



City of Culver City

Mike Balkman
Council Chambers
9770 Culver Blvd.
Culver City, CA 90232
(310) 253-5851

Staff Report Details (With Text)

File #: 21-369 **Version:** 1 **Name:**

Type: Minute Order **Status:** Action Item

File created: 10/7/2020 **In control:** City Council Meeting Agenda

On agenda: 10/12/2020 **Final action:**

Title: CC - (1) Discussion of Findings and Recommendations from the City Manager’s Office Related to the Public Safety Review; and (2) Provide Direction to the City Manager as Deemed Appropriate

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. 2020-10-12_ATT No. 1_CC_Public Safety Survey_Report.pdf, 2. 2020-10-12 - ATT 2_CC_RIPA-best-practices-2020.pdf

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

CC - (1) Discussion of Findings and Recommendations from the City Manager’s Office Related to the Public Safety Review; and (2) Provide Direction to the City Manager as Deemed Appropriate

Meeting Date: October 12, 2020

Contact Person/Dept: John Nachbar, City Manager’s Office
Serena Wright-Black, City Manager’s Office

Phone Number: (310) 253-6000

Fiscal Impact: No **General Fund:** N/A

Public Hearing: No **Action Item:** No **Attachments:** Yes

Public Notification: (E-Mail) Meetings and Agendas - City Council (10/07/2020)

Department Approval: John Nachbar, City Manager (10/07/2020)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council (1) discuss findings and recommendations from the City Manager’s Office related to the Public Safety Review; and (2) provide direction to the City Manager as deemed appropriate.

BACKGROUND

On May 25, 2020 George Floyd was killed by a Minneapolis, Minnesota police officer during an arrest for allegedly using counterfeit money. After his death, demonstrations and protests were held across the world calling for an end to individual, institutional, and systemic racism and the killings of countless unarmed African Americans by police.

On June 22 2020, after receiving substantial feedback from the community on the allocation of police resources, the City Council Ad Hoc Police Liaison Subcommittee (Mayor Eriksson and Council Member Small) recommended that City Council authorize the development of a task force to review all public safety services, resources, and responsibilities. City Council ultimately directed the City Manager's Office to lead a comprehensive 90-day study and bring back recommendations on options to reimagine public safety in Culver City through shifting public resources and reducing the reliance on law enforcement to address various community needs.

The recommendations from the City Manager were to be viewed through a racial equity and social justice lens and informed through discussions with affected City departments and labor representatives, feedback from the Chief's Advisory Panel, General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Finance Advisory Committee (FAC), members of the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE), and the broader community, as well as other quantitative data collected from City consultants.

DISCUSSION

Consultants for Technical Review and Feedback

On July 13, 2020, City Council approved professional services agreements with consultants, Center for Public Safety Management (CPSM) and Saul Sarabia from Solidarity Consulting as part of the public safety review. CPSM was contracted to conduct a police department workload and deployment analysis, review staffing levels and organizational structure, and industry best practices related to core police functions. Mr. Sarabia's scope of work included assisting with developing the approach and timeline for the project, data collection and synthesis related to elevating race equity and social justice and facilitating meetings and supporting the City Manager's office in developing final recommendations for City Council.

Both consultants will provide a presentation sharing a summary of their findings and any relevant recommendations during the October 12th City Council meeting.

Community¹ Outreach and Engagement

Wide reaching community outreach and engagement was a priority for City Council as this review process was being designed. Council wanted to ensure that a significant number of diverse experiences and perspectives were taken into consideration.

Over the last 90 days, City staff and consultants have conducted numerous meetings, in which hundreds of people have participated. There have been seven meetings with the Chief's Advisory Panel. Three of those meetings, held on August 20th, September 17th and September 24th, were open to the general public. Of the three meetings open to the general public, two were joint meetings

with other City Council appointed committees: one with the GPAC and City employees trained by the GARE, and another with the FAC. There were also six separate focus group discussions, as described below.

Members of the public were invited to share their opinions, experiences and priorities related to public safety services, as well as perceptions of the Culver City Police Department (CCPD), via a community survey that was available online and in print. There was also a dedicated public safety review email address and City webpage created so that community members could submit any comments and follow the review as it progressed.

Community Meetings

Discussions with the Chief Advisory Panel and the other joint community meetings provided a variety of opinions on policing within Culver City, including both compliments and criticisms of CCPD's service and approach.

Individuals acknowledged the complex job that is performed by police officers and expressed appreciation for their efforts in keeping the community safe. Many also praised CCPD's response times, the care and empathy with which many officers approach the job, particularly those on the mental evaluation team, and with ensuring that City property was not damaged during the recent protests.

