the public as serving one purpose (for example, coordinating emergency response), but then surreptitiously used for another purpose (warrantless mass surveillance).

At the January 28, 2014 Public Safety Committee, the Port presented on the DAC and explained that its purpose was to enhance Port security by giving the City’s first responders access to Port surveillance and sensor feeds. But if the mission of the DAC is to ensure Port security, then why the need for cameras trained at Oakland residents? In addition, the draft privacy policy states that one of the “missions” of the DAC is to “improve readiness to prevent, respond to, and recover from major emergencies at the Port and in the greater Oakland region and.” See Draft Framework, Section II. It is unclear how the DAC would “prevent” a major emergency, unless it operates as a comprehensive surveillance center aimed at identifying suspicious activities that might be precursors to terrorism. Does “preventing” a major emergency mean that the DAC will be used to surveil mosques suspected of harboring potential terrorists? Cf. Adam Goldman & Matt Apuzzo, “With Cameras, Informants, NYPD Eyed Mosques,” *Associated Press* (Feb. 23, 2012).³ In light of OPD’s selective enforcement of even mundane vehicle code violations in connection with political protests, the potential for abuse of a powerful surveillance tool is troubling.

³ Available at <http://www.ap.org/Content/AP-In-The-News/2012/Newark-mayor-seeks-probe-of-NYPD-Muslim-spying>.

Third, there has been an alarming lack of transparency on issues as ostensibly straightforward as cost. To date, the City Council and public have still not been provided with concrete information about the ongoing staffing and maintenance costs to the City, after the expiration of federal grant money. On the contrary, the DAC has consistently been presented as having no fiscal impact, even when that is clearly not the case. The inadequate or inaccurate fiscal information begs the question of whether other critical aspects of the DAC have not been disclosed.

* * *

In short, the potential for abuse and OPD's history of selective enforcement underscores the need for oversight. But the lack of transparency dramatically undermines the City Council's ability to engage in meaningful oversight. The City Council, as the legislative body elected by the residents of Oakland to set policy for the City, should vet the privacy policy and demand information about the purposes, technological capacity and cost of the DAC, *before* granting any further approvals. Any other approach cedes critical oversight responsibilities to unelected staff. Moreover, if the City Council does grant approval, it should do so aware that oversight will be an on-going, resource-intensive, and complex task. One-time approval of a privacy policy will not ensure that privacy rights are actually safeguarded.

Sincerely,



Linda Lye
Staff Attorney
ACLU of Northern California

Enclosure

CONTINUATION REPORT

OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT
455 - 7th Street
Oakland, CA 94607RD #
13-054595

CRIME <input type="checkbox"/> SUPPLEMENTAL	INCIDENT # 185	V1	VICTIM LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE State of Ca
SUSPECT LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE	INCIDENT LOCATION 599 El Embarcadero	DATE OF THIS REPORT 31 Oct 13	ORIGINAL DATE REPORTED 25 Oct 13

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		<input type="checkbox"/> MARRIED <input type="checkbox"/> COHABITANT	<input type="checkbox"/> DIVORCED <input type="checkbox"/> BOY/GIRL FRIENDS	<input type="checkbox"/> CHILD-IN-COMMON <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	VICTIM RELOCATED TO ALTERNATE SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	# OF CHILDREN PRESENT AGES:	
DATES OF PREVIOUS INCIDENTS	MO/YR	MO/YR	MO/YR	MO/YR	MO/YR	TOTAL REPORTED INCIDENTS	PRIOR RESPONSE BY LAW ENFORCEMENT FOR SAME VICTIM AND ABUSES? <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES FREQUENCIES (e.g., 3 times last 5 months):
INJURIES <input type="checkbox"/> SEVERE <input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> NONE <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLAINT OF PAIN		MEDICAL TREATMENT <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		RESTRAINING ORDER IN EFFECT <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			
DESCRIBE:		PROVIDED BY:		ORDER NO.		EXP. DATE	ISSUING COURT
PHOTOS TAKEN <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO				SERIAL NO.		DATE	TIME
I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT I ADVISED THE SUSPECT OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE RESTRAINING ORDER		OFFICER'S SIGNATURE					

