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How does one best commemorate significant historical events? That was the question that emerged in our deliberations as we contemplated the 50th anniversary of the 1965 Watts Rebellion. We concluded that our best effort would be to make history rather than merely remember it. So, we undertook a comprehensive assessment of the state of policing throughout Los Angeles County with a view to identifying how we could advance equitable constitutional law enforcement practices in the 21st century. The civil unrest and social uprisings following the tragic police killing of George Floyd make clear the need to address historic and systemic inequities that continue to plague Black Americans. Demands for police reforms range from enhanced training to divestment to complete abolishment. Despite the variances in approach to address needed transformations, there is consensus that we can never return to status quo. Inaction is unacceptable. We must come together to build a new normal that prioritizes human dignity and repairs the damages done by discriminatory policies and practices.

Equitable law enforcement* is established when all communities have fully engaged in determining their own agency and needs for public safety. It signifies a change from unilateral asymmetrical power dynamics, which have allowed law enforcement agencies to operate with qualified immunity, to robust, transparent oversight by the communities they serve. A paradigm shift is required from traditional punitive systems that disproportionately impact vulnerable communities, to a healing approach that empowers community stakeholders to handle appropriate social issues. By having access to a wider safety net infrastructure of service providers, law enforcement deployment can be scaled back proportionate to critical need. Eliminating the negative impacts of punitive law enforcement approaches, such as the criminalization of youth and lethal uses-of-force, are considered a best practice to improving police-community relations.

As Carolina Goodman of the League of Women Voters writes, “We are ready to move away from solely a ‘lock ‘em up’ strategy to the implementation of policies and procedures that address the safety and well-being of all members of our communities. We cannot, and should not, expect law enforcement to deal with issues of mental illness, drug addiction, lack of housing, poor education, unemployment, etc. In fact, we have personally heard LAPD Chief Moore and LASD Sheriff Villanueva speak these same words. The metaphor of turning a large ship in the ocean comes to mind; much planning in advance needs to take place for changes in our justice system, and it will not happen as quickly as we might want.”

Creating equitable law enforcement is a first step toward establishing a culture of wellbeing and harm-reduction. This undertaking is only possible when policies and process incorporate the lived experience of community members. The insight of academic partners and other subject matter experts also provides analytical depth of understanding to a complex and everchanging universe. The greatest challenges lie ahead as we work to effectuate recommendations provided from community testimony. We look forward to the day when we can celebrate that achievement. For now, let us listen to the language of dissent, learn from the suffering of the impacted, and build the path forward together.

Isabelle Gunning, Professor of Law
Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Policing & Human Relations
Supervisiorial District 3 Commissioner, LA County Commission on Human Relations

*Italicized words are defined in the glossary beginning on page 55.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2015, the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations commemorated the 50th anniversary of the 1965 Watts Rebellion by beginning a process to examine the current state of policing and human relations in Los Angeles County. To do so, we held seven public hearings from 2016 through 2018 to capture community voices from each of the 5 County Supervisorial Districts, including caucuses of women of color, members of LGBTQ+ communities, and law enforcement partners. This began a long and complex trust building exercise with diverse stakeholder groups often at odds.

Our research methodology for maintaining independence while obtaining data (qualitative and quantitative) centered on a participatory process of legitimation, amassing allies and relationship brokering to build a collaborative, which extended beyond County agencies. Key stakeholders included: community members with lived experience, justice-involved individuals, advocates, nonprofit organizations, law enforcement agencies, and academic institutions. While the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department and the Los Angeles Police Department were primary focuses of our examination, this report also contains input from myriad LA County municipal police departments, including school police agencies. The accumulation of political/social credibility took time and remains an exercise in trust building within a highly polarized environment with a checkered history.

Our objective was to produce a report which would legitimately represent the voices and recommendations of community after publication. Completion dates were often scaled back to ensure integrity of the process. We were compelled to maintain a strict timeline for project finalization because to not have done so would have undermined our intended purpose.

Each conducted hearing focused on both the problem and promise of attaining just, equitable law enforcement for every aspect of our community. While some community advocates seek to end the profession of policing altogether, this was not the majority view expressed in the community hearings. What we did find agreement on was reallocating resources for economic investments to improve and expand social safety nets, alleviating militarized community occupation, and utilizing a culturally competent framework. These strategies can be developed and implemented collaboratively with public safety stakeholders to ensure the mechanisms currently in place begin to reflect the desired paradigm shift.

Lastly, this report’s purpose draws from the Commission’s own purpose. While we endorse long-term solutions to generational issues of disenfranchisement, our recommendations in this report reflect our own position in the County as well as our own values. We are an organization which functions as a balance, rather than an arbitrator; an organization which provides communication and process amid chaos. Having seen the historical fluctuation of power between law enforcement and community swing between oppressive, corrupt moments in which law enforcement systemically overstepped their power, to moments of community-led reform which created new levels of accountability, we believe our role is to be the restorative, healing component of that process. We create the ‘safe space’ for community members, advocate leaders, and academic representatives of those negatively impacted by prejudicial policing to convene. Our aim is to assist in devising systems of care by creating better policies and access to resources, which allow for improved safety, freedom, and, ultimately, less violence. We are determined to relieve law enforcement from duties unsuited for their skillsets, then transfer those responsibilities to the appropriate community-based service providers with the capacity to support need. At its core, the Commission is focused on human suffering. This includes both the community at large and the officers who witness acts of wrongdoing but often receive little to no healing for their own psychological wounds.
While the scope of this report is police-community relations at a patrol- and enforcement-level, we recognize that there are other elements of the criminal justice system, such as probation and judgeships, which are not directly addressed in this report. They are all interconnected gears in public safety change efforts and merit equal attention. This report, and the priorities listed herein, was informed by community perspectives of public safety, and focuses on the primary intercept points of the criminal justice system—prevention, community intervention, and law enforcement response.

The criminal justice system’s inequitable policies and practices have adversely impacted communities of color by contributing to poverty and marginalization. These same disproportionately impacted communities are paving a path forward by building coalitions committed to transforming policing, restoring public trust, and enhancing community power. Of the many recommendations made, we will do our part to build the infrastructure for stakeholder groups to advance equity, transparency, and accountability in policing. We hope the dozens of individuals, organizations, and academic partners who contributed to this report will join us in advancing that effort.

The COVID-19 pandemic and social uprisings following the killing of George Floyd are significantly altering the social landscape. COVID-19 has laid bare existing racial and social inequities. Vulnerable communities are still subject to police hostility in addition to contending with the disproportionate impacts of the pandemic. Certainly, government budgets for programs will shrink in the near term. In our communities, we already see vulnerable individuals being released from incarceration to curb the spread of disease in County jails, and the inequities of “shelter in place” and “social distancing” orders as a privilege not afforded to everyone. While the community at large is being mandated to stay at home, many of LA County’s low-income residents are unable to do so because of their need to provide financially for their families and others as essential employees. Even so, many are not receiving the personal protective gear (e.g. gloves, N95 masks) necessary to protect against infection. They are also unable to fully adhere to physical distancing orders because many are confined to living in close quarters with others due to the housing crisis. We considered calls by some to delay release of this report in light of the rapidly changing conditions. We recognize, however, that current conditions make the need for action even more urgent.

Releasing this report expresses our intention to advance needed action-oriented solutions outlined in the report’s recommendations. Our Commission recognizes that these are phase-one approaches and that further deliberations with community are required to further this agenda. We know and honor that implementation for policy success, and sustained best practices, are only achieved through collaborative effort.

Our report is a multi-perspective assessment reflecting the experiences and reform priorities of key stakeholders and Los Angeles County residents. To help consolidate these findings within a historical context, academic partners from both University of California, Los Angeles and the University of San Diego were consulted to synthesize community testimony, provide policy analysis, and share insight into national best practices for policing. Hearing recordings, stakeholder feedback and other supplemental materials collected as part of this report are available for review on the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations’ website, lahumanrelations.org.

---

The following 34 recommendations were compiled related to 9 strategic aims.

**Strategic Aim #1 – Increase Transparency and Accountability**
Enhance community participation in the processes of transparency and accountability by building systems that promote public communication of information, including the disposition of complaint and misconduct investigations.

RECOMMENDATION 1 – Expand family assistance and communication policy to prioritize trauma-informed approaches and empathy building in every interaction with the public, while also requiring officer self-identification; provide regular media briefings for high-profile investigations to keep the public at large informed of the investigatory process.

RECOMMENDATION 2 – Change federal and state laws, in addition to local law enforcement policies, to end qualified immunity and provide public access to information about police officers involved in both complaint and misconduct investigations, including their prior history and the results of investigations.

RECOMMENDATION 3 – Create quality control mechanisms to ensure ample resources are equitably allotted to law enforcement investigations of incidents involving vulnerable communities (e.g. people of color, LGBTQ+ communities, immigrants).

**Strategic Aim #2 – Revise Use-of-Force Policies and Practices**
Current use-of-force policies authorize practices that too often lead to serious harm and loss of life. Protocols and mechanisms should be developed that will safeguard the lives of community members and responding officers.

RECOMMENDATION 4 – Change state law to require law enforcement agencies to implement policies to exhaust all other acceptable measures, including self-identification, de-escalation techniques, and non-lethal tactics, before resorting to use-of-force.

RECOMMENDATION 5 – Assign use-of-force investigations to independent special prosecutors housed outside of law enforcement agencies and the district attorney’s office.

RECOMMENDATION 6 – Make information on use-of-force incidents and assault on officer incidents, including all relevant geographic and demographic data, publicly available and accessible; this information should also be reported at public forums such as oversight meetings, town halls, etc.

**Strategic Aim #3 – Strengthen Civilian Review and Oversight**
Authorize community members to oversee policing issues, providing checks and balances necessary for accountability and trust.

RECOMMENDATION 7 – Each law enforcement jurisdiction without a civilian oversight body should establish one to provide input on policies and practices, including hiring and disciplinary decisions.

RECOMMENDATION 8 – Ensure that all civilian oversight bodies have the necessary authority to perform their mission, including subpoena power and the power to censure and/or discipline.
RECOMMENDATION 9 – Ensure that membership selection processes for civilian oversight bodies include community nominations and designate seats for people who have been justice-involved and impacted family members.

RECOMMENDATION 10 – LA County Board of Supervisors should mandate and resource production of an annual report documenting and assessing policing and human relations in LA County, including monitoring the progress of implementation of this report’s recommendations in consultation with the LA County Office of the Inspector General and related bodies; this report should involve all local law enforcement jurisdictions and incorporate a legislative analysis as well as highlight data on use-of-force incidents and police stops.

STRATEGIC AIM #4 – END OVERPOLICING & UNDERPROTECTION OF VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES

Both data and community perceptions confirm that our poorest and most vulnerable Angelenos have the least access to equitable law enforcement. Equity under the law is indispensable in building trust and deepening a cooperative relationship with the diversity of communities in Los Angeles County.

RECOMMENDATION 11 – Use alternatives other than arrest when responding to quality of life violations and misdemeanor offenses related to crimes of survival, such as sleeping in public spaces or in cars.

RECOMMENDATION 12 – End cooperation of local law enforcement agencies in the enforcement of federal immigration laws and adopt policies that comply with sanctuary state laws, including curbing unnecessary data sharing with federal agencies by coding non-violent crimes committed by people who are undocumented with immigrant neutral codes.

RECOMMENDATION 13 – Increase police engagement in activities unrelated to enforcement that promote ongoing dialogue to humanize all public safety stakeholders; activities can include community events, urban gardens, recreational programming, and facilitated discussions which allow for the most vulnerable populations to safely speak directly to those with policing power.

RECOMMENDATION 14 – Create advancement opportunities for officers who demonstrate high ethical standards while serving the same community for a long period of time.

RECOMMENDATION 15 – Conduct data briefing sessions between law enforcement and community partners when incidents requiring immediate action occur; the briefing sessions should include collaborative, problem-solving components to ensure the fairest and most effective deployment of resources, as well as nurture relationships of trust.

RECOMMENDATION 16 – Publicly demonstrate the use of information collected through the Racial and Identity Profiling Act by advocating for state resources to be allocated to law enforcement agencies and neutral third-party facilitators to increase data analytics capacity and public dissemination.

STRATEGIC AIM #5 – IMPROVE POLICE TRAINING

Create training environments for recruits and officers which promote holistic portrayals of the communities they serve, including focus on preventing bias by proxy.
RECOMMENDATION 17 – LASD must end the practice of assigning new deputies only to custody duty in jails.

RECOMMENDATION 18 – Collaborate with community groups to design and facilitate police trainings.

RECOMMENDATION 19 – Mandate the training of police officers on the purposes, processes, and target populations of relevant community resources to facilitate effective referrals as alternatives to arrest.

RECOMMENDATION 20 – Mandate the training of police officers on trauma-informed approaches for interactions with the public.

RECOMMENDATION 21 – Integrate evaluation metrics for trainings to ensure intended behavior change.

RECOMMENDATION 22 – Mandate ongoing training (at least every two years) of patrol officers, dispatchers, and diversion specialists on effective ways to a) engage people with substance use disorders, b) assist people experiencing mental health challenges, c) use culturally appropriate de-escalation techniques, d) integrate ethics and integrity in their work, e) recognize and address hate crimes and incidents, and f) eliminate, or at least manage, their own implicit and explicit racial and identity biases.

STRATEGIC AIM #6 – TRANSFORM POLICE CULTURE

Officers should be assessed holistically and deserve adequate assistance to navigate the impact of work-related traumas. Policies that place less emphasis on enforcement should be developed. Moreover, performance metrics should emphasize a) community engagement, b) trust-building, and c) an officer’s socio-emotional wellbeing.

RECOMMENDATION 23 – Create and implement policies, protocols, and performance evaluation metrics that incentivize the transformation of law enforcement from a “guardian of public order” mentality to an “officer of peace” orientation.

RECOMMENDATION 24 – Improve psychological assessments to evaluate the social and emotional intelligence of incoming recruits more effectively; additionally, when hiring, reinstating, or promoting officers, misconduct records should be considered.

RECOMMENDATION 25 – Provide ongoing psychological evaluation throughout an officer’s career arc to ensure that work-related traumas are understood and addressed; integrate the socio-emotional wellbeing of officers into performance evaluation metrics.

STRATEGIC AIM #7 – ENHANCE COMMUNITY-BASED ALTERNATIVES TO LAW ENFORCEMENT

Law Enforcement is too often called upon to perform tasks better carried out by other professionals. These duties should be shifted to allow specialists, including community-based organizations, to provide nuanced and culturally appropriate services, allowing law enforcement to interact in safer ways with the public.

RECOMMENDATION 26 – Increase capacity and number of co-response teams for responding to calls involving persons experiencing homelessness, substance use disorders, and mental health challenges.
RECOMMENDATION 27 – Significantly increase funding, including reallocating law enforcement funds, for non-law enforcement community-based initiatives such as drop-in centers and community response teams that proactively address core issues of poverty, education, health, safety, and youth development.

RECOMMENDATION 28 – Create Countywide outreach campaigns to promote use of community alternatives to 911 (Emergency), including 211 (LA County), 311 (LA City), and other resource and referral hotlines.

**STRATEGIC AIM #8 – MANAGE UTILIZATION OF POLICING TECHNOLOGIES**

Unregulated policing technologies and algorithmic artificial intelligence, especially when utilized for predictive surveillance, promote totalitarian methods for controlling populations which disrupt the fundamental relationship of trust between law enforcement and the people they serve.

RECOMMENDATION 29 – Eliminate the use of predictive surveillance technologies because they infringe upon County residents’ privacy rights and expand law enforcement surveillance capabilities in violation of fundamental constitutional rights.

RECOMMENDATION 30 – Local governments should adopt ordinances to limit law enforcement surveillance by mandating community collaboration prior to the adoption of public safety technologies and producing a surveillance impact report to ensure they are not used for predictive surveillance purposes; if a law enforcement agency unilaterally adopts new technologies without public input, the respective local government should halt use of the technology and follow the aforementioned guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION 31 – Adopt and implement protocols to ensure timely release of footage to the public domain from body worn cameras and other surveillance technologies potentially used in prosecution.

**STRATEGIC AIM #9 – ESTABLISH A CULTURE OF WELLBEING AND HARM-REDUCTION IN LA COUNTY**

We recommend that the LA County Board of Supervisors embark on a long-term process of establishing a culture of wellbeing and harm-reduction in LA County. Using restorative practices, we should engage in healing generational trauma and balancing power to foster the justice that is essential to genuine peace and making LA County whole.