There were concerns expressed early in the process about the review timeline. Several individuals felt that 90-days was not adequate time to study such a complicated nuanced issue. Also, many felt that the "aspirational" 50% budget reduction goal was not appropriate nor backed by data and, if implemented, would be devastating to community safety.

Some questioned whether everyone felt safe within Culver City and voiced doubt that the review would result in any substantive change to help people of color feel safe within Culver City. As an example, a response provided to the Public Safety Community Survey question, "What does public safety mean to you?" offered the following:

"I think of public safety very broadly. Everything in the public sphere (paid for with public funds) that contributes to the well-being of our community and those who live, work, play, visit, or pass through Culver City, should feel safe and welcome to be here. This means that the environment we create as a community, needs to respect each person's dignity and rights. Public safety has typically been thought of more specifically as government-provided services/functions.... but public safety is also about how people are treated by all of the city's institutions--policies, regulations, laws--and individuals who work for our city or otherwise interact with the public. All of us have a role to play in making people feel safe."

There were also questions whether the CCPD has been tasked with responsibilities that others may be better suited and trained to handle. Specifically, there were numerous comments provided in support of transitioning mental health response away from the police and instead creating a mobile crisis response unit, similar to the Crisis Assistance Helping Out in the Streets (CAHOOTS) program in Eugene, Oregon (which is discussed further below).

At the various meetings, City staff shared examples of changes that other cities are considering as they reassess police department services including exploring the option of removing police officers

from certain duties and reassigning that responsibility to a civilian employee. Examples of services that might be reassigned to a civilian employee include traffic enforcement and responding to non-violent calls related to mental health, homelessness, neighbor disputes and substance abuse.

There was also dialogue at the meetings pertaining to CCPD's budget allocation, staffing levels, employee compensation and priority areas to consider for reinvestment of police funds.

Feedback from Focus Groups

In addition to the above-mentioned meetings, six targeted focus group discussions were held with:

- Culver City Community of Color Collective
- Students from New Earth Organization
- Culver City Police Officers Association
- Protect Culver City
- People Organized for Westside Renewal (POWER), Mar Vista Gardens Chapter
- City employees responsible for services which rely on support from police officers

The focus group meetings were meant to be a safe space for individuals to speak openly about desired outcomes and fears related to the public safety review and share insights and experiences pertaining to CCPD. The primary themes that emerged from the focus group meetings included:

- Community Safety

Many participants engaged in these targeted discussions expressed appreciation for the job being done by CCPD. They pointed to officers' reliability in quickly responding to calls and noted that the level of accountability and transparency within the department has increased over the last several years as new technology has been implemented (e.g. body cameras and motor vehicle cameras). Some participants expressed concern over the perceived rise in crime and were anxious that if police resources were reduced it would result in increased crime and longer response times. Others noted feeling unsafe with CCPD. They expressed that Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC²) in Culver City live with stress and fear. That law enforcement does not need to be eliminated but a radical shift is needed in their approach, handling and respect of BIPOC.

- General Concern about the Review

There was concern expressed that the Review was politicized and not designed to implement real change, and that given the context of how the discussion began, it was difficult to engage in meaningful dialogue over changes that may be needed. Some stated that it appears police are being blamed for larger societal issues over which they have no control. It was also stated that in order for systemic change to occur the entire criminal justice system need to be restructured. There was also anxiety over amending CCPD policies and systems without changing the mentality of how police officers approached the job and interacted with communities of color, particularly black and brown citizens.

- General concerns related to policing

It was noted during the discussions that societal attitudes towards policing make the job more difficult. Individuals often challenge police and are less compliant and more defiant of police authority. It was mentioned that because officers work in a high stress environment the City needs to ensure that the officers are taking care of their own mental health, and the officers should be regularly reevaluated.

Some of the participants expressed opinions that police were too heavy handed, particularly with people of color. They felt officers do not show enough empathy or attempt to provide resources, instead of making arrests. It was stated that policing institutions have lost the public trust and that people of color have a genuine fear of calling the police for fear that the situation will escalate.

There was also concern expressed over the hiring, training, and disciplining of police officers. It was suggested that new officers should be carefully paired with field training officers that model the behavior and attitudes that exemplify the highest standards of fair unbiased policing and that they should receive more training on communications and cultural awareness. It was also recommended that police officers who violate policies or show a tendency towards bias be terminated.