VICTIM ADVISED OF EMERGENCY PROTECTIVE ORDER (EPO) <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	IF MISC. CASE, WAS VICTIM ADVISED OF PRIVATE PERSON ARREST PROCEDURES? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO IF VICTIM REFUSES TO PROSECUTE, LIST REASON:	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESOURCE CARD GIVEN <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
SUSPECT UNDER INFLUENCE OF ALCOHOL OR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	FIREARM OR DEADLY WEAPON AT SCENE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO FIREARM OR DEADLY WEAPON RECOVERED? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	VICTIM ADVISED TO NOTIFY THE INVESTIGATOR OF ANY ADDRESS OR PHONE NUMBER CHANGE <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

CRIME	2	COMMON NAME Vandalism	SECTION / SUBSECTION 594(b)(4) PC	CODE	PERTAINS TO: V:1
CRIME	3	COMMON NAME	SECTION / SUBSECTION	CODE	PERTAINS TO: V:

ITEM #	QNTY	PROPERTY (and/or NARRATIVE) ITEM TYPE, BRAND, MODEL #, SIZE, COLOR, MARKS, ETC.	SERIAL #	VALUE
<p>On 25 Oct 13, at about 2110hrs, I was dressed in OPD utility uniform riding OPD motor #2208. I was assigned to work an Occupy Oakland protest. I was standing approximately 100 feet north of the Pergola at Lake Merritt, 599 El Embarcadero. There were about 20 people with bicycles listening to music and dancing inside of the Pergola. This group had left the Occupy Oakland protest some time earlier and had ridden their bicycles around Oakland, at times taking up all lanes of traffic, until they ended up in the Pergola.</p> <p>As I was standing in the park north of the Pergola with the TNT and bicycle officers, an unknown refused couple approached us from the direction of the Pergola. The male said he did not want to be involved, but there was graffiti "going on" inside of the Pergola.</p> <p>A short time later, the rest of the motor detail arrived. The group began to leave with members leaving in different directions. As they were leaving TNT <u>announced via the loudspeaker to the group all traffic laws would be enforced.</u> The group left the area.</p> <p><u>At about 2130hrs a group of about 10 bicyclists, from the same group who were inside of the Pergola, were individually stopped for specific vehicle code violations near Bay St and Vernon St for various violations of the vehicle code (refer to the supplemental reports for details). The following people were stopped and cited:</u></p> <div></div> <p>On Monday 28 Oct 13, I went to the Pergola to look for a backpack that, allegedly, had been thrown into Lake Merritt by a member of the group in the Pergola. I did not locate a backpack. I did note what appeared to be fresh graffiti in the inside N/E corner of the Pergola. The graffiti appeared to be recent as many older instances of graffiti had been painted over using a tan paint.</p> <p><u>There was a black "FTP" with an anarchy (a capital A inside of a circle) symbol under it.</u> There was also another "tag" painted in purple. It is unknown if the two items are related. I took photos of the graffiti with my department issued Casio GzOne cellular phone. The photos are attached to this report. I called the copy yard via dispatch to request a clean-up of the graffiti.</p> <p>The above listed parties were part of the group in the Pergola. It is unknown if they are witnesses or suspects in regard to the graffiti being sprayed on the Pergola wall.</p>				

REPORTED BY Sgt. S. Paich	SERIAL NO. 8121	AREA BFO2	WATCH 1	SUPERVISOR Lt. P. Lau	SERIAL NO. 8030	PAGE 2 OF
------------------------------	--------------------	--------------	------------	--------------------------	--------------------	--------------

OPD ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT

OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT
455 - 7th Street
Oakland, CA 94607

RD #

13-054595

CRIME OCCUPY OAKLAND PROTEST	SUPPLEMENTAL	INCIDENT # 185	V1	VICTIM LAST, First, Mid. STATE of CA
SUSPECT LAST, First, Mid SA [REDACTED]		INCIDENT LOCATION 24th ST. & HARRISON ST.	DATE OF THIS REPORT 25 OCT 13	ORIGINAL DATE REPORTED

ITEM #	QNTY	PROPERTY (Veh, Gun, Narc, Etc)	ITEM TYPE, BRAND, MODEL, SIZE, COLOR, MARKS, ETC	SERIAL #	VALUE
--------	------	--------------------------------	--	----------	-------

SUPPLEMENTAL

ON 25 OCT 13 AT ABOUT 2135 HRS. I WAS WORKING AS OPO UNIT 87003. I WAS ASSIGNED TO THE OCCUPY OAKLAND PROTEST AT APPROX.