RECOMMENDATION 32 – Convene groups of relevant stakeholders to create innovative models that define public safety as a cooperative community endeavor rather than merely an assignment to enforce laws.

RECOMMENDATION 33 – Engage community stakeholders in developing a Countywide Community Wellbeing Vision and Rights Declaration that will be incorporated into the County charter, prominently displayed in County facilities, and disseminated via a public awareness campaign.

RECOMMENDATION 34 – Establish restorative community circles throughout LA County to envision and apply new paradigms of community wellbeing.
This report details the project that produced these recommendations and prepares for the next stage in which we will foster collaboration with stakeholders to advocate for implementation to redefine policing throughout the County.
INTRODUCTION

The mission of the County of Los Angeles Commission on Human Relations is to transform prejudice into acceptance, inequity into justice, and hostility into peace. With these ends in mind, we proactively address racism, sexism, transphobia, homophobia, religious prejudice, linguistic bias, anti-immigrant sentiment, the intersections of these systems of oppression, and other divisive attitudes and practices that can lead to discrimination, intercultural tension, hate crimes, and violence. Created from a committee established by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in 1944 in the aftermath of the Zoot Suit Riots, the Commission was originally tasked to solve questions pertaining to equity and conflict throughout the County. In the early 1960s, Commissioners and staff were actively involved in unsuccessful attempts to bring law enforcement and community leaders together prior to the outbreak of violent clashes that lasted for six days in August of 1965.3 In 2015, to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the 1965 Watts Rebellion, Commissioners wanted to do more than issue a press release or host an event. We launched a multi-year project to assess the current state of policing and human relations in our County and advocate for needed reforms to redefine policing with our communities.

The Commission created an Ad Hoc Committee on Policing and Human Relations to plan and conduct the project. It was clear from the start that a) there are many professional and academic sources whose contributions would be essential and, b) the success of the project required the expertise and engagement of community members with lived experience and groups that work directly with them. With this in mind, we launched a collaborative policy development process that includes multiple elements of police-community systems in LA County. The project plan has two stages: assessment and action. In the assessment stage we conducted public hearings and consulted community, professional, and academic partners. This document is a report of the assessment stage. It will guide the action stage in which we will collaborate with community partners and law enforcement professionals to implement needed change.

From September 2016 to September 2018, we conducted 7 public hearings, five of which were held in each Supervisorial District. The sixth hearing focused on experiences of members of LGBTQ+ communities and women of color. The final hearing obtained input from law enforcement partners in dialogue with subject matter experts. Community members, advocacy groups, and policing professionals provided testimony for the public record about their experiences and suggestions to change policing in LA County. Following the hearings, we conducted stakeholder sessions to evaluate and expand the results of the hearings. In addition, we engaged subject matter experts to assist with critical analysis of current conditions and identification of examples, models, promising practices, and suggestions. Summaries of the results of the hearings and sessions are provided in Appendices B, C, and D. This report summarizes the assessment activities and presents recommendations for redefining policing.

The body of this report is organized in three sections: Remembering, Listening, and Moving Forward. The Remembering section provides important historical context regarding inequitable policing practices in Los Angeles County. The Listening section describes the hearings, stakeholder feedback sessions, and critical analysis along with the results of these activities. The Moving Forward section presents the recommendations for needed changes. Italicized words are defined in the glossary beginning on page 55.

REMEMBERING

Contemporary challenges to equity in law enforcement in Los Angeles County did not spring into existence suddenly. They are the current expressions of tumultuous collisions of long-standing conditions including asymmetrical consolidation of power by law enforcement which have sparked repeated cycles of civil unrest. The following brief historical review provides important context to understanding our present situation.

“We live in a moment that is bigger than any one of us. The struggles we face are rarely about individuals and they are rarely about bad apples. They are structural, they are persistent, and they are historical. Really, the struggles we face today are baked into the DNA of [this place] we call Los Angeles. Therefore, to part with the broken practices of our past and our present we are going to have to be visionary and we’re going to have to be bold...bold enough to fundamentally remake the story of policing in LA.”

Dr. Kelly Lytle-Hernandez, UCLA

Watts 1965

On August 11, 1965, a white California Highway Patrol (CHP) officer pulled over Marquette Frye, a black resident of Watts, suspecting him of drunk driving. Marquette’s stepbrother, who was in the car with him, ran to their house nearby and brought members of the family, including Marquette’s mother, to the scene. A crowd of neighborhood residents assembled and quickly grew. The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) arrived as back-up. More CHP officers were called in as well. Marquette panicked and the officers struggled to arrest him. An officer knocked Marquette down with a baton. His stepbrother and mother intervened and were arrested. Less than an hour after the initial traffic stop angry crowds were throwing rocks, bricks, and bottles at buses and cars that had been stalled in traffic by the incident.4

The next morning a neighborhood meeting was called by the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations to calm the mounting tensions, but to no avail.5 That night the violence continued. Police and community members fought. Buildings and cars were set on fire. Firefighters were blocked. Stores were looted. Within 3 days, the impacted area covered 50 square miles. About 14,000 National Guard troops were deployed in response to the civil unrest. Los Angeles Police Department Chief William Parker publicly said the angry crowds were like “monkeys in a zoo.” It was another 3 days before the unrest was suppressed. When it was over, this traffic stop gone wrong had sparked six days of violence in which nearly 4,000 persons were arrested, more than 1,000 were wounded, 34 had died, and property damage totaled $40 million.6

When the officers stopped Marquette, residents of Watts were already living under the immense burden of race and class oppression. It was the height of the Civil Rights Movement, along with the accompanying

---

backlash of cruel harassment and repression. Watts faced the daily realities of racism common throughout the country – a continuation of the twin legacies of slavery and colonialism, manifested by police brutality, housing discrimination, and poverty. At the time, the Watts area was among the most vulnerable in the Los Angeles region. Schools were largely ineffective and de facto segregated. Not surprisingly, Bayard Rustin, a civil rights activist and advisor to Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., said local youth felt hopeless. Tensions with law enforcement were endemic and entrenched. When asked to comment on what had occurred, the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. observed that he found “a unanimous feeling that there has been police brutality” in Watts.\textsuperscript{7}

Less than a week before, the landmark Voting Rights Acts had been signed into law.\textsuperscript{8} But it had only been about 5 months since the nation was horrified by televised images of police officers with batons and dogs attacking and tear-gassing marchers in Selma, Alabama.\textsuperscript{9} And barely 6 months prior, Malcolm X had been assassinated.\textsuperscript{10}

![Examples of Police-Community Clashes in LA County](image)

Racial oppression resulting in events like the Watts Rebellion were not new to LA County in 1965 and have proven persistent since. In fact, the County’s Commission on Human Relations was created from a Committee formed in January 1944 by the Board of Supervisors in response to what has come to be called the Zoot Suit Riots. For three days young white men in the military attacked local young men of color. During these attacks local law enforcement stood by and watched until the beatings were finished and then arrested the victims.\textsuperscript{11} Nearly 30 years after, the beating of African-American motorist Rodney King,

and the not guilty verdict in the state trial of the police officers, set off the Los Angeles Civil Unrest of 1992. The entire neighborhoods have burned in reaction to “use-of-force” incidents which were deemed legal by local authorities.

The disproportionate impact of the criminal justice system on communities of color continues to bolster racist ideology within law enforcement communities and the community at large. Critical incidents involving people of color seldom result in equitable law enforcement and criminal justice interventions regardless of video evidence. The murder of Ahmaud Arbery, an unarmed African-American jogger who was hunted down by a vigilante ex-officer, and the killing of George Floyd by a police officer with a substantial history of misconduct while three other officers stood by are examples of this. Moreover, the shooting of Breonna Taylor, an African-American health worker who was killed by police while she was lying in bed after they executed an incorrect search warrant, further brings to light the need to address the inequities of our criminal justice system. These tragic killings have sparked civil unrest across the nation as people demand an end to police brutality and a transformation of public safety. It is not within the scope of this document to detail the hundreds of lesser known actions taken by community to protest moments when law enforcement broke the public trust. Thousands of lives lost, billions in property damage, and the intangible costs of a social contract broken.

**Recent Developments**

Many of the problems that led to the Watts Rebellion continue today—vulnerable communities still struggle with inadequate educational opportunities, the lack of decent and affordable housing options, high rates of unemployment and underemployment, and inequitable law enforcement practices. Furthermore, the conditions for our most vulnerable communities are likely to get more severe considering the ongoing crisis created by the COVID-19 pandemic. The civil unrest following the killing of George Floyd in Los Angeles County, across the nation and internationally is a response to these inequities. We should use this opportunity to listen to community stakeholders and push government and law enforcement to address them. Change is possible; it has already begun. In recent years there have been numerous state laws adopted directed at law enforcement as well as innumerable strides to improve community safety through local policy and programmatic initiatives. Many of these actions address how policing targets our most vulnerable communities and strengthen accountability mechanisms. Following is a brief sample of these reforms.

The Coalition Against Police Abuse (CAPA) was founded in 1976 by civil rights activists to take complaints of police misconduct, advocate for the legal rights of victims of police brutality, expose police wrongdoings and promote accountability through public campaigns, and foster gang cease fire and peace treaties. Through its sociopolitical capital, CAPA initiated a campaign in the 1980s and 1990s to get the City of Los

Angeles’ Charter changed to include an elected civilian review board with subpoena power and an independent prosecutor.\textsuperscript{16}

More recently, the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA) requires the state to collect detention and search data information for every police agency and provide that information to the public to monitor racial profiling.\textsuperscript{17} Brotherhood Crusade, one of the feedback session participants, was instrumental in bringing this bill to fruition as it arose out of a conversation with Brotherhood Crusade’s youth and Senator Kamala Harris while she was serving as California’s Attorney General.

In 2017, CA Senate Bill 29 was passed after grave concerns about the federal administration’s ramped up targeting of noncitizen populations. This bill prohibits cities, counties, or other local agencies in California from entering into new contracts with the federal government, agencies, or private corporations for the purposes of detaining noncitizens for immigration custody.\textsuperscript{18}

In 2018, CA Assembly Bill 1985 was passed which sought to clarify and standardize the implementation of previous hate crime legislation. Besides clarifying the nature of disability as a protected characteristic, the bill requires “any local law enforcement agency that updates an existing hate crime policy or adopts a new hate crime policy to include, among other things, the model policy framework developed by POST [Peace Officer Standards and Training] and information regarding bias motivation.”\textsuperscript{19}

Also, in 2018, CA Senate Bill 1421 chipped away at California’s reputation as one of the most secretive states in the country when it came to public access to records of police misconduct.\textsuperscript{20}

In the summer of 2019, California passed landmark legislation on the use of deadly force via CA Assembly Bill 392. The last time the law was changed was in 1872, which allowed officers to use deadly force if it was “reasonable.” The new standard restricts the use of lethal force to when it is “necessary in defense of human life” as perceived by a “reasonable” officer and based on the “totality of circumstances.” The new law for the first time adds de-escalation as an effective alternative to lethal force.\textsuperscript{21} A companion bill, CA Senate Bill 230, backed by the State’s leading law enforcement unions, was also passed in 2019. The bill requires all law enforcement agencies to revise their policies under the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training and earmarks $450,000 to develop new training guidelines related to use-of-force and de-escalation.\textsuperscript{22}


Los Angeles County has passed and implemented local reforms as well, sometimes surpassing state reforms through youth diversion, probation reform, Sheriff’s oversight, truancy reform, and decriminalizing mental health. This is due to the innovative efforts and leadership of various political leaders, nonprofit organizations, government agencies, foundations, and community advocates that reside in this county. We discuss just a few of these changes below.

In August 2016 and in April 2017, the LA County Board of Supervisors approved board motions that called for the implementation and expansion of the Countywide Equity Initiative under the purview of the Department of Human Resources and the Commission on Human Relations.23 The first motion, “Improving Police-Community Relations through Law Enforcement Training”, emphasized training for public safety officials to reduce the influence of implicit bias24 and strengthen relationships between County government and the communities it serves.25 The second motion, “Countywide Implementation of Implicit Bias and Cultural Competency Training”, expanded that emphasis to include all County departments and also called for the review and assessment of best practices, implementation of relevant strategic priority goals, design of specific plans including related costs, and countywide convenings to promote awareness, commitment, and skill development.” 26 The intent of the Countywide Equity Initiative is to develop LA County to be a national model of equity.

After years of advocacy and organizing from community members most impacted by law enforcement, the County has taken many steps in establishing oversight bodies that serve to increase the transparency and accountability of law enforcement practices. Two of these bodies are the Los Angeles County Civilian Oversight Commission and the more recently formed Probation Oversight Commission. Community groups in Los Angeles long advocated for the formation of an oversight body for the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD). In December of 2014, the Los Angeles County Civilian Oversight Commission (COC) was formed, and two years later the nine commissioners and executive director were appointed. The mission of the Commission is “to improve public transparency and accountability with respect to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, by providing robust opportunities for community engagement, ongoing analysis and oversight of the department's policies, practices, procedures, and advice to the Board of Supervisors, the Sheriff's Department and the public.”27 Recently, again after years of community advocacy, the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors (BOS) approved subpoena power for the Office of the Inspector General in January 2020, and shortly after in March 2020 the public voted in favor of Measure R which gave the COC subpoena power in order to more effectively carry out their mission.28

Part of the important work of this oversight body has been research and advocacy for the establishment of a Family Assistance Program (FAP), which was approved by the BOS in 2019. The County, through FAP, has taken the first steps to provide assistance, crisis intervention, and grief counseling to families after a loved one is killed by a LASD deputy or dies in LASD custody. The precursor and motivation to establish FAP came from organizations like Youth Justice Coalition (YJC) who drafted a comprehensive Family Bill of Rights along with key protocols and recommendations to fully serve communities when a loved one dies. YJC and the many family survivors, like the aunt and mother of Wakeisha Wilson, developed these proposals after decades struggling to navigate the bureaucracies within city and county law enforcement agencies to get support after their loved ones died at the hands of law enforcement.

In 2018, the BOS established the Probation Reform and Implementation Team (PRIT), which was tasked with “transforming the existing Probation Commission into a Probation Oversight Commission (POC) and coordinating existing recommendations for systemic reform of the Probation Department into a comprehensive plan.” The PRIT proceeded to engage the County in listening sessions and then produced a report championing several recommendations, including the establishment of the POC with subpoena power. Other recommendations from the PRIT include separating the juvenile and adult probation systems and eliminating the use of pepper spray by probation officers in juvenile facilities. In October of 2019, the POC was approved by the BOS and given subpoena powers.

LASD has also recently partnered with the Department of Mental Health for the Mental Health Evaluation Teams (MET) to address mental health crises. MET teams consist of one sheriff’s deputy and one Department of Mental Health licensed mental health clinician. In 2018, LASD found that “fifty-five (55) incidents were resolved with less significant use-of-force required by patrol personnel (a lower level of force) as a direct result of MET arriving on scene to help deescalate the patient.” The County is preparing to roll out MET on a greater scale.

In December 2018, Stop LAPD Spying Coalition released a report documenting problematic surveillance programs with racial bias like the Los Angeles Strategic Extraction and Restoration (LASER) program. At the direction of the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners, the LAPD’s Inspector General, Mark P.
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Smith, conducted a study which ultimately concluded that the program lacked oversight and was inconsistently applied.37 The program was subsequently scrapped.

At the same time, the County Board of Supervisors has embarked on an initiative for reform by establishing an Alternatives to Incarceration (ATI) Work Group established by the BOS.38 The BOS will utilize the roadmap and framework created by the ATI Work Group to scale alternatives to incarceration and diversion so that care and services are provided first.39 This roadmap includes examining aspects of policing that would assist in achieving the County’s desired paradigm shift which Los Angeles County District 1 Supervisor, Hilda Solis, has described as “care first, jail second”. 40

While much has changed since 1965, many of the conditions that led to the Watts Rebellion continue to challenge the County: homelessness, underinvestment in impoverished areas, failing public schools, under/unemployment, and overcriminalization. Incidents of racial profiling, police harassment, discrimination, excessive use-of-force, and non-authorized officer-involved shooting have not been ameliorated. Though some progress has been made on many issues, including criminal justice reforms, the lack of accountability and unconstitutional law enforcement interactions with residents in communities of color, are consistent areas of concern. For example, the COVID-19 pandemic has shown how overcrowded local jails have inadequate health services to ensure the safety of the lives they are tasked with protecting, leading to unprecedented releases over the months of March and April of 2020.

