
From: Silas Savard <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2026 6:44 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: cityatty.help@lacity.org; communityrelationsoig@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment: Terminate All Partnerships With Flock Safety

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners:

I am profoundly disturbed by and reject the Los Angeles Police Department's use of the Flock "Safety" ALPR system to surveil and stalk citizens.

While Flock specializes in Automatic License Plate Readers (ALPRs), we all know Flock is capturing our movements, locations, images, and other data. Flock is an egregious expansion of the mass surveillance state that criminalizes all Angelenos across the city. Flock weaponizes our movement data to expand the presumption of guilt.

ALPR cameras and surveillance technology do not keep us safe. They must be abolished. The taxpayer money spent on unnecessary surveillance should be redirected toward housing and services that meet our basic needs.

The Board of Police Commissioners needs to instruct LAPD to terminate all partnerships with Flock. LAPD, the Board of Police Commissioners, the LA City Council, and the Mayor should not enter into any new partnerships with other ALPR companies (Axon, Vigilant Solutions, etc.).

Sincerely,
Silas

From: Alexander Mujica <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2026 1:13 PM
To: Police Commission; cityatty.help@lacity.org; communityrelationsoig@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment: Terminate All Partnerships With Flock Safety.

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners:

I have deep concerns of the Los Angeles Police Department's use of the Flock "Safety" ALPR system to track and surveil Angelenos. I also oppose the Los Angeles Police Department's use of Flock as it surveils and seeks to criminalize working class and marginalized communities.

Flock is a company that specializes in Automatic License Plate Readers (ALPRs) and other surveillance technology. Flock does not just capture license data, but also captures people's movement, location, date, time, images of drivers and passengers, dog walkers, etc. Flock, as a company, will be used as a tool to help accelerate the mass deportation pipeline and criminalize many marginalized communities including Black folks, immigrants, trans folks, youth, abortion seekers, sex workers, and many more. Flock weaponizes our movement data to expand the presumption of guilt.

I know Flock is one of the many enablers of the state's ability to monitor and criminalize marginalized communities. Automatic License Plate Readers cannot be reformed with better privacy policies or data-sharing guardrails. They have to be abolished.

ALPR cameras and surveillance technology do not keep our communities safe. What keeps our communities safe is investing in more housing programs and many other social safety net programs that meet our basic needs.

I demand that the Board of Police Commissioners instruct LAPD to terminate all partnerships with Flock with immediate effect. I demand that the Los Angeles Police Department terminate all partnerships with Flock "Safety." I demand that LAPD, the Board of Police Commissioners, the LA City Council, and the Mayor do not enter into any new partnerships with other ALPR companies (Axon, Vigilant Solutions, etc.).

Sincerely,
Alexander Mujica

From: Jayme Kusyk <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2026 4:34 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: cityatty.help@lacity.org; communityrelationsoig@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment: Terminate All Partnerships With Flock Safety

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners:

I am deeply concerned and reject the Los Angeles Police Department's use of the Flock "Safety" ALPR system to surveil and stalk Angelenos.

Flock is a company that specializes in Automatic License Plate Readers (ALPRs) and other surveillance technology. But Flock does not just capture license plate data. Flock's ALPRs capture people's movement, location, date, time, images of drivers and passengers, dog walkers, and more. Flock is an expansion of the mass surveillance state, a technology that accelerates the mass deportation pipeline, criminalizes all Angelenos across the city including Black folks, immigrants, trans folks, youth, abortion seekers, sex workers and more. Flock weaponizes our movement data to expand the presumption of guilt.

I know Flock is one of the many enablers of the state's ability to monitor and criminalize marginalized communities. Automatic License Plate Readers cannot be reformed with better privacy policies or data-sharing guardrails. They have to be abolished.

ALPR cameras and surveillance technology do not keep us safe. Angelenos need investment in housing and services that meet our basic needs, not more surveillance technology that police and criminalize us.

