
From: Kimberli Meyer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 4:46 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Dear Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Sincerely, Kimberli Meyer

From: Tiana McKenna <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 4:13 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community.

Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide “oversight” and screening of Oakland PD’s use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore’s time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Sincerely,
Tiana McKenna
Los Angeles 90042

From: Beth Baker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 4:09 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, which has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition, I urge you to decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,

Dr. Beth F. Baker

From: Maraky Alemseged <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 3:12 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Mitch O'Farrell; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Maraky

From: kristen studard <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 2:47 PM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Kristen Studard

From: Lucia Pier <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 2:33 PM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition, as always: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Lucia Pier

--

LUCIA PIER
she/her/hers



From: Margaret Starbuck <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 1:42 PM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will

always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Margaret Starbuck

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: Liz Sommer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 1:33 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is

described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,

Elizabeth Sommer
Los Angeles resident

From: Catherine Safley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 12:55 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On today's agenda is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and underfunded. We are still asking this question today.

As communities lack vital funding for needs such as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) show otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, along with inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet were adopted and used by LAPD regardless. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which the plan describes as a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members who are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, which has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from

Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide “oversight” and screening of Oakland PD’s use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

Additionally: Decrease Moore’s time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Catherine Safley

From: Harrison Weinfeld <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 12:45 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; Fails Lapc; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Harrison Weinfeld

From: Rachel Rosenbloom <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 12:42 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Rachel Rosenbloom

--

Rachel Rosenbloom | She/Her
www.rachel-rosenbloom.com

██████████

From: Samantha Lappin <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 12:40 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We have seen little change, and so we ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community.

Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide “oversight” and screening of Oakland PD’s use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore’s time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Samantha

Sammi Lappin
Communicator & Educator
she/her

From: Laura Adery <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 12:10 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Mayor Helpdesk; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; Mayor Garcetti; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Sincerely,
Laura Adery, Ph.D.

From: Jack MacCarthy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 12:02 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Jack MacCarthy

From: Kevin King <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:41 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community.

Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, who's been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

Additionally, decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment with no restrictions. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Thank you from a concerned citizen

Kevin King

From: Audrey Georg <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:43 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: My public comment for the PC meeting on 4/19/22

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted

and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,

Audrey Georg

"If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor." Desmond Tutu

From: Danielle Castrence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:39 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Mayor Helpdesk; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Mitch O'Farrell; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway.

In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Danielle Castrence

From: ashley brim <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:34 AM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment for 4/19 BOPC

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.

Commissioners,

During the summer of 2020, I was in the streets demanding accountability from LAPD and was met with violence from the people who have vowed to "protect and serve". On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

Do not approve any more funds for LAPD. Our communities do not need more police. They need more services, affordable housing, and to have a say in the afterschool programs and sports their children have access to.

In addition: Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say. Please stop restricting Public Comment to 45 minutes and allow the community to speak after each agenda item has been presented.

Signed,
Ashley Brim

--

Ashley Paige Brim // she/her/hers
Co-Producer / HOMELAND
Director / *An Act of Terror* & *The Goldfish*
Fox Directing Lab 2018-19
HALF Initiative Directing Fellow 2017
AWD Directing the Actor Fellow 2021
C: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
ashleypaigebrim.com

From: Carter Moon <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:21 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Carter Moon

From: Dayna Bowers <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:18 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Dear Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the 6 month update on the LAPD's "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 (following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism). This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a global pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many **questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded**. We are still asking this question.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP). The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 indicate otherwise, with **many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services**.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were **widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway**. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, which has been unsuccessful for years in

obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide “oversight” and screening of Oakland PD’s use of surveillance technology. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and **we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.**

In addition: **Decrease Moore’s time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit.** Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Dayna Bowers

From: Rachel O'Brien <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:17 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Rachel O'Brien

From: Danielle Carne <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:14 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda this week is a presentation of LAPD's 2021 "Use of Force" Report. This report is LAPD's attempt to datify and normalize brutalization, assault, shooting, and murder that have been committed by LAPD in the last year, and to give the appearance that police violence is somehow being measured and tracked. In reality, a large volume of violent acts committed by LAPD against community members every year are never reported, or are minimized, denied, or covered over. To indicate that this is being meaningfully measured and reported every year by police is a complete fallacy.

Additionally, LAPD uses these reports to attempt to criminalize those folks against which it is most brutal. Entrenched in white supremacy, LAPD is more violent towards Black, brown, poor, and unhoused communities, as well as folks with mental illness. In its "Use of Force" publications, LAPD attempts to justify its bias by printing its own crime statistics - gathered and kept by police - in an attempt to associate "criminality" with the communities it brutalizes. In doing so, LAPD reminds us how much it has invested in racial profiling and criminalizing entire communities, while claiming "safety" and "transparency." We reject this violent institution and its reports.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Danielle Carne

From: Lizabeth Belli <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:04 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Lizbeth Belli

Lizbeth Belli *she/her/hers*

████████████████████

████████████████

#CareFirst

From: Michelle King <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 11:04 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community.

Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, who's been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

Additionally, decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment with no restrictions. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

In community,

Michelle King

From: Sam Wohl <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 10:50 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed, Sam wohl

From: Camille Sacristan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 10:48 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the

opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Camille Sacristan
LA County Resident

From: Marianne Drummond <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 10:47 AM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Marianne Drummond

From: Magan Wiles <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 10:23 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,

--

magan wiles (she/her)

From: Cody Sloan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 10:11 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,

Cody Sloan

--

Cody Sloan

pronouns: he/him/his ([what's this?](#))

MFA in Acting: UCSD '21

www.codydsloan.com

██████████

From: Adam Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 10:11 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; Fails Lapc; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; Councilmember Bonin; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Mitch O'Farrell; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment for tomorrow's meeting that has to be submitted 16 hours before the meeting starts.

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan

describes police “engagement” at CSPs and how residents work “alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs,” but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a “Technology Adoption and Use Policy” for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of “oversight,” and while the plan claims to allow for “assessment and analysis” as well as “evaluation by the public” of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board’s “chosen” community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide “oversight” and screening of Oakland PD’s use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore’s time in Police Commission meetings and

open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Adam Smith

P.S. Joe Buscaino- how terrible is your campaign lol 😏😂😂😂😂😂😂

From: Jayme Kusyk <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 10:06 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,

Jayme Kusyk

From: Jessi Jones <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 10:05 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community.

Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, which has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide “oversight” and screening of Oakland PD’s use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore’s time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed
Jessi Jones
90004

From: SHERRY VARON <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 9:53 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPCFails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Sherry varon

From: Mads Gauger <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 9:53 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Mads Gauger

From: J.Stephen Brantley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 9:51 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/18/2022

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.

Commissioners,

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a "Technology Adoption and Use Policy" for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of "oversight," and while the plan claims to allow for "assessment and analysis" as well as "evaluation by the public" of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the

technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board's "chosen" community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide "oversight" and screening of Oakland PD's use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore's time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
J.Stephen Brantley

From: michele dumont <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 9:49 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; wjbriggs@venable.com; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; james.queally@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; ericgarcetti@gmail.com; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment BOPC 4/19/2022

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.

Commissioners,

I am writing to oppose any more funding for the LAPD. In fact the outcome of the last couple of years for me and for most of the LA community is that we need to cut that funding and get the police out of most of the calls that come for emergency services, especially calls that involve persons who are suffering some sort of crisis and/or are houseless.

On the agenda today is the six-month update on the LAPD's so-called "After-Action" report implementation plan, regarding the department's response to the uprising in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd and amidst ongoing police brutality and racism. This revolutionary uprising in the midst of a pandemic and ever-increasing housing crisis had many questioning why we fund the police when so many services for the community go unfunded and under-funded. We ask this question still.

As communities lack vital funding for such needs as housing and health care, LAPD continues to ask for more resources and an expansion of police, part of which is described in the six-month update report. LAPD also continues to misrepresent the "success" of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and the CSP Bureau, the latter of which was established as part of LAPD's After-Action implementation plan. The plan describes police "engagement" at CSPs and how residents work "alongside officers to reduce crime and develop sports, recreation, and other programs," but even the community surveys conducted by the Urban Peace Institute at each site in 2021 (which are noted in

the report as being completed) indicate otherwise, with many folks reporting a lack of trust in police, as well as inadequate access to community programs and social services.

The plan also notes the creation and adoption of a “Technology Adoption and Use Policy” for LAPD. Such a plan would allow LAPD to obtain new surveillance and tracking technology under the guise of “oversight,” and while the plan claims to allow for “assessment and analysis” as well as “evaluation by the public” of such surveillance tech, we have seen this play out before with body-worn video, drones, ALPRs, and facial recognition, all of which were widely rejected by community members in community meetings, petitions, and public comment and feedback, yet readily adopted and used to LAPD anyway. In many instances LAPD has additionally lied about its use of the technology and has withheld information from the public. Brian Hofer, one of the individuals writing the Technology Adoption and Use Policy, does not even live in Los Angeles and has no understanding or experience of how the Board of Police Commissioners - which in the plan is described as being a place where public comment can be heard - discourages and dismisses public comment and the opinions of community members that are not part of LAPD or the Board’s “chosen” community. Further, Hofer is a member of the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission, that has been unsuccessful for years in obtaining records from Oakland PD, though the purpose of the Commission was to provide “oversight” and screening of Oakland PD’s use of surveillance technology. Police will always conceal and lie about their use of surveillance tech. We reject the notion that a policy or ordinance will be followed by police, and we reject all use of surveillance tech by LAPD.

In addition: Decrease Moore’s time in Police Commission meetings and open up public comment, with no restrictions on the number of speakers, and no 45-minute time limit. Members of the communities most affected by policing are by far the most knowledgeable about the real-world effects of the matters before the board, and about LAPD in their neighborhoods, and you need to hear what they have to say.

Signed,
Dr. Michele Dumont