- Alternatives to Law Enforcement

A discussion surrounding mental health and alternatives to police response for non-violent events was raised in each focus group discussion. It was recommended by some that, in the co-responder model, the City consider having police officers respond to mental health issues as backup. A mental health professional could be in the forefront with police close by. Conversely, some noted that the co-responder model does not work for all community members and that an alternative model should be explored. It was explained that the presence of police may exacerbate a situation and that a better approach was to have a mental health professional paired with a nurse or emergency medical technician (EMT). Some also expressed that more de-escalation training is needed for police officers and that the community should be better informed on mental health.

There was also some discussion about whether there could be alternatives to domestic violence calls, neighbor disputes, and misdemeanors involving minors. It was suggested that the City consider using a mediation service and/or social workers.

There was also discussion around traffic enforcement and whether this provided community or society benefits. Questions were raised about whether it prevented crime or accidents, or if it was only a stream a revenue. Some felt that police use it as a pretext to target individuals of

color and there is an apparent disparate enforcement for African Americans and Latinx people.

- Perceptions of Police Officer Biases

Individuals in the focus group discussions reported feeling that minorities are targeted by CCPD and that people of color are overpoliced and racially profiled. There is a perception that some in the community may believe that people of color do not “belong or fit” in the neighborhood. It was shared that minority and non-minority youth are treated differently. It was stated that the youth of color are not treated with care or compassion - instead, they are treated like criminals. An example was provided of a youth being stopped while walking and asked to pull up his shirt to show he was unarmed and then questioned whether he was in a gang.

It was also suggested that CCPD consider using phenotype (e.g. observable physical characteristics) instead of race as public descriptions for suspects to reduce bias and to ensure that individuals are not unfairly targeted.

- Investment in Prevention and Community Programs

It was noted that more police officers do not necessarily result in safer communities, and that more amenities are needed to deter criminal behavior. Funding should be directed to schools, mental health, affordable housing, homeless shelters and prevention and support programs such as food banks, rehabilitation centers and tutoring for school children. It was specifically stated that more youth programs are needed to prevent school failures that can make children vulnerable to deviance and that free sports and other recreation programs are needed to provide discipline and allow creative expression. These were pointed to as resources that prevent crime.

Summary of Presentations Related to Public Safety

As the public safety review was being designed, there was a desire to ensure that the community groups involved in the review as well as the general public received relevant contextual information to put the review in perspective and to also understand the background on the reasons that led up to the review.

August 20, 2020

At the first public meeting held on August 20, 2020 information was presented on the current organizational structure, CCPD duties and budget, an introduction to the UCLA Million Dollar Hoods project and a discussion of alternatives being explored in other jurisdictions.

Acting Police Chief Cid discussed new initiatives and approaches that have been implemented within CCPD, which include:

- Early adoption of the California Racial and Identify Profiling Act (RIPA) which can be used to

evaluate patterns and practice of bias and disparate treatment by officers.

- Improving data collection and reporting to increase transparency related to arrests, use of force and complaints.
- Increasing community engagement by reducing vehicle patrol and replacing with bike and foot patrols; and expanding the Partnership in Policing team.
- Exploring the possibility of growing the mental health crisis co-responder model.
- Enhancing youth partnerships through the youth diversion program, fostering partnerships with Culver City Unified School District, and informal engagement and mentorship between CCPD and youth.

Culver City resident and UCLA professor Dr. Kelly Lytle Hernandez presented preliminary findings pertaining to arrests by CCPD between January 1, 2016 through July 15, 2018 based on data obtained through a public records request. The report highlighted the following racial disparities:

- African Americans are 8% of the Culver City population, but 21% of the Culver City resident arrests by CCPD;
- Latinx Culver City residents are approximately 40% of Culver City residents arrested by CCPD, but less than 25% of the city population;
- 90% of the people arrested by CCPD are unhoused or live outside the city (5% unhoused, 85% non-residents);
- 70% of all of the arrests made by CCPD are for misdemeanors.

Finally, staff provided information from other organizations that are exploring different options to providing community public safety services. Those alternatives include the creation of mobile crisis response teams, removing police from traffic enforcement, establishing civilian oversight committees, and shifting money away from police budgets to allocate towards community and youth programs.

September 17, 2020

On September 17, 2020 a joint public meeting was held with the Chief's Advisory Panel, GPAC and city employees trained by GARE.

At this meeting, presentations were made by: (1) a representative from GARE focusing on racial inequities within government and strategies to address those inequities that move beyond merely revising programs and services; instead focusing on changes to policies, institutions and structures; (2) representatives from the County of Los Angeles introducing the Alternatives to Incarceration program which focuses on pre-arrest diversion, prevention/treatment services, and restorative justice programs; and (3) GPAC consultant, Raimi + Associates, who gave an overview of the General Plan Update and preliminary results from the Public Safety Community Survey.

Community Survey

The informal community survey was made available in both English and Spanish and was open to the public from August 25 - September 22. It received over 2,500 responses: 78% of the respondents were Culver City residents and 21% were non-Culver City residents, the remaining 1% did not specify if they are or are not a resident. Most Culver City residents that provided housing information identified as homeowners (78%) and not renters. Participants were invited to share all racial or ethnic groups they identify with: 62% of the respondents identified as White, 18% Hispanic/Latino, 11% Asian, 11% Black/African American, 1% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 11% identified as multi-

racial, and 3% declined to respond. Overall respondents feel that Culver City is safe. However, across racial and ethnic groups, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and multi-racial residents are more likely to feel unsafe and, across generational groupings, younger people feel less safe or have less trust in the presence of law enforcement than older people. There was also strong support by survey respondents for any reallocated funding be directed to mental health services (75%) and homeless programs (64%).

September 24, 2020

The final public meeting held on September 24, 2020 was a joint meeting with the Chief Advisory Panel and the FAC. The Center for Public Safety Management provided an overview of its data collection/analysis and its operational assessment of CCPD. A representative of CAHOOTS provided information regarding the mobile crisis intervention program in Eugene, Oregon which has been in place for over 30 years.

There was information presented related to costs pertaining to co-responder mental evaluation team models, mobile crisis response models, and reinvestment options such as youth and senior programs. There was also a discussion surrounding CCPD salary and benefits and budget allocation. A general concern was expressed that City Council needs to review City finances in all departments and make tough budgetary decisions to ensure that the City is sustainable.

Insurance Considerations

As of July 1, 2020, Culver City is self-insured up to \$2 million and purchases excess insurance up to \$20 million through insurance broker AON. AON has alerted the City that insurance carriers around the country are seriously concerned with steps that are being taken to realign public safety resources. They are warning municipalities that reducing or reallocating police funding that results in the diminution of a police department's ability to respond to 911 calls with sworn police personnel could result in the City's inability to obtain insurance coverage. Insurers are concerned about cities not having appropriate police staffing to respond to 911 calls or, due to reduced staffing lack of backup officer support, and potentially having fatigued officers responding to incidents. All of these factors increase the likelihood of an event that could result in a large judgment against the City, thereby affecting the insurer.

In addition, the insurance industry is not comfortable with non-sworn personnel responding to 911 calls. Although the possibility may be small, they are concerned that non-sworn personnel could possibly be injured or killed in what seems to be a benign event but turns out otherwise.

Another consideration is that private property insurance, especially for businesses, could be affected if the insurance industry perceives a city's ability to respond to 911 calls with sworn police officers has been reduced.

The state of tort liability in California is exacerbating all of the above, as we are now seeing judgments of \$50 million or more being awarded by juries.

City Manager Recommendations

After considering feedback received over the last three months, as well as information and data provided by technical consultants and independent staff research, the City Manager has put forth the recommendations set forth below. These recommendations are designed to decrease the reliance on

police officers to perform certain non-criminal activities and address concerns that have been expressed by community members regarding perceived disparate treatment received by CCPD. Recommendations are grouped into specific areas, some of which may be implemented in a relatively short timeframe, while others will require further research and study. It should be noted that there are no recommendations to reduce the current staffing level of sworn employees. If this is an area that City Council would like staff to further explore, additional time is required to study the best way to achieve a reduction in force in a thoughtful manner that is commensurate with the reallocation of assigned workload and responsibility.

Rebuilding and Reinforcing Public Trust, Addressing Organizational Culture

Some minorities that have interacted with CCPD have expressed that a culture of mistrust exists between CCPD and people of color and that they feel that they have been treated with a lack of respect by officers. Examples of the reported misbehavior include a perception that people of color are being over policed and that they are arrested at higher rates than non-minorities, are frequently required to exit their vehicles and sit on the curb while their documentation is being verified, which may or may not also include being handcuffed, and also being aggressively questioned without explanation as a driver, vehicle passenger or pedestrian. The desired outcome is that all community members are treated with respect and care by law enforcement officers regardless of their race, gender, perceived socio-economic or immigration status, or other protected characteristic.

Racial and Identity Profiling Act

AB 953, the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA), codified in California Penal Code § 13519.4 et seq. was created with the goal of eliminating racial and identity profiling, and improving racial and identity sensitivity in law enforcement. As previously mentioned, CCPD is on target to be in full compliance by December 2020 - two years ahead of what is required.

RIPA requires that the following data be collected on all traffic and pedestrian stops, regardless if the contact results in arrest:

1. Date, time, and duration of stop;
2. Location of stop;
3. Reason for stop;
4. Whether the stop was in response to a call for service (yes/no answer);
5. Actions taken by officer during stop (e.g., curbside detention, handcuffed or flex cuffed, firearm pointed at person, firearm discharged or used, whether a search was conducted [and whether the officer asked for consent to search the person or person's property, and whether consent was given]);
6. Contraband or evidence discovered, if any;
7. Property seized, if any; and
8. Result of stop (e.g., warning, citation for infraction, custodial arrest).

The officer must also report his/her own perception, based upon personal observation only (and not through any other means, such as asking the person or referring to identification), regarding the following:

- Perceived race or ethnicity of the person stopped;
- Perceived age of the person stopped;
- Perceived gender of the person stopped;
- Whether the person stopped is perceived to be lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender;
- Whether the person stopped is perceived to have limited or no English fluency; and

- Whether the person stopped is perceived or known to have a disability.

In addition, the officer must also report: his/her years of experience; his/her type of assignment during the stop (e.g., patrol, traffic enforcement, field operations; narcotics/vice, investigative/detective) and an explanation, in his/her own words, the reason the person was stopped and/or searched.

This information is reported to the Department of Justice and then analyzed and posted by the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board in an annual report. The role of the RIPA Board includes:

1. Analyzing data regarding complaints made against California peace officers;
2. Working with state and local law enforcement to review and analyze their policies and practices relevant to racial and identity profiling;
3. Working with the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) on its trainings pertaining to racial and cultural differences;
4. Conducting and consulting evidence-based research on bias, and law enforcement community interactions; and
5. Making policy recommendations to eliminate racial and identity profiling.

This data-based approach will inform law enforcement agencies and communities about any disparities or patterns of behavior that may exist, allowing police departments to take appropriate action such as policy changes, additional training, and/or disciplinary action. As an added layer of accountability and transparency, CCPD will also review its data with the Chief's Advisory Panel and discuss with them any recommended policy changes or training that results from the report.

It is anticipated that the full implementation of RIPA will assist in building upon the organizational changes being put into place by Acting Chief Cid. Additional cultural shifts are achieved through a police department's mission, vision, and philosophy. Building and reinforcing trust requires intentional interaction and engagement. Policies, training, and accountability can reinforce the expected performance standards and behaviors.

Recommendation:

- Update the CCPD Bias-Free Policing Policy to include, Bias by Proxy, and other best practices provided by the RIPA Board Proxy;
- Mandatory bi-annual training for all sworn officers in the areas of mental health first aid, cultural competency, anti-bias, racial equity; and social justice;
- Create opportunities for authentic interaction and engagement with CCPD and communities of color and youth community members;
- Revise CCPD mission and vision statement to be community centric and service oriented, reinforce cultural shift through training and daily briefings;
- Reinforce and strengthen efforts to elevate the level of compassion and care that officers use when engaging community members; and
- Communicate the value of diversion - report on the number of individuals diverted in addition to arrests.

Reallocating Police Department Resources

CCPD's budget was reduced from \$47.6M in Fiscal Year (FY) 2019/2020 to \$44.6M in FY 2020/2021, representing a \$3M or 6.4% overall reduction. This reduction was achieved through defunding nine

positions (including four police officer positions), eliminating programs, terminating service contracts, and reducing equipment maintenance. During the FY 2020/2021 Budget Adoption process there was \$153,000 reallocated from the Police Budget to support additional mental health services. The remaining Police Department budget savings of \$2.9M was diverted back to the City's General Fund.

Recommendation:

Redirect a portion of the \$2.9M Police Department budget savings towards additional community and social service programs.

PRCS Budget

Establish Teen Center Scholarships per the MBK Local Action Plan	15,000
Expand the PRCS Dept Youth After School Program	100,000
Total reallocation to PRCS	115,000

Fire Department Budget

Creation of a Fire Department Mental Health Team	310,000
Total reallocation to Fire Department	310,000

In reviewing activities that are assigned to CCPD that do not involve preventing or solving crimes, it is recommended that Parking Enforcement, Animal Services and School Crossing Guard Programs be reassigned to another City department(s). This would reflect an additional estimated 2.7% budgetary decrease to the CCPD budget.

(1) Parking Supervisor	128,822
(9) Parking Enforcement Officers	767,850
(2) Animal Services Officers	164,454
Crossing Guards (hourly staff)	103,630
Total Personnel related costs	1,164,756
Add: Vehicle maintenance	60,000
Total proposed budget reallocation	1,224,756
Decrease to the FY 2020/2021 CCPD Budget	2.7%

Based on biannual audits received from the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) as well as recommendations from the consultant, