



# POLICING AND PUBLIC SAFETY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Meeting #4 Summary*

---

January 13, 2022 | 6:30-8:30 PM



## Background

The City of Culver City (City) held the fourth Policing and Public Safety Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting on Thursday, January 13, 2022 from 6:30 PM to 8:30 PM. The City is convening TACs to explore innovative General Plan topics in detail and serve as an advisory body to the General Plan Update (GPU) team. The Policing and Public Safety TAC is comprised of eight members of the public and was developed to help identify policies and programs to reimagine public safety through the GPU's 2045 horizon year. Its members include:

- Anne Diga Jacobsen (Absent)
- Ippy Kalofonos (Absent)
- Joy Kecken (Absent)
- Kelly Lytle Hernández (Absent)
- London McBride (Absent)
- Mark Rosenfeld (Absent)
- Jeff Schwartz
- Noah Zatz
- Nancy Barba (previous Housing TAC member)

Originally, this TAC was scheduled to have five meetings. The fourth meeting would have taken place in the late fall of 2021 and covered materials to inform the draft Policing and Public Safety Policy Framework. The fifth meeting was tentatively scheduled for early 2022 and would cover the draft Policing and Public Safety Policy Framework. Due to budget and timing restrictions, the GPU team was not able to facilitate the original plans for the fourth meeting and drafted a Policing and Public Safety Policy Framework based on previous conversations. The GPU team presented this draft Framework for discussion during this fourth meeting.

## Summary

Project staff from the City's Advance Planning Division staffed the meeting and Raimi + Associates (R+A), the consultant leading the GPU, presented the draft Public Safety Policy Framework and facilitated the meeting.

## Objectives and Presentation

This meeting was designed to provide opportunities for TAC members to review and discuss the working draft of the Policing and Public Safety Policy Framework. The policy framework includes the following components:

- **Outcomes:** statements that describe where Culver City wants to be by 2045
- **Performance Metrics:** quantitative and/or qualitative data that will track progress towards reaching the outcome
- **Goals:** broad expressions of community values that lead towards specific directions and outcomes

- **Policies:** support the achievement of goals by mandating, encouraging, or permitting certain actions
- **Actions:** activities such as physical improvements, partnerships, and programs that carry out a policy

R+A presented updates on the GPU process to date and a working draft of the policy framework. [A copy of the presentation is available on the project website.](#) As R+A staff presented the contents of the policy framework, TAC members were invited to provide verbal feedback. The notes below summarize themes and takeaways from the discussion.

## Discussion

Discussion and review of the draft Policy Framework was split into two sections. The first section focused on outcomes, targets, and performance metrics, while the second section focused on goals, policies, and actions. In the subsequent discussion, TAC members particularly emphasized the need to acknowledge the City’s unjust history as a starting point for the Policy Framework and to include more affirmative capacity-building goals and policies.

## Outcomes, Targets, and Performance Metrics

During this discussion session, R+A staff asked TAC members to consider whether any outcomes were missing from the Policy Framework, which key performance indicators were most meaningful for each outcomes, and which outcomes were most important to supporting the City in reimagining public safety through the General Plan horizon. Responses are summarized below:

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion Points
<b>Draft Outcomes</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Racial inequities and other inequities related to public safety are eliminated.</li> <li>B. Reduced contact with (and response by) armed police officers.</li> <li>C. Reduced arrests and increased use of alternative responses.</li> <li>D. Robust, more reliable data on how diverse community members (including non-residents)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For people who are skeptical of the City's commitment to making institutional changes, the language of the outcomes feels inadequate/weak</li> <li>▪ Outcomes are too vague to meaningfully drive policy change and should be strengthened with numerical targets and more concrete language (i.e., changing “reduced contact with armed police officers” to “eliminated contact with armed police officers”).</li> <li>▪ Outcomes are generally negative (i.e. reduce, eliminate) and could incorporate more affirmative language (i.e., related to building capacity)</li> <li>▪ Other outcomes suggested: Create a Public Safety Department outside of the Police Department to</li> </ul>

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion Points
<p>experience interactions with City employees and departments are collected and made available.</p>	<p>address public safety issues without using armed police</p>

General comment about draft performance measures:

- Performance indicators need a concrete timeline to be useful; it would be helpful if the City Manager provided regular reports on progress towards milestones.

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion Points
<p>Outcome A: <b>Racial inequities and other inequities related to public safety are eliminated.</b></p> <p><i>Key Performance Indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Racial, gender, age, and residency inequities in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stops</li> <li>○ Arrests</li> <li>○ Victims of crime</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Perception of safety by residents of different demographics</li> <li>○ Fines issued and collected by corresponding demographic data (including residency)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Need to break down “residency inequities” by city residents/non-residents and by neighborhood</li> </ul>
<p>Outcome B: <b>Reduced contact with (and response by) armed police officers.</b></p> <p><i>Key Performance Indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Types of emergency responders responding to 911 calls (e.g., police, firefighters, emergency medical services, social workers)</li> <li>○ Responsibilities shifted to civilian/non-armed City employees (including breakdown of employees within and outside of the Police Department)</li> <li>○ Number of sworn police officers the City employs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Tracking the “types of emergency responders responding to 911 calls” is too limited in scope because plenty of police-initiated contact does not originate with a 911 call</li> </ul>

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion Points
<p>Outcome C: <b>Reduced arrests and increased use of alternative responses.</b></p> <p><i>Key Performance Indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Results of responses to 911 calls by types of calls (e.g., percent of public disturbance calls that result in arrest/citation/warning/social work follow up, percent of property destruction calls that result in arrest/diversion referral/insurance claim)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Breakdown “results of responses to 911 calls by types of calls” and “interactions with City employees and departments” by voluntary and involuntary contact</li> </ul>
<p>Outcome D: <b>Robust, more reliable data on how diverse community members (including non-residents) experience interactions with City employees and departments.</b></p> <p><i>Target</i></p> <p>By 2030, at least 10% of community members interacting with City employees and departments participate in a customer service survey annually</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential performance indicators suggested:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Types of calls that police versus other emergency/non-emergency responders are responding to</li> <li>○ Composition of arrests</li> <li>○ Percentage of police time spent on violent crime, misdemeanors, etc.</li> <li>○ Number/percentage of frontline, non-emergency responders</li> <li>○ Police Department budget</li> <li>○ Number of police personnel per call and by incident type</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Goals, Policies, and Actions

During this discussion session, R+A staff asked TAC members to consider whether any goals were missing from the Policy Framework, what additional policies or actions were necessary to bridge goals and identified outcomes, and what concerns or unintended consequences the Policy Framework might have. Responses and themes are summarized below:

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion Points
<b>Draft Goals</b>	
<p>1) Culver City is a place where people of all</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Generally, the goals have a “feel of colorblindness” and fail to explicitly acknowledge that the City is a</li> </ul>

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion Points
<p>races, ethnicities, genders, ages, abilities, <b>and homes experience safety from harassment, violence, discrimination, theft, and disrespect.</b></p> <p>2) A City that <b>reduces its use of armed police officers</b> and strengthens its ability to <b>promote restorative and transformative justice.</b></p> <p>3) A City that <b>models accountability, ongoing learning, and growth.</b></p>	<p>product of an unjust history, or why low-income households, non-English speakers, and other marginalized groups are more likely to be victims of harm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goal 2 should be most prioritized because it provides the most concrete pathway to institutional change</li> <li>▪ The Policy Framework should emphasize that the City wants to be a leader in all areas of public safety. At the minimum, the City needs to be keeping up with other jurisdictions.</li> <li>▪ Reframe “victims of crime” as “people suffering from harm or violence”</li> <li>▪ Alternative to draft goal 3: Culver City develops the capacity to affirmatively counteract the influence of structural and system racism on its institutions, including the Police Department.</li> </ul>

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion
<p><b>Goal 1: Culver City is a place where people of all races, ethnicities, genders, ages, abilities, and homes experience safety from harassment, violence, discrimination, theft, and disrespect.</b></p>	
<p>Policy: <b>Collect data on inequities in public safety and use data to inform changes to inequitable practices, programs, and policies.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action: Analyze public safety data (e.g., calls for service, stops, crime reports, use of police technology) by race/ethnicity and other demographics, report on data to City Council at least annually and identify annual action steps to reduce inequities</li> </ul> <p>Policy: <b>Support victims of crime in accessing supportive resources and services.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action: Develop program to help low-income community members and community members who are not fluent in English file insurance claims for property damage and loss</li> <li>○ Action: Provide educational materials and help for accessing victims' compensation funds</li> </ul>	<p>No comments in addition to those made related to draft performance measures</p>