THIS TIME I WAS ADVISED TO CONDUCT TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT ON A GROUP OF BICYCLISTS THAT WERE RIDING ^{AROUND} OAKLAND WITHOUT STOPPING FOR RED LIGHTS, STOP SIGNS, AND TAKING UP ALL LANES OF TRAFFIC. I WAS WEARING FULL POLICE UTILITY UNIFORM AND RIDING FULLY MARKED POLICE MOTORCYCLE #2260.

I OBSERVED [REDACTED] RIDING A BICYCLE W/B ON GRAND AVE. HE WAS IN A GROUP OF ABOUT 20 BICYCLES. I NOTICED [REDACTED] DID NOT HAVE A WHITE BICYCLE LIGHT EVENTHOUGH IT WAS DARK OUTSIDE. I PULLED BEHIND [REDACTED] AND JUST TO HIS LEFT AND ACTIVATED MY EMERGENCY LIGHTS AND SIREN. WHEN [REDACTED] DID NOT STOP, I USED MY PA TO TELL HIM TO STOP AND PULL OVER. HE CONTINUED TO RIDE W/B ON BAY AND THEN W/B ON 27th ST. I STARTED TO PULL IN FRONT OF HIM AND POINTED AT THE RIGHT SIDE WHILE TELLING HIM TO STOP. HE EVENTUALLY STOPPED ON 27th ST. JUST W OF HARRISON.

I ADVISED [REDACTED] THE REASON I STOPPED HIM WAS BECAUSE HE WAS RIDING A BICYCLE IN THE ROADWAY WITHOUT A LIGHT. I ASKED HIM FOR ID AND HE HANDLED ME A CDL. I ISSUED HIM CITATION # 5250018 FOR 21201(d) V.C. HE SIGNED THE CITATION AND WAS RELEASED. I ASKED HIM IF HE HAD A WORKING BIKE LIGHT AND HE SAID HE HAD ONE, BUT HE SAID IT MUST NOT BE WORKING.

I DO NOT HAVE A PPOD I DID NOT HANDCUFF OR SEARCH ANYONE. I DID NOT USE FORCE OR SEE ANYONE USE FORCE. NO KNOWN WITNESSES.

REPORTED BY G. HARA	SERIAL # 8549T	WATCH	DISTRICT	SUPERVISOR Sgt S. P. [REDACTED]	SERIAL # 8721	PAGE 1 OF 1
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------	----------	---	-------------------------	---------------------------

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT

OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT
455 - 7th Street
Oakland, CA 94607

RD #

13 - 054595

CRIME

☒ SUPPLEMENTAL

INCIDENT #

185

V1

VICTIM LAST, First, Mid.

SUSPECT LAST, First, Mid

INCIDENT LOCATION

27th St @ Harrison St

DATE OF THIS REPORT

25 OCT 2013

ORIGINAL DATE REPORTED

ITEM

QTY

ITEM TYPE

BRAND

MODEL

SIZE

COLOR

MARKS

SERIAL

VALUE

SUMMARY:

25 OCT 2013, I WAS ASSIGNED TO TRAFFIC OPERATIONS IN SUPPORT OF OCCUPY OAKLAND DEMONSTRATION. I WAS IN FULL POLICE UNIFORM AND RODE MARKED OPD MOTORCYCLE 2265.

APPROX. 2100 HRS. I WAS DIRECTED BY SGT. STEINBERGER TO CONDUCT TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT ON BICYCLISTS WHO WERE BLOCKING LANES OF TRAFFIC, RUNNING RED LIGHTS AND NOT RIDING ON THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE ROADWAY/BICYCLE LANE.

APPROX. 2145 HRS. A GROUP OF THE BICYCLIST DEMONSTRATORS CONTINUE TO RIDE IN VIOLATIONS OF MULTIPLE CVC'S W/B BAY ST @ GRAND AVE. I EVENTUALLY REACHED 27th St @ HARRISON ST. I SAW A MAN WEARING A CAMOUFLAGE JACKET RIDING AWAY FROM THE OTHER BICYCLISTS. THE BICYCLE DIDN'T HAVE ANY LIGHTS.

I ACTIVATED MY EMERGENCY LIGHTS/SIREN. THE MAN, LATER ID AS [REDACTED] BEGAN TO WEAVE IN BETWEEN OTHER M/C'S AND SCREAMED, "I DON'T HAVE ANY BRAKES".

[REDACTED] EVENTUALLY STOPPED. I EXPLAINED REASON FOR STOP AND ID MYSELF. [REDACTED] DIDN'T HAVE ANY ID. OFF. B. KO VERIFIED HIS ID THROUGH CRIMS. I ISSUED [REDACTED] CITE 5055701 FOR RIDING W/O LIGHTS AND NO BRAKES. [REDACTED] SIGNED HIS CITE AND I GAVE HIM A COPY AND WAS FREE TO LEAVE.

[REDACTED] ASKED FOR MY BUSINESS CARD. I FILLED OUT AN IBC AND ASKED IF HE WANTED TO MAKE AN COMPLAINT. [REDACTED] SAID NO. HE JUST WANTED THE INFO SO HE MAY GIVE IT TO HIS LAWYER. SGT STEINBERGER RESPONDED AND FINED TO [REDACTED]

PODAD ACTIVATED. NO USE OF FORCE. NO OTHER OFFICERS USED FORCE.

REPORTED BY

R RACE

SERIAL #

7715 P

WATCH

DISTRICT

SUPERVISOR

SGT STEINBERGER 7819 P

SERIAL #

PAGE

OF



Activity Information

Activity Details

Activity No.: FC13-022045
Activity Type: FIELD CONTACT
Agency: Oakland PD
Status:

Reported Date:
Start Date/Time: 2013/10/25 13:45:00
End Date/Time:
Location/Address (Type):
900 BLOCK OF BROADWAY, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA
Region (Large/Medium/Small): 1//04X

Related Officers

Agency	Name	Sex	Badge Number	Phone Number	Activity Category	Assignment Category	LEOKA Category
Oakland PD	DANIEL BRUCE				REPORTING OFFICER		

Activity Description

Subject: FBR NARRATIVE Author: BRUCE, DANIEL Narrative: Summary: On 25 Oct 13 I was working as OPD unit 14A56 as a QRF for an Occupy Oakland event. I was wearing an OPD uniform and in marked vehicle 1443 with Ofc. C. Borjesson and B. Rivera 8480. We were directed by UC officers to stop the above listed subject who was later identified as [REDACTED] UC officers advised that [REDACTED] was riding a bicycle. UC officers observed [REDACTED] **rim two red lights** and ride his bicycle on the sidewalk. At about 1345 hrs we located [REDACTED] riding his bicycle southbound Broadway approaching 9th St. We turned in front of [REDACTED] to prevent him from continuing south on Broadway. I exited our vehicle and contacted [REDACTED] I asked [REDACTED] to step off of his bicycle and he began to try and put the kick stand down. As [REDACTED] did this, he spontaneously stated that he had marijuana in his back pocket. I asked [REDACTED] for his ID and he told me that he did not have one, but began to look through his wallet. [REDACTED] provided his name and birthday verbally. Ofc. Rivera asked [REDACTED] if he had ever been arrested in Alameda County and [REDACTED] replied that he had. [REDACTED] then provided his PFN# [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] identity was confirmed via CRIMS. [REDACTED] was advised of why he was stopped and he apologized for the observed violations. [REDACTED] **stated that he was anti-occupy and that he was in the area to try and dissuade any protest.** I asked [REDACTED] about the marijuana that he had. [REDACTED] showed me a bag that he had in his rear pants pocket. Inside the bag was a green leafy substance that based on my training and experience, was extremely low-grade marijuana. **I elected to issue a warning to [REDACTED] for the observed violations.** No known witnesses. My PDRD was activated. No force used or observed.

Related People

Relationship: Contact (Contact)

Name: [REDACTED]
Sex: MALE
Race: WHITE
Date of Birth: [REDACTED]
SSN No.:
FBI No.:

Person Comments:

COMPLEXION : LIGHT CLOTHING - SEE
PDRD

Related Activities

Relationship	Activity Type	Activity Category (Agency Activity)	Agency	Activity Number	Start Date	Street Address	City	State/Prov
FIELD INTERVIEW TO INCIDENT	INCIDENT	Disorderly Conduct (OBSTRUCTS/RESISTS PUBLIC OFFICER/ETC)	Oakland PD	13-054595	2013/10/25	1200 BROADWAY	OAKLAND	CALIFORNIA