Along with the adult criminal system, the County passed landmark reforms within the juvenile system.41 There is a direct correlation to youth in the dependency (foster care) and the delinquency (juvenile justice) systems. Young people in the County juvenile justice system are disproportionately youth of color who are oftentimes in foster care, living in poverty, homeless, or abused or trafficked. Youth of color are disproportionately referred to probation, detained and incarcerated.42 The arrest rate for black youth in Los Angeles County is over six times higher than that of white youth.43 After several decades of lawsuits and Department of Justice (DOJ) monitoring along with consistent community and advocate advocacy, the Probation Department that oversees young people is now making the pivot away from punishment to rehabilitation. The organizational norm is shifting to best practice models, which center on diversion,

43Denise C. Herz et al., The Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study Part II (County of Los Angeles: California State University, Los Angeles, May 2017), http://www.juvenilejusticeresearch.com/sites/default/files/2017-08/POS%20Part%20II%20Report%205-10-2017%20FINAL.pdf
restorative justice protocols, and keeping young people with their families and communities. This effort is being led by the County Board of Supervisors who unanimously supported an ambitious plan to avoid arrests of youth for misdemeanors and certain categories of felony offenses with motions in 2017 and 2019. In support of these actions they found that of the 13,665-youth arrested in Los Angeles County, 11,000 could be eligible for diversion and community supportive programs. They established the County goal to divert 80% of youth arrests away from the juvenile justice system in the next 15 years.44

The State of California has embarked on a process of decarceration that began with reforms in both the adult and youth criminal systems. In a 2011 landmark case, Brown v. Plata, the United States Supreme Court ruled that conditions in California’s prisons constituted cruel and unusual punishment. The California legislature subsequently passed a “public safety realignment” measure, which resulted in the depopulation of its state prisons by holding more individuals in county jails instead.45 In 2007, the California’s juvenile system went through a similar shift called “Juvenile Justice Realignment”.46 Since then, additional legislation, such as Proposition 47: The Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act, has passed which has changed the severity of punishment for certain offenses, and re-structured sentencing schemes in such a way that more individuals are able to return home from custody and/or remain in their communities.47

At the same time, community leaders, advocates, and families have worked to end abuse in the County jails and in all aspects of the criminal and juvenile justice systems, and they have been at the forefront of pressing the County to become a leader in sweeping justice reforms. As a result of community organizing, in August of 2019, the County Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to cancel a $2 billion contract for a new jail facility, sending a clear signal that the County is moving away from a system of incarceration.48 District 3 Supervisor Sheila Kuehl has said, “incarceration is itself an experiment, and it’s an experiment that has failed. There are a lot of countries that have said, this is not the way to go.”49 As Los Angeles County moves toward decarceration, thorough review is needed of policing policies and practices that have been pivotal in driving the explosion of incarceration. The time has come to move beyond reform to fundamental change.
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LISTENING

At the outset, the Commission turned to the diverse communities of Los Angeles County for their insights, knowledge, and guidance on identifying the main priorities for needed change. Two challenges to hearing the voices of community members had to be surmounted: diversity and access.

Community Hearings

The diversity of the population of Los Angeles County is well documented. Total population exceeds 10 million people living in an area of more than 4,000 square miles. Nearly half identify as Latinx. More than 25% are non-Latinx white. Over 15% are Asian. The black or African American portion is 9%. Less than 1.5% are Native American. Less than 0.5% are Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. More than 3% identify with two or more racial categories. More than a third were born in another country and more than half speak a language other than English at home. Nearly 14% are 65 years of age or older and 6% are under 5. More than 4.5% of people in the Los Angeles metropolitan area identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. Two-thirds of adults in the metro area identify as Christian. One-fourth are not affiliated with a religious group. The portions of adults in metro LA identifying with other major religious groups include 3% Jewish, 2% Muslim, 2% Buddhist, and 1% Hindu.

Access to voices of diverse community members was accomplished with a series of 6 public community hearings conducted from September 2016 to September 2018 in locations across the County at times when residents could participate. Groups and organizations serving and representing distinct communities agreed to enlist community members to provide testimony during the hearings. Five of the hearings were conducted in each of the County Supervisorial Districts. A sixth hearing focused on participants who were women of color and members of LGBTQ+ communities. A final public hearing was conducted to obtain input from law enforcement professionals throughout the County. These 7 public hearings brought together community organizations, individual constituents, service providers, and law enforcement agencies to share their experiences and ideas for change.

University of San Diego, Department of Sociology researchers compiled testimony from hearings participants and analyzed them with Dedoose, a qualitative research software program to identify common themes and patterns that emerged. A list of participating organizations and agencies involved in the community hearings can be found in the Acknowledgements section (see page 53).

While each community described distinct needs and experiences for their members, nine issues related to equity in law enforcement in LA County were identified in all 6 of the community hearings:

- Lack of transparency and accountability in addressing complaints and investigating use-of-force and misconduct
- Inadequate use-of-force policies and practices
- Insufficient civilian review and oversight
- Over policing of vulnerable populations through racial, ethnic, and gendered profiling


• Inadequate training in cultural competence (including managing racial and ethnic bias), de-escalation, and engaging with persons with substance use and mental health challenges
• Insufficient engagement with community members by both command and patrol officers
• Limited interaction with immigrants, both documented and undocumented
• Deployment of armed officers on school campuses
• Insufficient funding for community-based programs as alternatives to law enforcement

For a full summary of findings on the Community Hearings, see Appendix B.

Law Enforcement Hearing

It is highly unlikely that substantial changes in law enforcement policies and practices will occur without the active participation of law enforcement agencies and professionals. Moreover, law enforcement professionals are a crucial source of knowledge about what changes are needed and how they can be implemented. For these reasons, law enforcement has been and will continue to be engaged throughout the project. A list of participating law enforcement agencies can be found in the Acknowledgements section.

Early on, law enforcement leaders were contacted to inform them of the project and invite them to participate. Prior to the community public hearings, we shared with local agencies and stations specific information about the activities in their areas. A representative group of law enforcement leaders was enlisted to participate in the final public hearing with subject matter experts. Prior to this final hearing participants received a summary of findings of the 6 community hearings.

During the law enforcement hearing, agency representatives shared a variety of ways they are attempting to address equity in their work:

• Several civilian advisory bodies are functioning in LA County, including Burbank Police Commission, Carson Public Safety Commission, La Cañada Flintridge Public Safety Commission, Los Angeles Police Department’s Board of Police Commissions, Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department Civilian Oversight Commission, Pasadena Public Safety Commission, Redondo Beach Public Safety Commission, Sierra Madre Public Safety Commission, and South Pasadena Public Safety Commission.

• The Long Beach Police Department and the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) have implemented the use of body-worn cameras department-wide and has increased the frequency of their release of footage, while the LA County Sheriff’s Department (LASD) are piloting the use of body-worn cameras.

• The LAPD Family Liaison Section coordinates contact with family members of persons who are killed in encounters with LAPD; LASD investigators on cases involving use of lethal force by deputies notify next-of-kin, explain the investigative process and provide written information including contact phone numbers for resources.

• The City of Los Angeles’ mayor’s office trains and deploys volunteers who contact and support family members dealing with crises such as homicides, suicides, domestic violence, officer-involved shootings, infant deaths, and serious traffic accidents.

• LAPD and LASD provide implicit bias training to their officers.

• LASD does not directly notify federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement offices when detainees are released, though all release information is publicly posted.
For a full summary of findings on the Law Enforcement Hearing, see Appendix C.

Stakeholder Feedback Sessions

While community stakeholders described distinct needs and experiences for their constituency, six priority areas related to equity in law enforcement in LA County were identified throughout the 42 sessions:

- Hiring, staffing, training & education
- Transparency and accountability of law enforcement
- Overpolicing and overcriminalization of targeted communities
- Conditions of confinement
- Immigration and policing
- Greater resources for communities

Following the conclusion and analysis of the 7 public hearings, Commission staff conducted stakeholder feedback sessions with community and law enforcement partners throughout Los Angeles County in 2019. During these sessions stakeholders provided input on the results of the hearings, best practices and important resources, and additional issues that need attention and recommendations for consideration. Over the last decade, many of these stakeholders in LA County have been at the forefront of innovation in California in police reforms and reducing mass incarceration.

Notable was feedback on “retaliation.” Two organizations which historically sought police oversight spoke of retaliation against them as individuals and organizations. Accounts included officers intimidating advocates by visiting their homes, picking them up in cars and dropping them in “enemy” neighborhoods, and stalking them at their workplaces.

All the stakeholder groups consulted confirmed that the analysis of the hearings reflected their input and expressed enthusiasm about moving forward to implement needed changes. A list of participating organizations and agencies involved in the stakeholder feedback sessions can be found in the Acknowledgements section.

For a full summary of findings of the Stakeholder Feedback Sessions, see Appendix D.

Critical Analysis of Current Conditions

In addition to hearing from community and law enforcement partners, input from subject matter experts and relevant literature is crucial for understanding current conditions and identifying solutions to the challenges for redefining policing in LA County. Researchers from the Criminal Justice Program of UCLA’s School of Law provided invaluable assistance in conducting this critical analysis. First there is a brief overview of key dimensions of law enforcement in the County followed by an assessment of the current situation.

The County of Los Angeles is comprised of approximately 140 unincorporated areas and 88 cities, 46 of which have their own police departments. Some of the largest police agencies in the country serve LA County communities.

- The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department is the largest sheriff’s department in the United States with 9,662 sworn personnel. In addition to the unincorporated areas, LASD serves 42 contract cities, 216 facilities, including County hospitals and clinics, community colleges, schools, County parks, portions of the Metropolitan Transit Authority, and 38 courthouses. The Sheriff’s Department is also responsible for 8 custody facilities with up to 17,000-17,500 inmates daily. The current COVID-19 crisis has impacted Department operations; accordingly, the current daily inmate count is approximately 12,000.

- The Los Angeles Police Department has approximately 10,040 sworn officers.

- The Los Angeles County Probation Department is currently the largest probation agency in the United States with nearly 6,000 sworn peace officers.

- The Long Beach Police Department currently employs over 800 sworn officers.

- The Los Angeles School Police Department employs over 350 sworn police officers, more than many municipal police departments.

Additionally, within this County each California State University campus as well as UCLA has its own police department. Other police agencies that operate within the boundaries of the County include state and federal police agencies such as the California Highway Patrol, the Federal Bureau of Investigations, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

Perceptions and experiences in LA County are influenced by national perspectives. Many communities see police as an occupying force. Latinx and liberal-leaning people, in addition to people younger than 35, reported a national decline in confidence in and perception of law enforcement since 2000. In fact, almost a third of people in the U.S. view their local police as serving an enforcer role, while only roughly 16% of people view them as serving a protector role. Locally, factors contributing to this view include the use of resources made available by the National Defense Authorization Act of 1997’s Section 1033, the training of some of our state’s law enforcement by Israeli military, and increased use of surveillance technologies.

---
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Moreover, there is ample evidence that serious disparate impacts are far too common as deputies and officers working in LA County discharge their duties. For example, a recent state report released January 2, 2020 found that black drivers face stops and searches in California’s largest cities at higher rates than any other racial group. The report shows that of the nearly 337,000 stops reported by the Los Angeles Police Department, about 28% involved African American motorists, though African Americans account for only 9% of the city’s population. White drivers made up about 18% of LAPD stops, though they account for about 28% of the city’s population. The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department reported nearly 137,000 stops, about 17% of which involved African American drivers.  

Another review found that LAPD officers searched a higher proportion of black and *Latinx* drivers than white drivers during traffic stops, even though black and *Latinx* drivers were less likely to be found with illegal items.  

In addition, on January 6, 2020, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that a dozen police officers from LAPD’s elite Metro Division are being investigated for falsifying information gathered during stops that falsely identifies some County residents as gang members or associates.  

The disproportionality in policing vulnerable communities is far more than an irritating inconvenience. Nationally, police kill more people per day than other countries do in years. In addition to health issues, getting killed by police is a leading cause of death for black men and boys in America, at about 1-in-1,000. On average, the police in California engage in the use of deadly force at a rate 37% higher than the national average. In Los Angeles County, black residents make up only nine percent of the population, and yet they account for 24% of the killings by police officers. Consequently, some have ranked Los Angeles as one of the deadliest areas for police violence.  

---


Even when discriminatory policing is not lethal it can lead to multiple adverse outcomes including physical injuries, psychological trauma, wrongful convictions, loss of employment, and family division and separation. These significant psychological, economic, social, and health difficulties are devastating and can have multi-generational effects, disproportionately impacting our most vulnerable communities. A recent Boston University School of Health study found that black people experienced more incidents of depression, stress, and other mental health issues as a result of the high rate of police killings. These outcomes are not found in white Americans. One study found that “police killings of black Americans are responsible for more than 50 million additional days of poor mental health per year among black Americans.” Another study found that living in neighborhoods “where pedestrian stops are more likely to become invasive is associated with worse health.”

Another devastating impact of inequitable policing policies and practices is mass incarceration. The United States has a total population of 330 million people and 70 million of those people have criminal arrest records. A Vera Institute of Justice report found that there were 10.5 million arrests in the U.S. in 2016.

---


alone. Of those arrested, the vast majority have annual incomes below $10,000. With incidence of arrest this high, it is no surprise that we incarcerate more people in this country than any other country on Earth. Even though the U.S. comprises four percent of the world’s population, we hold 22% of all imprisoned human beings on the planet. In the 1970’s, there were under 300,000 people in prison in the United States, and now that number has swelled to more than 2.2 million, with an additional 4.5 million on probation or parole. Locally, the Los Angeles County jail system remains the largest in the world, with an average of approximately 18,000 individuals incarcerated in county jails on any given day. Due to early release measures taken because of the COVID-19 pandemic the current daily inmate count is approximately 12,000.

Our most vulnerable communities who are also often targets of hate crimes end up disproportionately ensnared in the criminal system – our poor, homeless, transgender, mentally- or cognitively-impaired, undocumented, and/or people of color. Nationally, 1 in 3 black men will go to prison in their lifetimes. While members of LGBTQ+ communities comprise only 3.8% of the general population nationally, they constitute 7.9% of the population of state and federal prisons as well as 7.1% of the city and county jail population. Many LGBTQ+ people of color are pulled into the criminal system at a young age. It was found that in Los Angeles County jails in 2018, on average 30% of the jail population “were in mental health housing units and/or prescribed psychotropic medications.” Of those with mental illness in the county jails, over 41% are black and 35% are Latinx.

L.A. County incarcerates around 2,000 women daily. As of 2015, the rate of mental illness is significantly higher in the female population (27%) than in the male population (19%) and this disparity continues to

---
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grow. The number of incarcerated women with serious mental illness is more than twice that of jailed men and six times that of women generally. Black and Latinx women are around 54% of the women in L.A. County but over 70% of those in the jail. Black women are hardest hit; they comprise only nine percent of women in L.A County but are 33% of jail bookings of women. Out of all women incarcerated in L.A. County, nine percent are homeless. The majority of women are arrested on low-level charges related to substance use, poverty, and survival.93

During several of the community hearings testimony focused on the death of Gemmel Moore at the apartment of a prominent Democratic donor, Ed Buck. Participants called for equitable investigatory treatment of vulnerable LGBTQ+ individuals. Residents advised that there had been no formal investigation of the crime. Following the conclusion of the community hearings, inspired by the collective efforts of concerned residents and activists, the Commission on Human Relations pressed the LA County Sheriff’s Department and the LA County District Attorney’s office for information regarding the limited investigation. After continued pressure from community activists and local government officials, a comprehensive investigation was completed which resulted in the indictment of Ed Buck by a U.S. State Attorney for the deaths of Gemmel Moore and Timothy Dean, another black man who suffered harm at the hands of the influential political insider.94 This is one of many cases that displays the impact of racial and identity bias in the law enforcement and criminal justice systems. Without the commitment of activists, and investment of time and resources from County and City leaders, this case likely would have remained unresolved and the process of obtaining justice for Gemmel Moore and the community at large would not have been initiated. This case brings to the light the need for public safety change at all levels from arrest to prosecution and details the path forward—one that is grounded in community action and government response.

“Starting at the national level, in the US transgender survey released in 2015, respondents experienced high levels of mistreatment and harassment by police, including verbal harassment, repeated misgendering, physical assault, sexual assault, and being forced to engage in sexual activity to avoid arrest. All of those adverse interactions leave scars. 57% of survey respondents said they would feel uncomfortable asking police for help if they needed it...Locally, we continue to hear alarming rates of profiling by law enforcement, including disproportionate stops, arrests, and overcharging of trans women, trans youth....I want to acknowledge that attacks on immigrants’ rights are currently a huge human relations problem facing our local LGBTQ communities...Particularly given the environments of trans phobia, homophobia, economic marginalization, and physical danger that face many LGBTQ immigrants.”