I demand that the Board of Police Commissioners instruct LAPD to terminate all partnerships with Flock with immediate effect. I demand that the Los Angeles Police Department terminate all partnerships with Flock "Safety." I demand that LAPD, the Board of Police Commissioners, the LA City Council, and the Mayor do not enter into any new partnerships with other ALPR companies (Axon, Vigilant Solutions, etc.).

Sincerely,

Jayme Kusyk

From: Joni Fullard <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2026 11:08 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: OIG Complaint; councilmember.soto-martinez@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org
Subject: Written Public Comment — Documented Pattern of Negligence, Institutional Misconduct, and Resulting Harm | Syreeta Joni Fullard
Attachments: Fullard_PublicComment_LAPC_DocumentedMisconduct.pdf

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

President Shields and Members of the Police Commission,

Please find attached a written public comment submitted for the record by Syreeta Joni Fullard.

This comment was originally submitted on May 15, 2026, for the May 19, 2026 Commission meeting. The May 19 meeting was subsequently cancelled. The May 26, 2026 meeting was also cancelled.

This submission is hereby resubmitted for the June 2, 2026 Commission meeting, and requests that it be entered into the public record at that meeting, pursuant to the Brown Act (Gov. Code § 54954.3), and that it be posted to the public comments section of the meeting materials and distributed to all Commissioners.

It is noted for the record that this submission has been pending through two consecutive meeting cancellations. The Commission's obligation under the Brown Act to receive and enter public comment into the public meeting record is not discharged by the cancellation of meetings. This submission remains active and has not been withdrawn.

Written confirmation is requested that this submission will be entered into the public record at the June 2, 2026 meeting.

Syreeta Joni Fullard

Date: May 15, 2026

TO: Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners President Rasha Gerges Shields Vice President Dr. Daniel K. Tabor Commissioners: Fabian Garcia, Teresa Sanchez-Gordon, Jeff E. Skobin Executive Director Django Sibley

CC: Office of the Inspector General Inspector General Matthew J. Barragan Assistant Inspector General Florence Yu

RE: Documented Pattern of Negligence, Institutional Misconduct, and Resulting Harm

President Shields and Members of the Police Commission,

This correspondence serves as formal notice of a documented pattern of negligence, institutional misconduct, and resulting harm arising from the actions — and repeated inactions — of this Commission and the Los Angeles Police Department.

I. Failure to Perform Mandated Duties

The Commission's repeated failures to appear, unexplained cancellations, and refusal to execute sworn obligations constitute a sustained breach of duty. The resulting leadership instability has imposed direct and measurable harm on the public.

In response to the Commission's absence, LAPD escalated its targeting of the undersigned in a manner consistent with an effort to compel the Commission's attendance. Upon the Commission's appearance, no corrective action was taken. The pattern is documentable: each instance of Commission non-performance correlates with increased harassment, stalking, and surveillance directed at the undersigned. The Commission's absence does not produce a neutral condition — it produces conditions in which misconduct intensifies, and the undersigned bears the consequences.

This sequence is now part of the record.

II. Long-Standing Corruption and Institutional Failures

This matter cannot be resolved without acknowledging the documented decades of corruption within the City of Los Angeles and within LAPD. This is not a speculative assertion; it reflects a

pattern that has persisted across administrations. The Commission's continued failure to address these conditions — despite repeated notice and opportunity — constitutes an ongoing breach of duty.

The systemic misconduct underlying this matter did not arise in isolation. Any meaningful resolution requires confronting the institutional failures that permitted it to continue. The Commission's refusal to do so is part of the record.

III. Institutional Neglect and Tacit Approval

LAPD has projected its institutional interest in avoiding exposure onto the undersigned through years of documented abuse, enforced silence, and unchecked misconduct. During this period, the Commission, the Mayor's Office, and the City Council each declined to intervene. That collective inaction constitutes a documented pattern of institutional neglect. The silence of these bodies has functioned as tacit approval of the conduct described herein.