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion Points
<p><b>Goal 2: A City that reduces its use of armed police officers and strengthens its ability to promote restorative and transformative justice.</b></p>	

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion Points
<p>Policy: <b>Shift specific responsibilities (e.g., traffic safety duties, responding to public disturbances, police bike and foot patrol, etc.) that have been done by CCPD officers to civilian City employees</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action: Study feasibility of transferring specific duties to civilian City employees and identify timeline and action steps to transition duties (including negotiating new or modified Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with unions).</li> </ul> <p>Policy: <b>Increase capacity of community members, City employees, and City contractors to respond to mental health crises, homelessness, substance use, etc.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action: Offer trainings in mental health first aid, conflict mediation, and de-escalation; by hiring or contracting a non-police crisis response team)</li> </ul> <p>Policy: <b>Eliminate CCPD use of military equipment and participation in military exercises and programs.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action: Study policy options to limit CCPD participation in military exercises and program (e.g., banning overtime accrual or pay for CCPD officers participating in military exercises) and identify possible unintended consequences (e.g., resulting from mutual aid agreements with regional law enforcement agencies)</li> </ul> <p>Policy: <b>Reinvest funding “saved” as the role and size of CCPD decreases to support longer-term, holistic safety and keep the community updated on budget allocations related to public safety.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develop the social services that do not exist today in Culver City</li> <li>▪ Develop institutional homes for public safety alternatives that are outside of the police department and ensure there is a clear transfer of capacity between the police department and this entity</li> <li>▪ The feasibility of transferring specific duties to civilian City employees has already been studied in the past, so it feels like a deferral action. A more concrete action would be to identify timeline/action steps to transition duties</li> <li>▪ Note that the City has already started to assemble a non-police crisis response team, so it does not make sense to have “hiring or contracting a non-police crisis response team” as a policy with a 20-year horizon.</li> <li>▪ Policy Framework is missing actions that eliminate purchasing/using military equipment or borrowing military equipment from other jurisdictions</li> <li>▪ Important for the Policy Framework to specifically state that developing non-police staffing is tied to reducing CCPD funding (reflecting a direct transfer/competition of resources)</li> <li>▪ Affirmatively develop other kinds of practices, such as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), which address safety without relying on the police</li> </ul>

Public Safety Policy Framework Working Draft	Discussion Points
<p><b>Goal 3: A City that models accountability, ongoing learning, and growth.</b></p>	
<p>Policy: <b>Ensure that the City proactively cooperates with the Los Angeles County District Attorney to investigate alleged misconduct by Culver City employees (including but not limited to CCPD officers).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action: Establish procedures and reporting mechanisms for City staff and civilians to report employee misconduct without retaliation.</li> </ul> <p>Policy: <b>Implement a process to proactively gather customer feedback, especially from non-residents who interact with City employees and departments.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action: Develop a simple, standardized customer service evaluation process (or initiative) where all community members (residents and non-residents) are invited to share their experience interacting with City employees and departments (CCPD and others)</li> </ul> <p>Policy: <b>Develop a City practice of acknowledging past harms and engaging the larger community in identifying, prioritizing, and implementing specific reparative actions and/or mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action: Establish an inventory of past harms that have been identified that were (or are) implemented and/or supported by City officials and government (including minimum types of information to record and categories to use), provide training so that all City employees know how to share what they learn from interactions with community members (and educate community members about how to submit past harms to this inventory), and establish a regular process (e.g., annually) to review inventory and determine responses (e.g., changing practices or policies to prevent harm from reoccurring)</li> <li>○ Action: Study legal constraints and liability concerns related to the City acknowledging and/or providing compensation for past harms and identify parameters or criteria for when and how the City can acknowledge past harms and how the City might offer compensation for adverse impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With policies around reparations, note that “past harms” also include harm that may have been justified or even done properly/ lawfully</li> <li>▪ Establish a civilian oversight body</li> </ul>

## Public Input

No members of the public attended the TAC meeting.

## Next Steps



Raimi + Associates will share meeting materials and solicit feedback from TAC members who were not present at this meeting, City staff, and ultimately community members.