Attorney, ACLU Southern California
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MOVING FORWARD

The current conditions for local and national change efforts are ideal. The convergence of political leadership and the power of community collaboration and activism are at their apex. The number of progressive policies and public interest in implementing breakthrough solutions mark this as a historic moment to redefine policing in LA County. The COVID-19 crisis and social uprisings taking place across the country have brought to light our interdependency. Through that heightened sense of connection people are uniting to address socio-economic and racial inequities. This section discusses recommendations for redefining policing that reflect the voices of community members, stakeholders, and law enforcement partners.

LA County’s Commission on Human Relations identified the following 9 strategic aims and 34 recommendations, garnered from the voices of those who spoke at the 7 public hearings, the 42 stakeholder feedback sessions, and consultation from academic partners at UCLA and USD. These strategic aims and recommendations are interconnected as they foster an ecosystem that redifines policing and public safety. All of these recommended changes are crucial. If implemented piecemeal, the recommendations will not serve their full potential in building public trust and empowering community members as agents of change for public safety. The forthcoming recommendations are meant to be adaptable to the various law enforcement jurisdictions in Los Angeles County.

STRATEGIC AIM #1 – INCREASE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY
Enhance community participation in the processes of transparency and accountability by building systems that promote public communication of information, including the disposition of complaint and misconduct investigations.

Perhaps the most consistently expressed need for advancing equity and improving trust between community members and law enforcement agencies was the need for robust accountability and transparency. Throughout the public hearings and stakeholder sessions participants called for greater, more robust transparency and accountability, particularly in addressing complaints from community members and investigating use-of-force and misconduct cases.

The call for increased transparency and accountability is not surprising. We consistently heard about the lack of investigation and consequences in response to police misconduct, lethal and excessive use-of-force by law enforcement, and the lack of response to in-person and online personnel complaints. Furthermore, testimony consistently shared the continuing need for public access to information and data about complaints, investigations, arrests, and officer performance. Many participants voiced concerns about police officers who are unfit for duty with histories of misconduct and abuse, and yet remain employed.

“The reason there is such a lack of accountability is because the police commissioners who are supposed to oversee are political appointees and supporters of the people that have appointed them. What we need is for those commissioners to step down so that we can have a bona fide civilian oversight body...Commissioners must also have disciplinary authority and subpoena power, otherwise, they are just figure heads.”
Audrey George, Supervisorial District 3
Participants also shared their lack of trust in complaint processes related to use-of-force and misconduct investigations. When there is an investigation of an officer, it is generally conducted by the officer’s employing agency, raising real concerns about conflicts of interest. And rarely are criminal charges filed. Participants spoke of being wary of the fact that the District Attorney’s Office, and not an independent agency, is the sole decisionmaker when it comes to filing charges against law enforcement.

Participants recommend that all law enforcement agencies work to provide insight into their process by producing a Know Your Rights (KYR) brochure to distribute to vulnerable communities in all threshold languages. This brochure would supplement other KYR publications circulated by advocacy organizations such as the ACLU and the NAACP. This brochure should share community members’ rights from detention to arrest with a focus on asking, "Am I free to go?", to be clear about the intent of responding officers. This brochure should also provide information on complaints and commendations. Youth have a different set of rights in patrol, custody, and detention settings, and this should be equally clarified.

An example of increased transparency and accountability is LAPD’s Family Liaison Section (FLS). The FLS was established in 2016 to provide assistance and improve communication and coordination with family members of those who have lost their lives during encounters with LAPD personnel or while in LAPD custody. The FLS responds to officer-involved shootings (OIS) and in-custody death (ICD) scenes. After an incident, FLS establishes an immediate relationship with the family of the decedent, maintaining contact with them throughout the entire administrative investigation and adjudication process.

In furtherance of increasing transparency and accountability of law enforcement, we support the Los Angeles County Civilian Oversight Commission’s recommendations on family assistance and communication, listed in Appendix E.

**Recommendations:**

**RECOMMENDATION 1** – Expand family assistance and communication policy to prioritize *trauma-informed approaches* and empathy building in every interaction with the public, while also requiring officer self-identification; provide regular media briefings for high-profile investigations to keep the public at large informed of the investigatory process.

“We need an independent special prosecutor for police crimes, a prosecutor with all the duties, resources, and funding to investigate and prosecute police crimes.”

Carlos Montes, Centro CSO
RECOMMENDATION 2 – Change federal and state laws, in addition to local law enforcement policies, to end *qualified immunity* and provide public access to information about police officers involved in both complaint and misconduct investigations, including their prior history and the results of investigations.

RECOMMENDATION 3 – Create quality control mechanisms to ensure ample resources are equitably allotted to law enforcement investigations of incidents involving vulnerable communities (e.g. people of color, LGBTQ+ communities, immigrants).

**STRATEGIC AIM #2 – REVISE USE-OF-FORCE POLICIES AND PRACTICES**

*Current use-of-force policies authorize practices that too often lead to serious harm and loss of life. Protocols and mechanisms should be developed that will safeguard the lives of community members and responding officers.*

In all the hearings and feedback sessions concern was expressed regarding use-of-force policies and practices. Participants spoke of a long history of local law enforcement killing people of color. This concern is a major civil rights issue facing the entire nation. Franklin Zimring of UC Berkeley has observed, “Here was a civil rights crisis that nobody had seen on the horizon: the phenomenon of killings by the police in the twenty-first century…...the killing of citizens by police...is a phenomenon in the United States as it is in no other peaceful and fully developed nation on earth....the sine qua non that must happen in a police department’s thinking and planning prior to achieving significant reform is adoption of the belief that the preservation of the lives of civilians is an important principle of policy.”

Residents throughout Los Angeles County expressed parallel concerns about the need for thorough revision of use-of-force policies and practices to require police to take steps to de-escalate conflict and minimize lethal use-of-force. In light of recent displays of force by police during the nationwide protests following the killing of George Floyd, government leaders have proposed new restrictions on crowd-control techniques and controversial force techniques, such as carotid holds, that have led to the untimely deaths of far too many people.

**Recommendations:**

RECOMMENDATION 4 – Change state law to require law enforcement agencies to implement policies to exhaust all other acceptable measures, including self-identification, de-escalation techniques, and non-lethal tactics, before resorting to use-of-force.

---

RECOMMENDATION 5 – Assign use-of-force investigations to independent special prosecutors housed outside of law enforcement agencies and the district attorney’s office.

RECOMMENDATION 6 – Make information on use-of-force incidents and assault on officer incidents, including all relevant geographic and demographic data, publicly available and accessible; this information should also be reported at public forums such as oversight meetings, town halls, etc.

STRATEGIC AIM #3 – STRENGTHEN CIVILIAN REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT

Authorize community members to oversee policing issues, providing checks and balances necessary for accountability and trust.

In response to their concern regarding lack of transparency and accountability participants called for increased monitoring of policing by stronger civilian oversight bodies with substantial investigatory and enforcement authority, including subpoena power. Community advisory groups are wholly inadequate and may even curtail the advancement of equity by encouraging a false sense of accountability.

There is a need for oversight bodies with the power, authority, and resources to investigate complaints and hold law enforcement agencies accountable. While the idea of and efforts toward community oversight have been around since the 1920s, it was not until the 1960s that a resurgence for civilian review boards grew in an effort to address police racism. 97 Currently, nearly 150 oversight boards or civilian-police oversight agencies operate in the United States. 98 Historically, their efficacy has been in dispute and seen largely as experimental, but today what is clear is that we are entering a new era of oversight that requires power, resources, and independence. 99

“We really...want a civilian board to take away the power from the police departments, take away the power from the attorney general, and where the community is going to be hand in hand. It would help [to] establish a real commission instead of a fake [one], not doing anything...”

Speaker, Supervisory District 2

At a minimum, law enforcement misconduct and abuse must be properly investigated with appropriate consequences that prevent repeated and ongoing misconduct. We must therefore support policies and practices that empower and resource oversight bodies to properly investigate and address such misconduct. This includes having access to documents and information to investigate cases of misconduct and lethal force thoroughly and impartially. Therefore, subpoena power is a central issue in our County and must be provided to all existing oversight bodies in the County.

Los Angeles County is taking positive steps in this direction. On January 21, 2020, the County Board of Supervisors voted to give subpoena authority to the Civilian Oversight Commission (COC) for the LASD, via the county’s Inspector General Max Huntsman. Until now, most requests for information by community and the COC have been met with silence. This decision is a major step forward. An important needed next step for maintaining strong civilian review and oversight of law enforcement in the County would be the production of an annual report on the advance of equity in policing throughout the County.

In 2018, CA Senate Bill 1421 took a crucial step toward ending California’s reputation as one of the most secretive in the nation when it comes to police records. SB 1421 requires police agencies to release reports or findings related to police officers’ discharge of a firearm or serious use-of-force, and sustained incidents by officers of sexual assault or dishonesty. Immediately after this legislation was passed, many police agencies throughout the state destroyed their agencies’ records before the law went into effect in 2019. The bill did, however, lead to the release of a large amount of data on the lack of investigations in law enforcement agencies. This revealed that 10% of the 122 agencies statewide failed to internally investigate incidents that occurred between 2014 and 2018, including “16 fatal shootings, three deaths following fights with officers, and nine nonfatal events.”

As the laws change and oversight bodies gain authority and power, the County along with city and state partners can support these reforms by not only improving their data collection process and resources, but also actively bringing government agencies together with communities to produce an annual report. Currently, there is no comprehensive, regular countywide review of the state of policing besides the LA County Office of the Inspector General’s reporting, which only focuses on the jurisdictions of the Sheriff’s Department. Such a report would document the use of lethal force, as well as excessive force and other acts of misconduct. In the spirit of transparency, this report would provide the public ready access to racial profiling data, arrest numbers, charges, current police protocols and practices, training, deaths at the hands of officers, and other relevant information regarding public safety and policing. This report would highlight new laws and practices as well as their implementation and efficacy. While existing civilian

---

“We need commissions that have subpoena power, hiring power, and disciplinary power.”

Robert Miller, Supervisorial District 3


[^103]: Ibid.


oversight bodies do conduct data review, there is a need for an inter-jurisdictional review of the County that consolidates information from the nearly 50 law enforcement agencies in LA County and reflects the expectations of community members for measures related to equity, accountability, and transparency in policing.

**Recommendations:**

**RECOMMENDATION 7** – Each law enforcement jurisdiction without a civilian oversight body should establish one to provide input on policies and practices, including hiring and disciplinary decisions.

**RECOMMENDATION 8** – Ensure that all civilian oversight bodies have the necessary authority to perform their mission, including subpoena power and the power to censure and/or discipline.

**RECOMMENDATION 9** – Ensure that membership selection processes for civilian oversight bodies include community nominations and designate seats for people who have been justice-involved and impacted family members.

**RECOMMENDATION 10** – LA County Board of Supervisors should mandate and resource production of an annual report documenting and assessing policing and human relations in LA County, including monitoring the progress of implementation of this report’s recommendations in consultation with the LA County Office of the Inspector General and related bodies; this report should involve all local law enforcement jurisdictions and incorporate a legislative analysis as well as highlight data on use-of-force incidents and police stops.

**STRATEGIC AIM #4 – END OVERPOLICING & UNDERPROTECTION OF VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES**

*Both data and community perceptions confirm that our poorest and most vulnerable Angelenos have the least access to equitable law enforcement. Equity under the law is indispensable in building trust and deepening a cooperative relationship with the diversity of communities in Los Angeles County.*

Repeatedly in the hearing and feedback sessions community members shared reports of what they experienced as profiling. Reports included profiling based on race and ethnicity, presumed immigration status, gender, sexual orientation, youth, mental health, and homelessness. Many of those expressing this concern indicated they also felt under-protected by police. In other words, law enforcement was something they experienced as too frequently done to them, too rarely done for them, and never done with them. One Supervisorial District 1 community member said, “the suppression that’s really intense right now is definitely tied into the gentrification that is going on.” The perception expressed was that long-time residents of the area are more likely to be targeted by police and have less input in policing decisions, because of favoritism to newer residents contributing to the gentrification of the community.

One best practice of local law enforcement is the Community Liaison Officer at the LAPD. To facilitate collaboration and open dialogue, LAPD’s Metropolitan Division has assigned officers to each Geographic Bureau. From this group, one officer is dedicated as a Community Liaison Officer (CLO). The CLO is the direct point of contact for community leaders, community interventionists, and area community relations

“This is a different community today, because of a kind of cleansing has taken place here...We need to look at this in a way that’s whole; complete.”

Speaker, Supervisorial District 2
officers. The CLO communicates with these stakeholders to learn about community issues, concerns, and needs. The CLO then identifies opportunities for non-enforcement contacts and open dialogue. They also attend Community Police Advisory Board meetings, which are joint information sharing sessions between community stakeholders and police representatives.

Community members emphasized the need for officers to work collaboratively with community residents, to help ensure safety and security of all Angelenos. This requires much more engagement of law enforcement with communities in activities unrelated to enforcement but that, instead, build trust and strengthen relationships. While participation of command personnel is important for this purpose, it is crucial that patrol officers be actively involved as well. Of course, the effectiveness of this engagement will be greatly enhanced if officers are consistently deployed to the same communities over time, as is the case with certain community policing programs. Following are more details of experiences related to particular characteristics or groups. Considering the intersectional nature of policing inequity, the recommendations provided herein may apply to all the following groups.

**Race & Ethnicity**
Community members shared experiences in which they felt they were profiled by officers due to their race or ethnicity, including unsupported suspicions that they were involved in illicit or gang activity. Some participants described targeted profiling indicated by a disproportionately high number of Driving Under the Influence (DUI) checkpoints in neighborhoods where many lower income persons of color reside. They also described the disparate impact of the practice of impounding cars for violations other than DUI. Testimony included accounts of numerous incidents of unnecessary and excessive police hostility and excessive use-of-force even when the targeted persons are in public spaces.

**Immigrants**
Throughout the hearings, community members expressed feelings that undocumented persons were unfairly targeted. Participants described the need for law enforcement to interact with all immigrant communities with greater sensitivity and respect. Community members voiced concern that nativist sentiments are negatively affecting police perception of an increasingly diverse immigrant community. Residents expressed fears that increasingly intolerant rhetoric towards immigrants was making inroads with law enforcement, with what they feel are detrimental effects on how their communities are policed. A large number view local law enforcement as agents of the national government. There is a need for clear communication through avenues that immigrant communities trust that local law enforcement will not enforce federal immigrant law. While the State has implemented sanctuary state protections for the immigrant community, the COC’s report “LA County Sheriff’s Department Cooperation with Immigration and Customs Enforcement” published in May 2019, warns of the changing landscape of federal immigration enforcement operations at the local-level via technology.
In furtherance of ending *overpolicing* and *underprotection* of vulnerable immigrant communities, we support the Los Angeles County Civilian Oversight Commission’s recommendations on immigration enforcement, listed in Appendix F.

**Gender and Sexual Orientation**

Women of color, transgender persons, and members of *LGBTQ+* communities described similar experiences of being overpoliced and underprotected. Members of these communities reported experiences of being targeted by police due to their gender or sexual orientation. They expressed need for an understanding by law enforcement of the intersectionality of their experiences that combine the impacts of discrimination based on their gender, sexual orientation, race, economic conditions, and sometimes immigration status. They also described feeling underprotected by law enforcement when they are targeted with physical, verbal, and sexual abuse by members of their own families and the local community. Many said that law enforcement did not take their concerns seriously as indicated by police refusing to respond to their calls for service or responding inappropriately when they did appear. Community members stated they were criminalized when calling law enforcement for help. In addition, members of this community expressed concern about young people being pushed into foster care. Some even reported having been sexually assaulted by law enforcement due to their gender or sexual orientation. Others stated that law enforcement seemed completely unaware of their trauma and other *mental health challenges* often leading to unwarranted and excessive use-of-force.

**Youth**

A prominent focus in the hearings and feedback sessions was policing in schools. Some participants recommended the full removal of police from schools. While Los Angeles Police Department Chief Moore stated that he wanted to avoid the “pipeline to jails,” other law enforcement partners stated that armed officers in some schools are necessary. There is no clear positive correlation, though, between police presence in schools and student safety. Instead, the increased police presence in schools has been instrumental in reinforcing the school-to-prison pipeline. Too often police presence in schools only militarizes those environments and places youth of color at risk, criminalizing adolescent misbehavior. According to the American Psychological Association harsh disciplinary measures fail to secure school safety. School-based policing can foster disorder and distrust in learning.

---

“[There are] very hostile experiences that our community have experienced. Especially our trans community who has reported to us several accounts of harassment, not just at detention centers but with PD.”

Representative, Long Beach Immigrant Rights Coalition

---

### School Districts in LA County with On-Campus Police

- **ABC Unified School District (LASD)**
- **Antelope Valley Union High School District (LASD)**
- **Baldwin Park Unified School District**
- **Compton Unified School District**
- **El Rancho Unified School District**
- **Hacienda-La Puente Unified School District**
- **Inglewood Unified School District**
- **Long Beach Unified School District**
- **Los Angeles Unified School District**
- **Montebello Unified School District**
- **Pomona Unified School District**

Source: CA Commission on Peace Officer Standards & Training

---

environments by creating an atmosphere of fear and anxiety for students.\textsuperscript{109} The Los Angeles Unified School District has taken positive steps to address this concern including a new policy to decriminalize truancy, moving away from allowing probation officers to supervise students without involvement in criminal activity, and ending random searches of students.\textsuperscript{110}

Additionally, many participants expressed concerns regarding the overpolicing of youth related to the disproportionate targeting of youth of color in Metro stations. One participant from Supervisorial District 2 said, “the very presence of police on metro and public transportation represents a public health concern for our children.” A variety of alternatives was shared, including cultural arts programs that give the opportunity for youth and officers to interact.

**Mental Health**

Participants in the hearings and feedback sessions expressed alarm at the policing of those struggling with mental health challenges and cognitive disabilities. There is cause for concern. “In 2017, law enforcement agencies nationally spent $918 million transporting people with severe mental illness...and spent 21 percent of their time responding to and transferring people for mental health issues.”\textsuperscript{111} These increased interactions between police who are not trained, mental health professionals, and individuals with mental health issues, often lead to the serious harm or death of those suffering from mental health issues. An estimated one in four people killed by police have a mental health issue.\textsuperscript{112} Recognizing these challenges,

\begin{quote}
“You can see long lines of youth of color being checked for fares at Metro. No similar lines in white communities. Less than 30% of what they spend to have law enforcement on the trains and buses would provide a free metro pass for every student in LA County.”

Kim McGill, Youth Justice Coalition
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
“We need to work on decriminalizing mental illness...overhaul the 911 system, in particular calls associated with mental illness.”

Jesús Otelo Martinez, Supervisorial District 2
\end{quote}

participants described a lack of sensitivity and competency of law enforcement in dealing with personal trauma and other mental health crises. They were dismayed at the apparent lack of training for law enforcement regarding mental health issues and described how it often led to unwarranted use-of-force, at times excessive.

**Homelessness**

One other population described by participants as overpoliced was persons without permanent shelter. Of course, the growing crisis of insufficient affordable housing in LA County is well-documented. There have been massive increases in the numbers of persons experiencing homelessness locally in the last several years, the majority of whom are people of color. Overpolicing of these persons described by participants includes the issuing of citations and custody placement of those living on the street for quality of life violations. It was reported that this type of aggressive policing has led to the unnecessary use of deadly force against people experiencing homelessness, primarily African Americans. An example of productive strategies involving law enforcement responses is Long Beach Police Department’s Quality of Life Officers, who are deployed to impacted communities, trained in socio-emotional approaches to community intervention, and are less focused on punitive enforcement strategies like citations and custody. Additionally, several law enforcement agencies have deployed co-response teams throughout the County with a focus on providing resources to people experiencing homelessness in partnership with service providers and health professionals. These collaborations are models for the future of policing in that they represent a synergistic approach which moves away from enforcement.

**Recommendations:**

**RECOMMENDATION 11** – Use alternatives other than arrest when responding to quality of life violations and misdemeanor offenses related to crimes of survival, such as sleeping in public spaces or in cars.

**RECOMMENDATION 12** – End cooperation of local law enforcement agencies in the enforcement of federal immigration laws and adopt policies that comply with sanctuary state laws, including curbing unnecessary data sharing with federal agencies by coding non-violent crimes committed by people who are undocumented with immigrant neutral codes.

—

“Law enforcement is the primary…responder to homelessness. It’s a problem because that makes it a crime…This is expensive…when people are criminalized...[t]hey go to jail. They end up in court…We [know of] 21 people…with tickets who are being criminalized.”

Speaker, Supervisory District 3

---


RECOMMENDATION 13 – Increase police engagement in activities unrelated to enforcement that promote ongoing dialogue to humanize all public safety stakeholders; activities can include community events, urban gardens, recreational programming, and facilitated discussions which allow for the most vulnerable populations to safely speak directly to those with policing power.

RECOMMENDATION 14 – Create advancement opportunities for officers who demonstrate high ethical standards while serving the same community for a long period of time.

RECOMMENDATION 15 – Conduct data briefing sessions between law enforcement and community partners when incidents requiring immediate action occur; the briefing sessions should include collaborative, problem-solving components to ensure the fairest and most effective deployment of resources, as well as nurture relationships of trust.

RECOMMENDATION 16 – Publicly demonstrate the use of information collected through the Racial and Identity Profiling Act by advocating for state resources to be allocated to law enforcement agencies and neutral third-party facilitators to increase data analytics capacity and public dissemination.

STRATEGIC AIM #5 – IMPROVE POLICE TRAINING
Create training environments for recruits and officers which promote holistic portrayals of the communities they serve, including focus on preventing bias by proxy.

Common among recommendations shared in the hearings and feedback sessions were calls for improved training of law enforcement officers. Training needs described included attention to cultural competence (including eliminating racial and ethnic bias), de-escalation, and engaging with persons with substance use and mental health challenges.

Participants described the need for consistent, ongoing, culturally specific training to address unfair and disrespectful treatment of vulnerable communities such as racial profiling, homophobia, xenophobia, and sexism. Specific attention was given to the need for cultural competency in working with members of transgender and gender non-conforming communities. Implicit bias and de-escalation trainings were also suggested along with recommendations to target and change law enforcement’s mode of communicating with the public. Almost every community group expressed their dismay at how police officers spoke with community members in ways that were oftentimes “authoritative,” “rude” “screaming,” or “name calling.” There is a need for training to ensure quality, respectful interactions with the public.

It will be essential that training is evaluated to ensure its effectiveness in changing policy and practice. There is a need for far more than increased awareness. Law enforcement professionals have reported that empirical evidence for the effectiveness of training in altering police-community interactions is limited: “law enforcement training in general is somewhat of a ‘black box,’ with very little empirical connection between how officers are trained and how they behave on the street.”

Concerted effort is

---

needed to identify and/or design ways of accomplishing behavior change.\textsuperscript{116} The Society for Prevention Research suggests that any training being considered for adoption by a law enforcement agency should be adopted in a slow and meticulous manner for best results. First, they suggest beginning with a small pilot for the training program, then implementing the training under optimal conditions and measuring the outcomes, and finally rolling it out in real world conditions, while conducting rigorous evaluation.\textsuperscript{117} Such evaluation should not result in an increase to law enforcement budgets; it should be determined how existing funds can be directed towards ensuring training is effective and rigorous.

Numerous stakeholders indicated that when they encounter law enforcement, officers are often not trauma-informed or trained to provide appropriate resources to victims, homeless individuals, or others in need of services. For example, the Los Angeles LGBT Center indicated that when officers come into contact with transgender individuals who are victims/survivors of crimes that the officers are not sufficiently trained to provide them with important resources related to victims’ rights and the next steps for that individual. The Downtown Women’s Center mentioned that the skid row station has an empty bulletin board rather than a place that advertises resources and that an app could be developed that officers could access to indicate what social service resources are available in their area.

Furthermore, the practice of “bias by proxy” was discussed. When law enforcement takes calls from the public, the callers own biases can lead dispatchers and responding officers to skewed preconceptions of individuals whom the caller is stereotyping. How to sort out these biased reports requires specific training on implicit bias management and dispatch protocols that address this possibility.

One attempt that the Los Angeles Police Department has made to address this issue is creating reference cards and then training officers to distribute them when responding to hate incidents or hate crimes. Additional reference cards are needed that address a variety of situations and officers need to be trained to use them. The training would equip officers to distribute the cards when called to a scene rather than escalating tensions or making arrests.

Community organizations should be contracted to create these reference cards of local resources. Additionally, they should be funded to develop and conduct trainings for officers on effectively using these materials and interacting with the public when delivering this information. Numerous organizations called for more community involvement when it comes to training of officers and this is one avenue by which this collaboration can occur. There are other opportunities for this sort of collaboration as well. Working closely with local organizations, impacted vulnerable communities, and stakeholders can help ensure that

\textbf{[Our local] police chief has been promising to improve training for years, yet the officers are still poorly and badly trained.}  
Speaker, Supervisorial District 2


the needs and character of their communities are adequately addressed in the training. Many of these groups already specialize in serving communities who are often disproportionately targeted. And these organizations know how to approach particular issues that can benefit police interactions with particular groups and issue-areas. These trainings can be led by community groups or facilitated in collaboration with trained law enforcement personnel. Such collaborations would lead to better-informed communities as well as better-equipped officers.

An example of such a collaboration is the “Through Our Eyes“ training sponsored by Legacy LA. This training experience for police officers was designed and is led by youth from a public housing community. In this training, youth guide officers in developing greater sensitivity for their experiences and more effective practices for interaction. In addition to providing excellent training, this tool changes the normative asymmetrical power dynamic by allowing traditionally policed youth to speak from positions of knowledge and authority. Collaborating with community members for training in this manner can empower vulnerable communities, foster empathy, and lay foundations for new relationships that prevent the over criminalization of vulnerable populations.

Specifically, Legacy LA trained officers from LAPD’s Community Safety Partnership (CSP) program. The selected personnel provide safe passage community programs for youth and are assigned to a specific area of the community for at least 5 years. The program uses a holistic approach, where key stakeholders from the community, community organizations and other City partners come together to solve long-term, systemic crime problems. This inclusive policing model has shown success, and LAPD is committed to ensuring its core principles and tenets are infused into department policies and operational mandates. The CSP assignments are coveted and LAPD indicates how much it values the program as many officers leave to promote or go to other highly desirable assignments.

Deputies in the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department have a starkly different experience as they are initially assigned to custody duty. Commissioner Fredrick Sykes, a retired Sheriff’s deputy states, “when you take impressionable recruits and put them in the jails, it creates a bias because of overexposure to negative social elements which develop a skewed notion of certain community members, namely communities of color, when they are eventually assigned to patrol duty.” Therefore, a strategy of patrol assignments should be implemented to provide balanced environments for newer deputies to develop a more accurate perspective of the communities they serve. We stand in solidarity with our partners at the LA County Office of the Inspector General among other agencies who have worked to end this practice.

Recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 17 – LASD must end the practice of assigning new deputies only to custody duty in jails.

RECOMMENDATION 18 – Collaborate with community groups to design and facilitate police trainings.

RECOMMENDATION 19 – Mandate the training of police officers on the purposes, processes, and target populations of relevant community resources to facilitate effective referrals as alternatives to arrest.

RECOMMENDATION 20 – Mandate the training of police officers on trauma-informed approaches for interactions with the public.
RECOMMENDATION 21 – Integrate evaluation metrics for trainings to ensure intended behavior change.

RECOMMENDATION 22 – Mandate ongoing training (at least every two years) of patrol officers, dispatchers, and diversion specialists on effective ways to a) engage people with substance use disorders, b) assist people experiencing mental health challenges, c) use culturally appropriate de-escalation techniques, d) integrate ethics and integrity in their work, e) recognize and address hate crimes and incidents, and f) eliminate, or at least manage, their own implicit and explicit racial and identity biases.

STRATEGIC AIM #6 – TRANSFORM POLICE CULTURE

Officers should be assessed holistically and deserve adequate assistance to navigate the impact of work-related traumas. Policies that place less emphasis on enforcement should be developed. Moreover, performance metrics should emphasize a) community engagement, b) trust-building, and c) an officer’s socio-emotional wellbeing.

A common concern expressed by many participants was a perceived militarization of law enforcement in LA County. Officers are viewed as operating with a warrior mentality rather than an “officer of peace” orientation. Excessive use-of-force incidents are expressions of this predominant culture in law enforcement agencies. For instance, the police officer who killed George Floyd had 18 prior incidents of misconduct and compliance issues on his record.118 Community members voiced a need for officers to work as officers who “serve and protect” the community rather than default to an “enforcement and criminalization” paradigm. Specifically, there is a need for performance metrics that place less emphasis on enforcement actions such as stops and arrest rates, and more emphasis on a) community engagement and trust-building and b) an officer’s mental health related to work related trauma so that they are assessed as holistic beings rather than one dimensional instruments for punitive enforcement.

The criminal justice system disproportionately impacts communities of color, binding them to a cycle of oppression that often leads to continual arrests and incarceration.119 Jails and prisons fail to prevent crime, end recidivism, and truly address the inequality and injustice in the adult and youth justice systems.120 Law enforcement agencies must confront this reality head on and become key partners, not just allies, in efforts to end violence and inequality in policing. This will require fundamental shifts in policies, protocols, performance measures, and incentive structures which will simultaneously alter the culture of police agencies. This must permeate all departments and all levels of leadership. The narrative shift, attitude change, and behavioral change must occur in every arena; from job descriptions, recruitment, hiring, and academy training, to probation, performance reviews, disciplinary actions, and promotions. There is a need for transformation to cultures that value respect, empathy, and service as much as professionalism and readiness. An example of movement in the right direction is the Long Beach Police Department’s

recent decision to reform their performance metrics so that they analyze more social-emotional indicators in addition to enforcement. The Los Angeles County Women & Girls Initiative, a Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors initiative, suggested something similar, recommending that incentive programs be put in place to encourage officers’ involvement in reducing recidivism.

Evidence of the need for change is apparent in the LAPD’s recent gang-framing scandal and new data affirming racial bias in traffic stops. A recent Los Angeles Times investigation obtained a Metro Division “platoon recap sheet” which suggested that officer performance was measured narrowly and by subjective categories. Officer productivity was measured daily in sixteen categories which may have disproportionately focused on guns, citations, arrests, and field interviews of gang members. There are concerns that the pressures to produce numbers could be a contributing factor to inequality and bias apparent in arrests and stops. ¹²¹ The LAPD’s Office of the Inspector General is still working on its own investigations of this matter.

Instead of evaluating officer performance using metrics to track enforcement actions, such as number of arrests, the County must engage in research on best practices to identify what metrics would elicit positive behavioral change in law enforcement. Change is needed within these agencies to implement a new system of metrics and officer performance evaluation. Additionally, we recommend that all law enforcement agencies expand recruitment and hiring strategies to reflect the communities served to represent the demographics of their community. Building empathy and understanding is key to serving and protecting in a manner that is respectful and authentic.

Recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 23 – Create and implement policies, protocols, and performance evaluation metrics that incentivize the transformation of law enforcement from a “guardian of public order” mentality to an “officer of peace” orientation.

RECOMMENDATION 24 – Improve psychological assessments to evaluate the social and emotional intelligence of incoming recruits more effectively; additionally, when hiring, reinstating, or promoting officers, misconduct records should be considered.

RECOMMENDATION 25 – Provide ongoing psychological evaluation throughout an officer’s career arc to ensure that work-related traumas are understood and addressed; integrate the socio-emotional wellbeing of officers into performance evaluation metrics.

STRATEGIC AIM #7 – ENHANCE COMMUNITY-BASED ALTERNATIVES TO LAW ENFORCEMENT

Law Enforcement is too often called upon to perform tasks better carried out by other professionals. These duties should be shifted to allow specialists, including community-based organizations, to provide nuanced and culturally appropriate services, allowing law enforcement to interact in safer ways with the public.

Both community members and law enforcement partners lamented the fact that police are called on far too often to address situations and issues that they are not trained or well-equipped to address. Such incidents include unsupervised youth, unpaid public transit fares, minor disputes, and people experiencing mental health challenges and homelessness. We have not recognized the necessity of reallocating public funds for effective prevention through community services. It is a need highlighted in the report of President Obama’s Task Force on 21st Century policing, which called for: “community based initiatives that address core issues of poverty, education, health and safety.” Long-term solutions to social ills will not be accomplished with badges and guns. They require a calm demeanor, empathic engagement, and commitment to systemic change.

Many participants, in fact, called attention to the need to reallocate law enforcement resources to fund community-based organizations at a much higher level. Such a change could be facilitated by an expanded sense of public safety to include attention to conditions that often contribute to persons becoming involved in the criminal justice system. One example would be allocating funds to pay for free public transportation passes for youth and persons with limited incomes. An example of a successful effort is the Summer Night Lights program. However, despite its success, Community Coalition indicated that funding has been shifted to support law enforcement agencies in conducting it rather than the community organizations that have developed it. Other suggestions included reallocating money for prisons to investments in education, housing, and related community programs, hiring school counselors, community psychologists, and providing the homeless with needed services.

Law enforcement partners agreed that community service organizations need to receive more funding. Representatives of both the Sheriff’s Department and LAPD, for example, reported a lack of public health and mental health clinicians and indicated that such individuals would be better equipped than law enforcement to handle homelessness, substance use, and mental health crises and thus should be funded at a higher level. Representatives of the Long Beach Police Department also noted the need to shift responsibility to the community to address “social ills”. Similarly, the representatives of the San Gabriel Police Department acknowledged that community members often have solutions to the problems impacting the community that do not involve traditional police work.

While we know that psychologists, homelessness outreach workers, and gang intervention workers hold incredible expertise in crisis response, de-escalation, and harm-reduction, there are substantially less resources for funding these professionals as compared to police departments. In the absence of a robust social safety net, we have overtasked law enforcement agencies and depleted the resources and funding for health care, social services, and education. In order to accomplish the shift that law enforcement

agrees with and community members are calling for, the County should significantly invest in the development and scaling up of a decentralized system of community based services that offer integrated mental health and substance use services, genuine alternatives to incarceration, and that promote equity for all residents such as equal access to quality housing, employment, and education. As the County shifts its funding priorities, we must build the social and health care infrastructure that truly meets the needs of our most vulnerable communities.

While co-response teams with law enforcement have made strides in serving individuals with mental health challenges, and the homeless, the long-term solution is for service providers outside of law enforcement to be available. This allows for funding to flow directly to those with the necessary skills and can build sustainable organizations which can grow to their fullest capacity. This non-law enforcement approach can eventually become its own systemic solution to the root cause issues which officers are often asked to respond to.

It is clear that the County will be required to take a different approach to homeless individuals since the Supreme Court of the United States left in place a Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling that the prosecution of homeless people for sleeping on public property when there are insufficient shelter beds violates the Eight Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Given this ruling, law enforcement should not be called on to respond to reports of loitering or sleeping on sidewalks. Instead, the County needs to proactively resource outreach workers who can help link homeless individuals to permanent housing and other resources that address the issue at its root. There is also a need for walk-in sites around the County that are open around-the-clock for people who are experiencing homelessness, substance use issues, and unemployment, amongst other issues. These sites could alleviate much of the burden that law enforcement faces from dealing with everyday issues of unequal resource distribution. Adequate funding for these sites will be crucial to make them successful.

Police stations are open 24/7, but often they lack connections to needed community resources. Currently there are no services available on Skid Row at night or on weekends. The Los Angeles LGBT Center pointed out the need for around-the-clock services of sexual assault advocates. While the County could spend money on placing those resources and referrals in police stations, law enforcement officers are not the best alternatives for people who need these kinds of services.

An important component of reversing the ineffective deployment of law enforcement to handle situations better served by community organizations would be the enhancement and expansion of alternatives to 911. 911 is the telephone number used for many types of emergencies. Yet, for most people it is synonymous with calling the police. “Emergency” is a subjective term that can run the gamut from incredibly serious to mundane human behavior, which can result in an overreliance on 911. The flipside

to the overuse of 911 is that, for some, calling 911 can feel unsafe. People who have had negative interactions with police in the past because of race, sexual orientation, gender identity or other identity affiliations, or who have had loved ones harassed or killed by law enforcement may not feel comfortable calling 911. Noncitizen communities also tend to fear 911 because of a long history of local law enforcement collaborating with immigration enforcement, or even the perception of such collaboration, which fuels distrust.\textsuperscript{125}

Some alternatives to 911 do exist. For example, the City of Los Angeles’ Mayor’s Crisis Response Team sends trained volunteers to the sites of homicides, suicides, domestic violence incidents, and other crisis situations.\textsuperscript{126} The County’s Department of Mental Health has a 24/7 mental health hotline available to County residents in crisis (1-800-854-7771).\textsuperscript{127} LA County has a homeless outreach portal that can be utilized to dispatch homeless outreach workers to individuals and provides an alternative to reporting homeless individuals to the police.\textsuperscript{128} Alternative numbers like 211 are also a central source for providing information and referrals for all health and human services in LA County and 211 is available 24 hours a day, just like 911.\textsuperscript{129} Statewide, a newly established California Peer-Run Warm Line is available for non-emergency mental health issues (1-855-845-7415).\textsuperscript{130}

The problem, however, is that these alternatives are not well-known to County residents. For example, even though the California Peer-Run Warm Line began operation in October 2019, the Los Angeles Times had not reported on its existence as of May 2020. Informing the public on when and how to utilize these services and resources is imperative. The goal is to offer a compassionate alternative for those experiencing mental health issues, substance use issues, homelessness, and other service needs. A concerted educational campaign that is widely publicized via billboards, on the Metro, and in schools to name a few, that lets County residents know about the alternatives to 911 could alleviate the burden on law enforcement and emphasize a more compassionate and problem-solving approach for County residents.

One example of the possibilities that has already begun in Los Angeles County is the establishment of Restorative Care Villages.\textsuperscript{131} These efforts are collaborations of four county agencies to create health campuses that link necessary services for community-based holistic care. This clustering creates easy to access services for community members, and allows all stakeholders involved in health to work at a higher level of coordination. Increased funding for community alternatives could include all relevant stakeholders to coordinate the provision of necessary advocacy and services and build relationships.

\textsuperscript{126} “About,” Los Angeles Mayor’s Crisis Response Team, City of Los Angeles, http://lacrt.org/about.
Recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 26 – Increase capacity and number of co-response teams for responding to calls involving persons experiencing homelessness, substance use disorders, and mental health challenges.

RECOMMENDATION 27 – Significantly increase funding, including reallocating law enforcement funds, for non-law enforcement community-based initiatives such as drop-in centers and community response teams that proactively address core issues of poverty, education, health, safety, and youth development.

RECOMMENDATION 28 – Create Countywide outreach campaigns to promote use of community alternatives to 911 (Emergency), including 211 (LA County), 311 (LA City), and other resource and referral hotlines.

STRATEGIC AIM #8 – MANAGE UTILIZATION OF POLICING TECHNOLOGIES

Unregulated policing technologies and algorithmic artificial intelligence, especially when utilized for predictive surveillance, promote totalitarian methods for controlling populations which disrupt the fundamental relationship of trust between law enforcement and the people they serve.

Participants in the hearings and feedback sessions expressed serious concerns about the burgeoning use of surveillance technology by law enforcement. While technology may appear alluring as an alternative to traditional methods of policing, some technologies are intrusive and disproportionately target communities of color. Michelle Alexander, author of The New Jim Crow, cautions against what she terms “e-carceration,” noting that technology may remove physical walls, but does not end the virtual cage communities and people will be surrounded by as they go to school, work, or home. We need to control utilization of surveillance technology by eliminating the use of predictive surveillance technologies and ensuring open and transparent public processes that include community members as partners in making key policy decisions on the adoption and uses of technology.

While some technologies ostensibly promote accountability and transparency, others have the potential to violate the civil liberties of entire communities without any clear positive impact. For example, some stakeholders assert that the increased use of algorithmic tools, like PredPol, to predict crime and threat has further entrenched the racial disparities of arrests and labeled entire neighborhoods as suspicious, creating greater police presence in only certain neighborhoods in the City of Los Angeles based on biased data. LAPD is currently reviewing its use of

“Technologies that were used on the front in Afghanistan...are now being incorporated into daily policing in communities that historically have been the targets of police violence.”

Hamid Khan, Stop LAPD Spying Coalition


PredPol, due to community advocacy. Technologies that focus on predicting crime steer us away from systemic solutions to harm and violence and instead focus on whether we can prevent one person from acting in a certain way.

The County should eliminate the use of *predictive surveillance* technologies that infringe upon County residents’ privacy rights and that expand the surveillance capabilities of the state. In addition, law enforcement access to County residents’ private security footage needs to be severely restrained. This includes, but is not limited to, facial recognition software, iris scanners, license plate readers, and drones when used for *predictive surveillance* purposes.

One example of a technology that has been widely debated in the public sphere is body-worn cameras. There are many policy considerations regarding body-worn cameras, from recording to releasing footage, that community residents, law enforcement agencies, and legislators have contended with. Although the deployment of body-worn cameras has increased the transparency of police behavior, especially during critical incidents, the video footage does not always yield prosecution. The evidence is often overlooked during investigations or contextualized in favor of law enforcement. Therefore, community groups have demanded prompt release of raw, unedited critical incident footage. This requires a reallocation of law enforcement funding, personnel, and other resources to enable effective processing and timely releasing of video footage. An effective body-worn camera program would have standardized deployment and utilization strategies in place to facilitate this, in addition to policies to discipline police officers found engaging in misconduct. Moreover, community groups have worked with policymakers to limit the harms of body-worn cameras while still allowing for the technology to serve a function after identifying their potential exploitation for unwarranted surveillance. This resulted in legislation that passed in October 2019 which prohibits the use of facial recognition technology on body-worn cameras operated by law enforcement.\(^{134}\)

While body-worn cameras have received national attention and have been studied and evaluated, there are many other technologies that law enforcement may choose to adopt that have not gone through this process. In instances where law enforcement is unilaterally using surveillance technology, we offer some promising practices. Several jurisdictions across the country have passed ordinances that require governmental bodies to go through several steps prior to using new technologies. These steps include things like a “surveillance impact report”, required public hearings, and regular reports evaluating the technology. The City of Seattle has adopted such an ordinance and the ACLU has a model ordinance available for any jurisdiction looking to regulate the proliferation of surveillance technologies.\(^{135}\) We recommend the adoption of such an ordinance countywide that will allow for greater public participation and closer monitoring of technology that is unilaterally implemented.

In furtherance of regulating the use of surveillance technologies, we support the Los Angeles County Civilian Oversight Commission’s recommendations on body-worn cameras, listed in Appendix G.


Recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 29 – Eliminate the use of predictive surveillance technologies because they infringe upon County residents’ privacy rights and expand law enforcement surveillance capabilities in violation of fundamental constitutional rights.

RECOMMENDATION 30 – Local governments should adopt ordinances to limit law enforcement surveillance by mandating community collaboration prior to the adoption of public safety technologies and producing a surveillance impact report to ensure they are not used for predictive surveillance purposes; if a law enforcement agency unilaterally adopts new technologies without public input, the respective local government should halt use of the technology and follow the aforementioned guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION 31 – Adopt and implement protocols to ensure timely release of footage to the public domain from body worn cameras and other surveillance technologies potentially used in prosecution.

STRATEGIC AIM #9 – ESTABLISH A CULTURE OF WELLBEING AND HARM-REDUCTION IN LA COUNTY

We recommend that the LA County Board of Supervisors embark on a long-term process of establishing a culture of wellbeing and harm-reduction in LA County. Using restorative practices, we should engage in healing generational trauma and balancing power to foster the justice that is essential to genuine peace and making LA County whole.

As explained by Ted Wachtel of the International Institute for Restorative Practices, “…restorative practices evolved in part from the concept and practices of restorative justice. However, restorative justice can be viewed as reactive because it addresses wrongdoing after it occurs. Restorative practices are processes that precede wrongdoing, “those that proactively build relationships and a sense of community to prevent conflict and wrongdoing.”136 Restorative practices are not just another alternative theory of criminal justice. They are how communities can build their own self-reliance and collective agency to determine their own needs and agendas without police involvement. Ideally, we find ways to live freely, without punishment or coercion. Restorative practices promote justice without criminalization; they begin to shift the paradigm away from retribution and punishment toward safety based on healing, relationship building, and wellbeing.

Restorative practices are deeply rooted in indigenous and first nation communities. They focus on building social capital by strengthening relationships and community based on trust, mutual understanding, and shared values. Restorative practices range in application from preventing conflict and harm to healing after harm and conflict have occurred.137 Embedded in the theory of restorative practices are core beliefs, the chief of which is that “when there is hurt, there must be healing.”138

137 Ibid.
Other government jurisdictions are undertaking this kind of transformation. They are adapting restorative principles and practices to infuse their operations and functions. Two examples are the City of Leeds in the United Kingdom and Oakland, California that “are working forward and achieving, a transformational change in culture and the social fabric of their cities by using mediations, conferences and relationship-building exercises to encourage the resolution of disputes and disagreements through productive communication, to address inappropriate and harmful behaviors and to promote community well-being in a caring and inclusive culture.”139 One of the fundamental shifts in these cities is that they look at conflict as an opportunity for change, rather than a threat.140 This endeavor will facilitate an approach that replaces traditional law enforcement-oriented public safety with a model of community safety as defined by communities.

An initial step would be for collaboration with service groups and organizations to bring members of chosen communities together to establish and strengthen relationships through peacebuilding, community wellbeing circles. Community circles involve groups of people coming together to engage in authentic and fundamental relationship building with one another. Circles encourage connection over suspicion and help to build relationships and interrelated communities of care, which in turn decreases the likelihood for harm to happen as it is much harder to harm someone with whom you are in relationship.

Prioritizing these kinds of interactions nurture prevention needed to build trust and wellbeing: building up the community support, resources, and connections needed to prevent or mitigate harm and conflict. When circle practices are employed, they encourage the skill of deep listening. Through deep listening comes understanding and the humanizing of one another. Circles like these would have to occur regularly and be accessible and well-publicized. This would require the County to empower community leaders with the skills to lead circles, and to provide the space and other resources to encourage the circles to occur. When members of our community sit together in circle and engage with each other, the paradigm shift begins to occur away from punishment and toward healing and support.

Another important step to establishing a culture of wellbeing and harm-reduction would be the collaborative creation and formal adoption of a county bill of rights for communities that commits to and honors a model of relationship rooted in community welfare. This declaration would set the stage for working with strategically chosen communities that could begin to shift the paradigm. Despite the varied issues and recommendations identified by the different participants, and the occasional opposing perspectives, some shared values were apparent, including respect, humanization, non-violence, healing, rehabilitation, understanding, and empathy to name a few. These values all point to a set of human and civil rights which can be the cornerstone for the reimagined network of community safety that moves away from reliance on force, violence, and policing.

Los Angeles County would enact policies and practices in alignment with these core values and rights. The County could leverage what was gained from the hearings and the feedback sessions and reach out to existing and new stakeholders to organize a series of educational townhalls to collectively create a community wellbeing bill of rights. This bill of rights could then be incorporated into the County charter and prominently displayed in all County buildings.

As our reliance on prisons and jails wane so must our reliance on arrests and policing. Establishing a culture of wellbeing and harm-reduction is the answer moving forward to rebuild our community connections and empower our communities to prevent, address, and heal conflict and harm by creating spaces for meaningful, long-term involvement of all stakeholders. Ultimately we seek to move outside the traditional boxes of dialogue which all too often end in familiar stalemates, and into a restorative, healing environment where those who are impacted can share their experiences, influence attitudes to build empathy to overcome long term profiling and stereotypes, and, with patience, restore communication to establish due process of law and a working balance of power.

Finally, the Commission supports the Alternatives to Incarceration (ATI) Work Group report’s understanding of restorative justice as part of our advocacy of the restorative practices outlined above. The ATI Work Group report and recommendations shows that a confluence of institutions is arriving simultaneously to these principles, indicating an opportunity for collaboration bound to the same change ideals.

Recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 32 – Convene groups of relevant stakeholders to create innovative models that define public safety as a cooperative community endeavor rather than merely an assignment to enforce laws.

RECOMMENDATION 33 – Engage community stakeholders in developing a Countywide Community Wellbeing Vision and Rights Declaration that will be incorporated into the County charter, prominently displayed in County facilities, and disseminated via a public awareness campaign.

RECOMMENDATION 34 – Establish restorative community circles throughout LA County to envision and apply new paradigms of community wellbeing.
CONCLUSION

This process began with public hearings hosting voices that represented multi-cultural communities of Los Angeles County. This included testimony from individuals, community organizations, law enforcement agencies, government officials, and academic experts. What resulted was a report that we hope provides greater clarity of the complex, divisive, and comprehensive issues pertaining to what must be done to change law enforcement practices with LA County communities, and a pathway to accomplish that objective.

The traditional roles law enforcement has attempted to fill in meeting the challenges before us is a key point of debate. We see clearly, however, that only with full participation of all stakeholders can comprehensive change occur. The insight and participation of law enforcement has been key to this process and will be critical moving forward. Dividing lines or not, we need a table at which everyone can sit to frame comprehensive, workable, breakthrough solutions to the entrenched cycle of civil unrest that periodically engulf our communities.