These conditions are not incidental. They are the direct result of sustained failures by the entities charged with oversight.

IV. Disparate Treatment and Misplaced Priorities

Commissioner Sánchez-Gordon resigned from this Commission citing safety concerns. During that same period, LAPD continued to harass, abuse, stalk, and surveil the undersigned — without oversight, without accountability, and without due process. The Mayor characterized the commissioner's circumstances as "appalling." No comparable concern has been expressed regarding a resident subjected to ongoing and documented harm at the hands of LAPD.

This Commission's response to Commissioner Sánchez-Gordon's departure has included attempts to redirect responsibility onto the public. That redirection does not alter the record of how this body has operated. It does not erase the pattern of deference that enabled LAPD to act without meaningful oversight. The attempt to shift institutional responsibility onto residents is inappropriate — and it confirms the very failures this notice documents.

V. The Breakdown of Oversight and the Necessity of Defunding

The nature and extent of LAPD's documented conduct reflects the degree to which this Commission has abandoned its oversight function. LAPD's behavior is not merely inappropriate

— it is legally indefensible and incompatible with any functioning system of public accountability. No governing body can permit a law enforcement agency to operate without restraint, supervision, or consequence and maintain even a minimal claim to lawful governance.

If the City of Los Angeles intends to restore a functioning standard of accountability, LAPD must be subjected to meaningful oversight and a substantial reduction of the power and resources that have enabled this misconduct to persist. That includes defunding, structural disempowerment, and the elimination of LAPD's capacity to operate without accountability. The current conditions are untenable. The City's continued failure to intervene has permitted this misconduct to become normalized.

VI. Personal Harm and Continuing Impact

LAPD's conduct has caused the undersigned the loss of years of life that cannot be recovered — including the deprivation of rights, personal safety, stability, and the basic conditions necessary to function and thrive. Commissioners, by contrast, retain the ability to cancel meetings, resign, and make decisions that serve their own interests, while the undersigned remains in circumstances created by institutional corruption and sustained by this Commission's inaction.

Those in positions of authority can remove themselves from accountability at will. The undersigned cannot. That disparity is not incidental — it is the predictable result of a system structured to protect institutional interests while denying recourse to those it has harmed.

VII. Disparity in Institutional Response

The Mayor's characterization of a commissioner's alleged safety concerns as "appalling" stands in documented contrast to the absence of any comparable institutional response to the ongoing harm inflicted on the undersigned by LAPD. LAPD has deprived the undersigned of years of life, safety, stability, and due process, and has done so without oversight or consequence.

When the alleged victim is a City official, institutional response is immediate. When the harmed party is a resident, no comparable urgency is shown. This inconsistency is part of the record.

VIII. Closing Notice

Commissioner Sánchez-Gordon will not bear the consequences of her tenure on this Commission. She retains the ability to step away, resume her life, and participate in civic

occasions — including those premised on principles of freedom and accountability — notwithstanding her role as President of a Commission that presided over one of the most documented histories of law enforcement misconduct in this country.

Residents bear the consequences she will not. Those consequences include documented cases of unchecked law enforcement conduct, among them the killing of Keith Porter Jr. by an off-duty ICE agent in Los Angeles — a case that further reflects the absence of meaningful oversight across agencies operating within this City.

Whatever Commissioner Sánchez-Gordon's experience of such occasions may be, it stands in absolute contrast to what is endured by the parents of Valentina Orellana-Peralta.

Syreeta Joni Fullard

From: Joni Fullard <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2026 11:09 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: OIG Complaint; councilmember.soto-martinez@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org
Subject: Addendum 3 - 90-Day Institutional Failure - Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies - Fullard
Attachments: Fullard_Commission_Addendum3_90Day_2026-06-01.pdf

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

President Shields and Members of the Police Commission,

Please find attached Addendum 3 to my March 2, 2026 public comment.

This addendum documents 90 days of complete institutional failure by the Los Angeles Police Commission and Inspector General to provide independent civilian oversight of LAPD, comprehensive exhaustion of all administrative remedies available through these bodies, multiple documented legal violations, and preparation for external escalation.

I am submitting this as public comment for the June 5, 2026 Commission meeting 6/02/2026 and request that it be posted to the public comments section of the meeting materials, pursuant to the Brown Act (Gov. Code § 54954.3), and distributed to all Commissioners.

This submission documents that all administrative remedies have been exhausted. The Commission and Inspector General have had 90 days, multiple explicit requests, specific deadlines, comprehensive documentation of institutional failures, and external validation of systematic obstruction. They have demonstrated unwillingness or inability to provide the independent civilian oversight they are statutorily required to provide.

Respectfully,
Syreeta Joni Fullard
[REDACTED]

ADDENDUM 3 TO MARCH 2, 2026 PUBLIC COMMENT

Date: June 1, 2026

TO: Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners

- President Rasha Gerges Shields
- Vice President Dr. Daniel K. Tabor
- Commissioners: Fabian Garcia, Teresa Sanchez-Gordon, Jeff E. Skobin
- Executive Director Django Sibley

CC: Office of the Inspector General

- Inspector General Matthew J. Barragan
- Assistant Inspector General Florence Yu

RE: Addendum 3 — 90-Day Institutional Record — Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

FACTUAL SUMMARY

Ninety calendar days have elapsed since March 2, 2026, when I submitted a public comment requesting independent civilian oversight of LAPD misconduct. During this 90-day period, the Los Angeles Police Commission and Office of the Inspector General have not provided substantive oversight, independent review, or substantive response to any submission.

This addendum documents the chronological record of submissions, non-responses, legal violations, and continuation of institutional patterns across two Commission presidencies.

CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD: MARCH 2 - JUNE 1, 2026

March 2, 2026

- Submitted public comment requesting independent civilian oversight of LAPD misconduct
- Commission acknowledged receipt and referred matter to Inspector General without conducting independent review

- Assistant Inspector General Florence Yu forwarded complaint to LAPD Internal Affairs Division same day

March 3, 2026

- Submitted written objection to routing to LAPD Internal Affairs
- Stated that LAPD investigating itself defeats civilian oversight purpose
- Requested 14-day response from Inspector General with clarification of oversight authority

March 17, 2026

- 14-day deadline passed
- No response from Inspector General

March 30, 2026

- Submitted follow-up after 27 days of non-response
- Requested 7-day response

April 1, 2026

- 30-day deadline from original March 2 submission passed
- No substantive oversight provided at any level

April 6, 2026

- Submitted Addendum 1 documenting 35 days of oversight failure
- Email sent to policecommission@lapd.online at 12:00 PM Eastern Time (9:00 AM Pacific Time)
- Addressed to April 7, 2026 Commission meeting
- Explicitly requested posting to public record pursuant to Brown Act (Gov. Code § 54954.3)
- Explicitly requested substantive response within 14 days
- Submission was made well in advance of any stated deadline

April 7, 2026

- Commission meeting held
- Public comments posted included two submissions only
- April 6 addendum was not posted to public record

April 8, 2026

- Submitted letter requesting explanation for failure to post April 6 addendum
- Requested 7-day response

April 14, 2026

- Commission elected new president
- Rasha Gerges Shields became President
- Teresa Sanchez-Gordon replaced

April 15, 2026

- 7-day deadline from April 8 request passed
- No response received

April 20, 2026

- 14-day deadline from April 6 addendum passed with no substantive response
- Executive Director Django Sibley sent letter dated April 20, 2026
- Letter stated April 6 addendum "did not meet the submission procedure" because materials "must be received by 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled meeting"
- **Factual record:** April 6 submission timestamp shows 12:00 PM Eastern Time (9:00 AM Pacific Time). 5:00 PM Pacific Time deadline was not missed. Submission occurred 8 hours before stated deadline.
- Same date: Submitted California Public Records Act request
- Request sought: all correspondence submitted to Commission, all internal communications about submissions, all responses, Commission policies on posting public comments
- Government Code § 6253(c) requires 10-day response
- Deadline date: April 30, 2026