More than 50 years after the Watts Rebellion and more than 25 since the Rodney King Uprising, we are reminded that many of the social conditions that led to these eruptions persist. It is clear that the root causes of repeated violence outbreaks are not the sole responsibilities of law enforcement. Indeed, it is an oversight of government that has placed law enforcement in untenable situations. Officers have become, by default, catalysts for fear and anger rather than safety and hope.

“Policing systems in this country operate within the larger systems of racism, sexism, classism, homophobia, and a whole host of other forms of oppression endemic in our country’s history. Policing is a complex system of relationships, practices, ideologies, and cultural assumptions empowered by the state to enforce law and social control through the legalized use-of-force. It includes not just people who wear badges, but prosecutors, court systems, judges, child welfare system, and laws. Policing happens inside the home, on the streets, in hospitals, and inside personal relationships, not just at the point of arrest, or carceral supervision. Success in meeting our challenges requires a comprehensive approach that incorporates all these settings.”

Dr. Kelly Lytle-Hernandez, UCLA

It is the intent of this project to produce a report that fosters change. In listening to the various voices of our County, we have heard of the decades of organizing in South and East LA to create community-based accountability. We heard law enforcement leaders discussing ways they have revised what they do and how. We heard the call for transparency in newer forms, some of which have come to fruition since the start of this project. We envision a County where the social consequences of poverty and racism are addressed by the agencies tasked to do so, not by law enforcement, and one where the community is fully engaged in designing their own public welfare safety nets.
In the past, reports were written advocating needed structural changes to prevent civil unrest in Los Angeles County. This included the McConne Commission Report\textsuperscript{141} on the Watts Rebellion, and the Christopher Commission Report on the Rodney King Uprising. The Christopher Commission Report\textsuperscript{142} findings, which offered solutions to root-cause issues that persist to this day, is in part the foundation of the current oversight system established in LAPD today. Sadly, we will never know if the McConne Commission Report would have had a similar impact, as its more systemic recommendations continue to be unimplemented.

That sobering realization both challenges and inspires us to work diligently and integrate the recommendations contained in this report and other changes that are needed. It is our intent to build on the momentum of the current moment to enhance transparency and accountability and support the empowerment of community members to advance their own solutions.

With this report’s completion, we now enter the final and most challenging stage of the project: action to implement needed change. The collaborations in which these recommendations were forged are also the springboards for success moving forward.

\textbf{“If you think about LAPD’s body camera policy, the changes to increased transparency and investigations of peace officers, even the existence and powers of the civilian oversight bodies…those were opposed by law enforcement at the time, but then held up here as a model…I would urge [law enforcement] to…reflect on that and embrace some of the community solutions when they are offered even when they seem challenging and press you to hold officers accountable to be more transparent…The challenge is also for policy makers and elected officials to take community concerns seriously and respond to them, to build structures that empower communities to have a voice over how they’re policed whether that’s through legislation…or meaningful civilian oversight and transparency that allows the public to know what police are doing and hold them accountable when they don’t match community expectations.”}

Peter Bibring, ACLU Southern California

\textsuperscript{141}Violence in the City: An End or a Beginning?, Governor’s Commission on the Los Angeles Riots, McConne Commission. (Sacramento, December 2, 1965), https://archive.org/details/ViolenceinCity/mode/2up.
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Public Hearings – Community
*Anchor Organizations who collaborated in organizing the hearings.
*Groups who participated in multiple hearings.

Supervisiorial District 1
Dignity & Power Now**
Centro CSO: Community Service Organization**
Los Angeles Community Action Network**
Brown Berets
Legacy LA
Montebello Unified School District
National Alliance on Mental Illness
Social Justice Advocacy Project
Youth Build, Boyle Heights

Supervisiorial District 2
Black Lives Matter – Los Angeles**
Watts Labor Community Action Committee*
Youth Justice Coalition**
Freedom Socialist Party
Korean Churches for Community Development
National Day Laborer Organizing Network

Supervisiorial District 3
Reseda Church of Christ*
Santa Monica Coalition for Police Reform*
Tia Chucha’s Centro Cultural & Bookstore*
Venice Justice Committee*
Committee for Racial Justice
The GR818ERS
Los Angeles City Attorney’s Office
NAACP, SFV Chapter
Stop LAPD Spying Coalition*

Supervisiorial District 4
Black Lives Matter – Long Beach*
California Conference for Equality and Justice*
Greater Long Beach Interfaith Community Organization*
Long Beach Immigrant Rights Coalition*
Centro Community Hispanic Association
Church Without Walls
Latino Human Rights Coalition
UNITE HERE Local 11
Unitarian Universalist Church, Long Beach
Women’s Policy Institute

Supervisiorial District 5
The Community Action League*
Antelope Valley Latino Education*
Antelope Valley People’s Coalition
Café Con Leche Radio Show
African American Caucus
One Way Up

LGBTQ+ Communities & Women of Color
Gender Justice Los Angeles*
TransLatin@ Coalition*
Somos Familia Valle*
The LGBTQ Center, Long Beach
Trans Women of Color Collective
Women’s Leadership Project
Public Hearing – Law Enforcement

Subject Matter Experts
- Dignity & Power Now
- TransLatin@ Coalition
- LA County Office of the Inspector General
- LAPD Office of the Inspector General
- Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of LA
- National Lawyers Guild
- UCLA – Center for Policing Equity
- UCLA – Million Dollar Hoods Project
- Police Assessment Resource Center
- Youth Justice Coalition
- LAPD Board of Police Commissioners
- LASD Civilian Oversight Commission
- ACLU – Southern California

Law Enforcement Agencies
- Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department
- Los Angeles Police Department
- Los Angeles School Police Department
- Long Beach Police Department
- Pasadena Police Department
- Inglewood Police Department
- San Gabriel Police Department
- West Covina Police Department

Stakeholder Feedback Sessions

Supervisors District 1
- Centro Community Service Organization
- Dignity & Power Now
- Homeboy Industries
- Legacy LA
- LA Community Action Network
- NAACP, Pomona Chapter

Supervisors District 2
- Brotherhood Crusade
- Centinela Youth Services
- Community Coalition
- Watts Labor Community Action Committee
- Youth Justice Coalition

Supervisors District 3
- African American Community Academy of Policing Reform
- Santa Monica Coalition for Police Reform
- Stop LAPD Spying Coalition
- Tia Chucha’s Centro Cultural & Bookstore

Supervisors District 4
- California Conference for Equality & Justice
- Greater Long Beach Interfaith Community Organization
- LA County Department of Health Services
- Long Beach Immigrant Rights Coalition

Supervisors District 5
- American Civil Liberties Union
- Coalition for Increased Civilian Oversight of Police
- The Community Action League
- The WOW Flower Project

LGBTQ+ Communities
- LA LGBT Center
- TransLatin@ Coalition
- SFV LGBT Center
- Somos Familia Valle

Women of Color
- Comisión Femenil
- Downtown Women’s Center
- LA County Women & Girls Initiative
- Women’s Leadership Project

Law Enforcement Agencies
- LA County Sheriff’s Department
- Long Beach Police Department
- Los Angeles Police Department
- Pasadena Police Department
- San Gabriel Police Department

Government Agencies
- LASD Civilian Oversight Commission
- LAPD Board of Police Commissioners
- Long Beach Citizen Police Complaint Commission
- Long Beach Human Relations Commission
- LAPD Office of the Inspector General
- LA County Office of the Inspector General
## Appendix A: Glossary

| **Bias by Proxy (n.)** | “When an individual...makes false or ill-informed claims of misconduct about persons they dislike or are biased against—e.g., ethnic and religious minorities, youth, homeless people—police...[may unintentionally engage in] “profiling by proxy”...[if they fail to] professionally and accurately evaluate the facts and risks of each individual case—beyond the hearsay of the transmitted complaint.”¹⁴³ |
| **Co-Response Team (n.)** | A team of police officers, mental health clinicians, and/or community interventionists that respond to incidents involving persons with mental health challenges, substance use disorders, and/or those who are experiencing homelessness in an effort to divert them from the criminal justice system by providing a full continuum of accessible services (health, social services, housing, healing, etc.). |
| **Crimes of Survival (n.)** | Low-level, non-violent infractions, such as public camping, public intoxication, and minor theft, committed by vulnerable populations—e.g., people of color, LGBTQ+ communities, youth, people experiencing homelessness—to secure their basic survival. |
| **Cultural Competency (n.)** | “…the integration of skills and cultural knowledge about individuals and groups of people into specific workplace policies, programs, and behaviors for the purposes of increasing the quality of workplace interactions and service delivery.”¹⁴⁴ |
| **Equitable Law Enforcement (n.)** | Just, demilitarized, nondiscriminatory execution of policing policies and practices in a public safety paradigm that encompasses decision-making led by community stakeholders to mitigate historical injustices and provide holistic systems of care. |
| **Holistic (adj.)** | Relating to or concerned with [wholeness] or with complete systems rather than with the analysis of, treatment of, or dissection into parts. Merriam-Webster |
| **Homelessness (n.)** | “[Condition of] an individual or family who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate...residence, meaning: i. has a primary...residence that is a public or private place not meant for human habitation; [or] ii. is living in a publicly or privately operated shelter designated to provide temporary living arrangements...”¹⁴⁵ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Impacted Family Members (n.)</strong></th>
<th>“Family members of incarcerated individuals are often... ‘hidden victims’...of the criminal justice system... neither acknowledged nor given a platform to be heard. These hidden victims receive little personal support and do not benefit from the systemic societal mechanisms generally available to direct crime victims, despite their prevalence and their similarities to direct crime victims.”¹⁴⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implicit Bias (n.)</strong></td>
<td>“…stereotypes that affect our attitudes, understanding, actions, and decisions in an unconscious manner. These biases, which encompass both favorable and unfavorable assessments, are activated involuntarily and without an individual’s awareness or intentional control.”¹⁴⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept Points (n.)</strong></td>
<td>Sequential points at which individuals can be “intercepted” and kept from going further into the criminal justice system. The primary intercepts, Intercept 0, and Intercept 1, focus on community and law enforcement responses.¹⁴⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latinx (n.)</strong></td>
<td>Of, relating to, or marked by Latin American heritage—used as a gender-neutral alternative to Latino or Latina. Merriam-Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ+ (abv.)</strong></td>
<td>Denotes people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or queer. This acronym is meant to be inclusive beyond the listed sexual orientations and gender expansive identities, including gender-non-conforming, Two-Spirit, and intersex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Health Challenges (n.)</strong></td>
<td>“…condition[s] [or diseases] that affects a person’s thinking, feeling, behavior or mood. These conditions deeply impact day-to-day living and may also affect the ability to relate to others.”¹⁴⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overpolicing (v.)</strong></td>
<td>The imposition of police control on individual or community activities at a heightened level unlikely to occur in the dominant society.¹⁵⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictive Surveillance (n.)</strong></td>
<td>“…a potential model of surveillance in which government collects data in bulk and then uses predictive analytics to detect patterns indicating terrorist or criminal activity.”¹⁵¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Immunity (n.)</td>
<td>A judicial doctrine that shields government officials from liability and is frequently applied to exempt law enforcement officers from accountability for excessive use-of-force.  (^{152})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life Violations (n.)</td>
<td>An enforcement strategy for low-level, non-violent infractions, such as public camping, public intoxication, and minor theft, committed by vulnerable populations to secure their basic survival aimed at connecting people to social services and safety nets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary State (n.)</td>
<td>“…a state which actively offers political support to undocumented immigrants through an official government capacity. And here official government capacity can refer to any amount of official governmental actions such as a piece of legislation, an executive order, however political statements are not considered actions.”  (^{153})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Emotional Wellbeing (n.) (abv. Social and Emotional Wellbeing)</td>
<td>“…a holistic concept which results from a network of relationships between individuals, family, kin and community. It also recognizes the importance of connection to land, culture, spirituality and ancestry, and how these affect the individual.”  (^{154})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorders (n.)</td>
<td>“…[disorders that] occur when the recurrent use of alcohol and/or drugs causes a clinically significant impairment including health problems and disability.”  (^{155})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma-Informed Approach (n.)</td>
<td>“An approach [that] begins with understanding the physical, social, and emotional impact of trauma on the individual, as well as on the professionals who help them…It incorporates three elements: 1. Realizing the prevalence of trauma[;] 2. Recognizing how trauma affects all individuals involved with the program, organization, or system, including its own workforce[; and] 3. Responding by putting this knowledge into practice.”  (^{156})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underprotection (v.)</td>
<td>The lack of deployment of supportive police services to prevent crime on a day-to-day basis and provide other essential services to a community, which leads to perceptions that police are only focused on policing and arresting community members.  (^{157})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{153}\)“Sanctuary States: What Are They and What You Need to Know,” External Vice President of Statewide Affairs, UC Santa Barbara, last modified March 2, 2017, https://evpsa.as.ucsb.edu/2017/03/02/sanctuary-states-need-know.


Appendix B: Summary of Findings – Community Hearings

Following is a summary of information about the 6 Community Hearings, including distinct issues in addition to the common list on pages 16 and 17.

Supervisory District 1
Location: Cal State University, Los Angeles (East Los Angeles)
Date: November 19, 2016
Anchor Organizations: Los Angeles Community Action Network, Dignity & Power Now, Centro Community Service Organizations
Issues
- Improve Conditions of Incarceration
- Linkage Between Gentrification and Over policing Communities of Color
- Establish an Independent Civilian Prosecutor
- Improve Community Policing
- Incorporate Gangs in Police and Community Relations Discussions
- Diversify Police Force by Recruiting Officers from the Communities They Patrol
- Implement the Use of Body Cameras
- Ensure that Young People Receive Free Metro Passes

Supervisory District 2
Location: Watts Labor Community Action Committee (South Los Angeles)
Date: February 25, 2017
Anchor Organizations: Watts Labor Community Action Committee, Youth Justice Coalition, Black Lives Matter – Los Angeles
Issues
- Lack of Inter-Agency Collaboration Between Law Enforcement Agencies Who Share Common Jurisdictions
- Establish Community Centers to Enhance Community Resilience
- Redirect Funding from Policing Programs to Community Programs that would Enhance Public Safety and Community Cohesion

Supervisory District 3
Location: Reseda Church of Christ (San Fernando Valley)
Date: March 26, 2017
Anchor Organizations: Reseda Church of Christ, Tia Chucha’s Centro Cultural & Bookstore, Venice Justice Committee, Santa Monica Coalition for Police Reform, Stop LAPD Spying Coalition
Issues
- End Police Surveillance, including the Use of Drones, and Predictive Policing of Persons and Communities of Color, Especially Among Ethnoreligious and Racial Minorities
- End Gang Injunctions and the Criminalization of Youth
- Create Alternative Programs of Neighborhood-based Community Justice, and Community Integration and Rehabilitation.

Supervisory District 4
Location: Jordan High School (Long Beach)
Date: December 3, 2016
Anchor Organizations: Greater Long Beach Interfaith Community Organization, California Conference for Equality and Justice, Long Beach Immigrant Rights Coalition, Black Lives Matter – Long Beach

Issues
- Remove Police from Metro Train Stations
- Implement Restorative Justice Programs
- Provide Trauma Counseling Following Officer Involved Shootings
- Increase the Standards by Which New Officers are Screened Prior to Assignment, Including Psychological Assessments
- Eliminate Gang Injunctions Throughout Los Angeles
- Help Residents Who Have Been Identified as Gang Members Access Opportunities to Find Stable Jobs
- Eliminate New Surveillance Programs from Both the Sheriff and Long Beach Police Departments
- Enact a Moratorium on Counterterrorism Programs Which Violate Rights of Residents
- Provide Free Bus Passes to Students

Supervisory District 5
Location: Antelope Valley Partners for Health (Lancaster)
Date: September 10, 2016
Anchor Organizations: The Community Action League, Antelope Valley Latino Education

Issues
- Lack of Mental Health Resources and Crisis Intervention Teams That Can Provide Support, Services and De-escalate Situations
- Lack of Attention to Rehabilitation and Public Health Focus for Social Problems Such as Drug and Alcohol Addiction
- End Racial Profiling Through DUI Checkpoints in Low-income Communities of Color, and Related Car Impounds for Violations Other Than DUI
- Greater Investment of Resources to Implement Community Policing, Including Hiring Diverse Officers Representative of the Community
- Develop Alternatives to Harsh Sentencing Policies for Non-violent Offenses

LGBTQ+ Communities & Women of Color
Location: L.A. Trade Tech College (Los Angeles)
Date: September 23, 2017
Anchor Organizations: Gender Justice Los Angeles, TransLatin@ Coalition, Somos Familia Valle

Issues
- End Sexual Assault and Harassment by Police Officers, including school police.
- Adopt an Intersectional Approach to Policing
- Hire a Full time LGBTQ+ Law Enforcement Liaison Who Is on Call 24-7
Appendix C: Summary of Findings – Law Enforcement Hearing

Following is a summary of information about the Law Enforcement Hearing, including issues discussed in that session.

Location: Metropolitan Water District
Date: September 26, 2018

Law Enforcement Agencies: Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD), Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), Los Angeles School Police Department (LASPD), Long Beach Police Department (LBPD), Pasadena Police Department (PPD), West Covina Police Department (WCPD), San Gabriel Police Department (SGPD), Inglewood Police Department (IPD)

Subject Matter Experts: Dignity & Power Now, TransLatin@ Coalition, LA County Office of the Inspector General, LAPD Office of the Inspector General, Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles, National Lawyers Guild, UCLA–Center for Policing Equity, UCLA–Million Dollar Hoods Project, Police Assessment Resource Center, Youth Justice Coalition, LAPD Board of Police Commissioners, LASD Civilian Oversight Commission, ACLU–Southern California

Police Transparency and Accountability

- Community Oversight
  o Policing experts claimed that failure to grant subpoena would undermine transparency and accountability. In contrast, LASD was firmly against granting subpoena power since they believed there was no demonstrable need given the establishment of the Civilian Oversight Commission and the Office of the Inspector General. LASD and activists were both in agreement regarding the adoption and implementation of SB 1421, which mandates the release of police records to promote transparency.

- Family Assistance and Communication
  o LASD refused to agree to withhold non-material information following use-of-force incidents, which community members believe may create bias regarding incidents. There was broad agreement on the recommendations to work towards parity for those who die at the hands of, or in the custody of police, and other members of the public killed by civilians.

Police Use-of-force

- Police Use-of-force
  o There appeared to be convergence that the ongoing crisis over police use-of-force, which has come to national attention since the summer of 2014, has eroded trust particularly between police and the African American community, but there was little discussion of the larger structural context, documented by various groups, including the U.S. Department of Justice. There appeared to be convergence, in part, as articulated by then Sheriff Jim McDonnell, in terms of aiming to reduce deadly force and put a premium on de-escalation instead.

- Implicit and Explicit Bias
  o Stakeholders and Interim Chief of PPD John Perez, were both in agreement that the early adoption of AB 953, which requires law enforcement agencies to collect data about police stops and ethnicity, was needed to address implicit bias. Although Interim Chief Perez stressed the importance of accountability there was no clear evidence that reviewing body camera footage will indeed lead to the type of personal and organizational accountability also needed to disrupt implicit bias.

Overpolicing and Underprotection

- Community Policing
There appeared to be convergence on the need to move from criminalizing youth, including through SB 439 which seeks to place limits on the involvement of youth with the juvenile justice system and related forms of juvenile incarceration. Chief Steven Zipperman of LASPD, was unwilling to advocate a position that LAUSD move away from random searches, though there are less constitutional safeguards for young people than adults, and the searches can have deleterious consequences in terms of involvement in the juvenile and criminal justice system and future life chances and opportunities.

- **Surveillance and Technology**
  - There was rhetorical convergence regarding the implementation of the policy outlined by the LASD Civilian Oversight Commission Ad Hoc Committee on Body Worn Camera (BWC) Procedures and Policies. However, there was no evidence of agreement of full or partial implementation of existing best practices regarding BWC procedures as recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee.

**Police Training and Cultural Competency in Dealing with Mental Health Issues**

- **Mental Health Challenges**
  - There appeared to be agreement and partial implementation of the recommendations from the LASD Civilian Oversight Commission Ad Hoc Committee on Mental Evaluation Teams (MET). LASD is currently in the process of providing training to its officers and establishing mobile mental evaluation teams. IPD currently has mobile crisis teams, but due to budget constraints is not able to develop a 24/7 response team.

- **Perceptions of Homelessness**
  - There was convergence on the importance of the growing homelessness crisis, and its intersection with mental health challenges, and the need to challenge stereotypes about the homeless. There was also convergence about the urgency of addressing the crisis and moving away from punitive attitude towards the homeless and relying more on the assistance of mental health professionals and various forms of homeless outreach teams.

**Undocumented Immigrants, Immigration Enforcement and Policing**

- **Public Safety and Trust**
  - The issue of possible hate crimes and police response to community concerns and perceptions here was a critical issue, and there was convergence between participants that more needed to be done to address ongoing concerns in this area. There was also recognition and emphasis that there has been a spike in hate crimes over the last few years, and that greater efforts must be made to address this, including for LGBTQ+ communities.

- **Immigration Enforcement**
  - Chief Eugene Harris from SGPD stated that his department terminated a memorandum of understanding with Homeland Security due to community activism. However, there appeared to be only rhetorical and partial movement towards practices and procedures that adequately build trust with immigrant communities.

**Intersectional Approach to Policing**

- **LGBTQ+ Cultural Competence**
  - Deputy Chief Richard Conant of LBPD explained that currently their department has implemented training to address cultural competence and a special-order outlining procedures for dealing with transgender persons to enhance officers’ responses. However, it appears to only address in custody police interactions with LGBTQ+ communities. There was little discussion regarding daily police interactions with members of the Trans community.
Appendix D: Summary of Findings – Stakeholder Feedback Sessions

The following is a list of issues and priorities drawn from testimony received in stakeholder feedback sessions following the conclusion of the public hearings.

Hiring, Staffing, Training & Education

- **Training & Departmental Protocols**
  - Stakeholders recommended creating agency-specific protocols and policies which would support trainings, minimize killings, and build trust between community and law enforcement agencies—including developing new police protocols in the event an officer shoots someone, focusing on developing skills to administer immediate aid to avoid wasting time which may result in death.

- **Staffing & Hiring**
  - Stakeholders called for a comprehensive review and change in County/City hiring policies inside law enforcement agencies that fail to create rigorous review of candidates for hire or are psychologically and relationally unfit to serve. Some groups called for hiring policies that encouraging hiring within the communities they serve, reflecting the diversity of the community—especially women and LGBTQ+ communities—as well as creating community-specific liaison positions. Others suggested new hiring eligibility requirements, creating pathways for non-traditional officer recruits who have higher education.

Transparency & Accountability of Law Enforcement

- **Civilian Oversight & Independent Bodies**
  - Stakeholders advocated for more community membership than law enforcement membership on civilian oversight bodies, while some advocated for the absolute removal of law enforcement representation. Suggestions also included that these oversight bodies have researchers, investigators, and other resources to carry out their work effectively. Some groups added that strict performance evaluations must be created to fire and discipline those oversight members who are derelict in their duties.
  - Stakeholders highlighted the lack of investigation and prosecution of crimes committed by police officers. Some groups suggested that the county should not allow district attorneys to review internal cases involving their own law enforcement agencies; these should be conducted by an independent special prosecutor.

- **Transparency**
  - Stakeholders called for the scope of investigation of LASD Deputy Gangs to broaden beyond gangs/collectives—to review systems and policies inside the department that allow corruption to continue including cronyism and nepotism in internal investigations.
  - Stakeholders also recommended advocates and community organizations investigate California’s Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act (POBRA) because of the barriers it places for proper and fair investigation of officer misconduct. Some groups called for removing barriers to applying SB 1421 (2018), which allows certain police misconduct files to be open to the public. Furthermore, they called for this law to be retroactively applied as well as removing financial barriers to requesting records by advocates and families. Others felt the same about transparency with the CalGang database and making sure the barriers to accessing the database are removed.

Overpolicing & Overcriminalization of Targeted Communities

- **Overpolicing and Decriminalizing Social Issues**
- **Creating Connections between Police and Community Advocates**
- **Alternatives to Incarceration and Reimagining Safety**
Stakeholders called on redefining public safety to mean healthcare, youth development, education, overall investments in under-resourced communities, and creating a shared community vision for personal and public wellness. Several groups also expressed criticism of “community policing” because of its reliance on “broken windows policing”, citing the fact that this theory of policing lacks an understanding of the root causes of crime and disproportionately impacts people with low-level criminal records and poor communities. They instead called for a new model of “relational policing”. These recommendations also included focusing on restorative justice models to policing.

Conditions of Confinement

- Convert Jails to Mental Health Centers
- Sexual Violence
  - Several stakeholders addressed sexual violence happening inside juvenile and adult facilities and immigration detention centers. Some groups called for full compliance of Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) federal regulations that have yet to be implemented in LA County. These guidelines would help protect the trans-population inside youth and adult facilities that are particularly vulnerable to sexual violence.
- In-Custody Communication & Commissary
  - Some groups advised that because each county has discretion to set payment/fee schedules for communication and commissary contractors, additional standards and regulations should be implemented by the State, and those standards should be transparent. While LA County has an “inmate welfare fund,” these funds are misdirected and appropriated to purchase additional law enforcement equipment rather than towards detainee wellness.

Immigration & Policing

- Immigration Enforcement
- Trans-Immigration
  - Stakeholders advised that issues of transwomen who are immigrants are different from the trans-community at large. There are direct pathways to criminality for trans-people—from immigration detention centers, to parole, to sex work, to further criminalization. Efforts should focus on social services to resolve issues of criminality instead of further enforcement measures.
- Transparency & Know Your Rights on Immigration Practices and Procedures
  - Some groups mentioned that in addition to the information about the rights of immigrant women and LGBTQ+ communities, more information must be shared about the rights and processes for deportation proceedings and the interconnection between immigration systems.

Greater Resources for Communities

- Divert Police Funding toward Services, Prevention, & Programs
- Family Assistance & Communication
  - Stakeholders called for an “Office of Family Assistance” or “Office of Accountability & Respect” agency in the County/City housed outside of law enforcement agencies. It would be civilian run, hiring formerly impacted families, and would have direct communication with local law enforcement family liaison units and leadership that has decision-making powers and controls agency resources. Stakeholders also recommended a family clinic that could house all the necessary services that a victim or grieving family needs. This includes services ranging from counseling to advice, moving toward empathy and healing. A space would include a memorial, which would be constantly updated to include all the victims of police abuse.
Appendix E: Family Assistance & Communication Recommendations

1. The County should establish an entity consisting of a multi-disciplinary team that is capable of providing ongoing support, resources, and transparent communication to families of the deceased.

2. Continuous trauma-informed training for all LASD personnel who come into contact with family members.

3. Department members who speak with the media should be mindful of how they characterize the subject of the investigation. This includes maintaining fairness and withholding judgement.

4. Los Angeles County should take a lead role that advocates for changes in the current state laws regarding access to victim resources.

5. Los Angeles County should establish a program that will assist families who experience a LASD-related death of a loved one with the cost of funeral and other associated expenses including, but not limited to, trauma and grief counseling for family members.

6. Develop a pamphlet specifically for the family members of Deputy Involved Shootings and In-Custody Deaths.

7. Create a website/and or social media page that thoroughly explains LASD procedures and protocol surrounding in-custody deaths and fatal deputy related uses of force.
Appendix F: Immigration Enforcement Recommendations

1. LASD should not provide ICE with more information than it provides to the public, nor shall LASD disseminate information regarding inmate release status or other confidential information, unless required by federal or state law.

2. LASD should continue to ensure that all department operations (e.g. custody facilities, station jails, and court lock-ups), inmate detainer release procedures and detainer notifications/acceptance policies are consistently reviewed and updated in accordance with governing laws.

3. LASD should ensure development of an “Immigration Information” web link for posting information items such as:
   a. Inmate detainer release procedures &/or detainer policies & flowcharts
   b. U-Visa and/or related policies & procedures
   c. Related helpful links including, but not limited to:
      i. Legal & social-service resources
      ii. ICE detainee locator system
      iii. Forms relating to the rights of inmates with detainers.

4. LASD should ensure development of social media, instant communications and marketing material to apprise the public of the availability of the “Immigration Information” web link. LASD public website should include, but not be limited to a brief video in English and Spanish highlighting the Department’s policy on Immigration inquiries and notifications that is comparable to the video on the intranet for Department personnel.

5. LASD should ensure that appropriate staff acknowledge receipt of these immigration policies and are trained in their application.

6. LASD should not assist ICE in any operation to enforce federal immigration laws. Nothing shall prohibit LASD from continuing to participate in joint task forces with ICE, where allowed by County policy.

7. LASD should disclose, through a publicly accessible website, on a basis consistent with state law, the following data:
   a. Annual reports to the Department of Justice, if applicable.
   b. Monthly reports reflecting the number of immigration-related transfers to ICE and the offenses justifying the transfer.
   c. Monthly report on U-Visa applications submitted for certification and the percentage certified by LASD.

8. The Sheriff should provide the COC with a quarterly report on the number of civil immigration detainers and criminal enforcement requests received from ICE as well as the number of immigration-related transfers to ICE in an effort to increase transparency and accountability.

9. LASD should not provide ICE, or persons or entities contracted through ICE with access to the Inmate Reception Center (IRC) or other areas within the jail, or other LASD properties such as courthouse lockups and station jails, unless required by federal or state law.

10. LASD should not honor ICE detainers, including requests by ICE to hold, detain, house, or transfer any inmate, unless specifically required by federal or state law.

11. LASD should not approve employee’s Requests for Approval of Outside Employment with ICE and/or ICE associated operations if they are incompatible or involve conflicting functions or responsibilities to the Department.

12. We recommend that the Board examine how LASD uses County resources on administrative and/or personnel costs involved in tracking and responding to ICE civil immigration detainers and propriety of seeking reimbursement from the federal government for such costs.
Appendix G: Body Worn Camera Recommendations
https://coc.lacounty.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=N3yfPmbNik4%3D&portalid=35

To the Board of Supervisors, CEO and the Sheriff:
1. In light of the substantial benefits to be derived by the deployment of Body Worn Cameras (BWCs), the Board of Supervisors should make BWCs a budget priority and promptly provide the necessary funding to implement the Sheriff’s BWC Plan.
2. The Sheriff should make the BWC program a priority and revise the timeline of his BWC Plan to provide for full implementation within two years of funding by the Board.
3. Because there is an issue regarding the level of funding, primarily driven by the increased workload and number of additional FTE needed to implement effectively the Sheriff’s BWC Plan, we recommend that the Sheriff, the CEO, and the Board meet, confer and resolve this issue as expeditiously as possible. The COC stands ready to assist the parties in reaching agreement. Given the further delay that would be entailed in hiring a consultant and bringing him/her up to speed, this step should be a last resort.

To the Sheriff, recommendations regarding policies needed before implementation:
4. The policies adopted by the LASD for BWCs should be readily accessible to the public.
5. Deputies should be required to activate their BWCs prior to all law enforcement and investigative activity involving a member of the public. Any exceptions should be limited and clearly defined, e.g., investigative interviews involving sex crime victims and confidential informants. For sex crime victims, consent to record should be obtained.
6. Deputies should document in writing or via video recording the reason his/her BWC was not activated as required by policy or was deactivated before the law enforcement event or investigative activity was complete.
7. Deputies should be expressly prohibited from altering or editing of BWC recordings.
8. Generally, deputies should be allowed to view video recordings captured on his/her BWC, but only for the writing of routine reports, resolving citizen complaints, etc. However, a deputy involved in a deputy-involved shooting, serious injury or use of lethal force should not be allowed to view video footage until after his/her initial statement or the writing of their first report.
9. As part of the LASD’s phased roll-out of BWCs, all deputies provided with a BWC shall receive training in the operation of the device and LASD policy regarding activation, de-activation, anti-tampering, etc.
10. It should be made clear that violations of BWC policy are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.
11. Deputies assigned LASD-issued BWCs should be prohibited from using personally-owned video recording devices while on duty.
12. The Sheriff should require regular internal audits to ensure compliance with BWC policy.
13. The Sheriff should have a clear policy calling for release of video footage of deputy involved shootings and use-of-force resulting in death or serious injury within thirty (30) days of the incident.
14. Video footage not used for training purposes, ongoing investigations, court or disciplinary proceedings should be retained no longer than six (6) months.
15. Because of the false positive rates, the Sheriff should not authorize the use of facial recognition technology for BWCs without first seeking advice from the COC and public comment.
16. Deputies should be encouraged to notify persons that they are being recorded when safe and practical to do so.
17. Concurrent with the implementation of BWCs, the LASD should launch a public education campaign designed to educate the community on the benefits and limitations of BWCs.
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