April 30, 2026

- 10-day CPRA response deadline passed
- No response from Commission
- CPRA violation documented

May 3, 2026

- Submitted Addendum 2
- Submitted on Sunday, May 3, 2026 at 5:47 PM
- Addressed to May 5, 2026 Commission meeting
- Documented 63 days of institutional failure

- Included: timeline, documentation of Executive Director's April 20 statement with timestamp evidence, named individual accountability, legal violation documentation, external validation
- Requested 14-day response deadline

May 5, 2026

- Commission meeting held
- Public comments posted included six submissions
- May 3 addendum was posted to public comments section
- **Comparison:** April 7 meeting posted two public comments; May 5 meeting posted six public comments including May 3 addendum

May 17, 2026

- 14-day deadline from May 3 addendum passed
- No substantive response from Commission or Inspector General

May 18, 2026

- Inspector General's office sent letter
- Dated May 18, 2026
- Signed by Manny Lopez, Police Special Investigator, on behalf of Florence Yu, Assistant Inspector General
- Letter stated: "The OIG staff determined that the information provided is related to Complaint Form No. 26-000811. On May 18, 2026, we forwarded the supplemental information you provided to Internal Affairs Division (IAD) for their review and action."
- Referral to LAPD Internal Affairs Division made 77 days after original March 2 complaint

May 19-June 1, 2026

- No communication from Commission or Inspector General
- No substantive response or independent review provided

LEGAL VIOLATIONS DOCUMENTED

Brown Act Violation (Gov. Code § 54954.3)

April 7, 2026: Commission meeting public comments included two submissions only. April 6 addendum was not posted.

May 5, 2026: Commission meeting public comments included six submissions. May 3 addendum was posted.

Pattern: Selective posting of public comments based on content. April 6 comment documenting Commission oversight failures was suppressed. May 3 comment documenting institutional failure was posted. This selective posting demonstrates differential treatment of substantively similar content.

California Public Records Act Violation (Gov. Code § 6253(c))

April 20, 2026: CPRA request filed.

April 30, 2026: Statutory 10-day response deadline.

June 1, 2026: No response provided. CPRA violation has persisted for 32 days beyond deadline.

Request: NextRequest Request #26-6967. Status: Open, Unpublished. No agency response.

Documented Factual Inaccuracy in Official Correspondence

April 20, 2026 Letter from Django Sibley, Executive Director:

Stated: April 6 submission did not meet procedure because materials "must be received by 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled meeting."

Factual Record: April 6 email timestamp 12:00 PM Eastern Time (9:00 AM Pacific Time). Deadline specified: 5:00 PM Pacific Time. Submission occurred 8 hours before deadline.

Timeline: Request for explanation was submitted April 8, 2026. Response was provided April 20, 2026 (12 days later), containing this inaccuracy.

Due Process Failure

90 days elapsed without independent review. Commission received written objection to LAPD Internal Affairs routing on March 3, 2026. This objection was not addressed for 90 days.

Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Timeline of Explicit Requests and Deadlines:

- March 3, 2026: Requested 14-day response (deadline March 17) — not met
- March 30, 2026: Requested 7-day response (deadline April 6) — not met
- April 6, 2026: Submitted Addendum 1, requested 14-day response (deadline April 20) — not met
- April 8, 2026: Requested 7-day response (deadline April 15) — not met
- April 20, 2026: CPRA 10-day deadline (deadline April 30) — not met
- May 3, 2026: Submitted Addendum 2, requested 14-day response (deadline May 17) — not met

Documented Non-Response: All explicit requests for response or independent review were not fulfilled within stated timeframes. No substantive response was provided within any deadline.

Continuation of Pattern: May 18, 2026 letter documented continued routing to LAPD Internal Affairs Division, the same deflection pattern established March 2, 2026.

INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTABILITY BY POSITION AND DATE

Inspector General Matthew J. Barragan

- March 2, 2026: Received complaint; deferred to LAPD Internal Affairs rather than conducting independent review
- March 3-June 1, 2026: Did not respond to March 3 objection for 90 days
- May 18, 2026: Continued routing to LAPD Internal Affairs despite documented objection

Assistant Inspector General Florence Yu

- March 2, 2026: Forwarded complaint to LAPD Internal Affairs Division
- March 3-June 1, 2026: Did not respond to March 3 objection for 90 days
- May 18, 2026: Authorized letter continuing routing to LAPD Internal Affairs

President Teresa Sanchez-Gordon (March 2 - April 14, 2026)

- March 2-April 14, 2026: Presided over deflection to Inspector General without independent Commission review (43 days)

- April 7, 2026: Commission meeting occurred during her presidency; public comments posted did not include April 6 addendum

President Rasha Gerges Shields (April 14 - June 1, 2026)

- April 20, 2026: April 20 letter with factually inaccurate statement was issued during her presidency
- April 30, 2026: CPRA deadline missed during her presidency
- May 18, 2026: Inspector General's continued routing to LAPD occurred under her leadership

Executive Director Django Sibley

- April 20, 2026: Sent letter containing inaccuracy regarding April 6 submission deadline (12 days after explanation was requested)

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES AVAILABLE AND EXHAUSTED

Commission and Inspector General: Were notified of complaint. Received explicit requests for response on six separate dates with stated deadlines. Received comprehensive documentation of institutional failures on May 3, 2026. Did not provide substantive response, independent review, or clarification of oversight authority.

Documented Pattern: All requests resulted in either non-response or continued routing to LAPD Internal Affairs Division.

Final Communication: May 18, 2026 letter from Inspector General's office demonstrated continuation of routing pattern despite prior comprehensive documentation of this pattern.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. **90 days of institutional record:** March 2, 2026 through June 1, 2026
2. **Legal violations documented:**
 - CPRA violation: 32 days past statutory deadline on June 1, 2026
 - Selective posting of public comments: April 7 (two comments, addendum excluded) versus May 5 (six comments, addendum included)

- Factually inaccurate statement in official correspondence: April 20 letter containing claim contradicted by email timestamp
3. **Pattern across two presidencies:** Identical routing to LAPD Internal Affairs under both President Sanchez-Gordon and President Shields
 4. **Exhaustion of remedies:** Six explicit requests with stated deadlines; all requests unfulfilled within stated timeframes
-

PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS

All rights to pursue civil litigation, administrative complaints, public disclosure, and any remedies available under federal, state, and local law are reserved.

Respectfully submitted,

Syreeta Joni Fullard

June 1, 2026

From: Los Angeles Citizen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2026 4:41 PM
To: Police Commission
Subject: BOPC 6-2-26

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mayor Bass, Chief McDonnell, Police Commissioners, and the entire LAPD and Public,

As the many months have passed into years, it is clear that the LAPD Police Commission has been unable or unwilling to perform its oversight duties and to lead the Department effectively in a myriad of ways, but especially in the implementation of community policing and reducing the fear and incidence of crime and disorder.

The failure of leadership from the Mayor to the Police Commission to LAPD Command staff has led to the LAPD being in a severe crisis with serious recruitment, retention, and low morale issues. The culture of mediocrity is entrenched in the Mayor Bass kakistocracy that is City Hall and has undermined the LAPD. There is a complete lack of urgency in implementing community policing, police-community communications, responding to citizen concerns and complaints, and responding to radio calls generated by the public for serious crimes and serious quality of life issues. The Mayor, Police Commission, and LAPD Command Staff are all responsible for the many failures over a period of years. It is time to replace this failed leadership which has continually demonstrated an indifference and lack of responsiveness to the concerns of the people.

The problem starts at the top in the office of Mayor. Today is election day. It is time to take a bold and decisive action for change in Los Angeles and elect a new mayor that has a personal understanding and lived experience when government, in the form of the Mayor, is incapable, indifferent, incompetent and ineffective.

Mayor Bass has a history of not supporting the LAPD and LAFD in performing their roles in fighting crime and disorder and life

threatening fires. Mayor Bass has held back the LAPD from responding to mob violence on many occasions. Just look at the streets! Just listen to your neighbors. Just try calling 911 and see what happens. We do not blame the officers who are doing the best they can under very challenging conditions. It's the leadership or lack of leadership which perpetuates a culture of mediocrity and low morale. A culture that discourages proactive policing and crime prevention. A culture which is more concerned with optics, appearances, and 'virtue signaling' than reality and effectiveness. The LAPD needs to have a culture change and that will only happen with a change in leadership at the top and that change would be mayoral candidate Spencer Pratt.

By listening to the comments of Spencer Pratt at the one mayoral debate, in the media, and with citizens, it is clear that he listens and knows the reality of the streets of LA and the problems of the LAPD. Spencer Pratt is listening to his own perceptions based on reality and that of his fellow LA neighbors all around the city. Spencer Pratt is ready to replace this Bass appointed Police Commission which has failed miserably and to change the culture of the LAPD from one that is reactive, opaque, and unaccountable to one that is proactive, transparent, and accountable!

We can all be heroes and clean up our city which is beset by crime, corruption, fraud, incompetence, and indifference. We can support the LAPD and public Safety for all by electing someone that bellies in enforcing the rule of law with common sense and compassion. The time is now to save L.A. together. It is up to us!

For Hope and Change to SAVE L.A.,
Steve Reilly

From: Voices For LAPD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2026 4:42 PM
To: Police Commission
Subject: 6/02/26 public comment

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

LAPD Police Commissioners,

President **John F. Kennedy** proclaimed **May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week containing May 15 as Police Week on October 1, 1962**, when he signed **House Joint Resolution 730** into law as **Public Law 87-726**.

A few historical details:

- In **1961**, Congress first passed a resolution designating **May 13–19, 1962, as Police Week** and **May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day** for that year.
- To make the observance annual, Congress passed H.J.Res. 730, authorizing the President to proclaim **May 15 of each year** as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week containing May 15 as Police Week.
- Kennedy signed that legislation on **October 1, 1962**, making it a permanent annual observance.

Kennedy's proclamation recognized the contributions of law enforcement officers and honored those who had been killed or disabled in the line of duty. Today, the observance continues each year under the authority of that 1962 law.

The last time the LAPD Police Commission met was on May 12th which was during National Police Week.

Deputy Chief Scott Harrelson provided the report of the Chief of Police due to Chief Jim McDonnell being in Washington, D.C. for National Police Memorial Day, May 15th and police week.

During his report, Harrelson neglected to mention why he was sitting in for the Chief or that it was National Police Week and that National Police Memorial Day was the upcoming Friday on May 15th. Police Commission President Rasha Shields did acknowledge National Police Week/Memorial Day but it was a rather perfunctory mention.

Representing the Chief of Police, Harrelson should have been the one to acknowledge and honor the fallen LAPD officers during his report. What does it say to the officers of the LAPD and the public that an LAPD

Deputy Chief neglected to even mention National Police Week and National Police Memorial Day?

Did Harrelson just forget those who have fallen in the line of duty or did he think it wasn't important enough to mention? Either way, the omission by Harrelson was noticed by the friends and families of LAPD officers that made the ultimate sacrifice and it is a sad commentary on Harrelson that he did not honor the lives of the fallen with a statement of acknowledgement honoring the Fallen and those they left behind.

It is in the best interest of LAPD and the public it serves to acknowledge Police Week and National Police Memorial Day at the beginning of May. Every Commission meeting during the month should include a moment of silence and acknowledgment for all fallen officers.

Respectfully,
Voices For LAPD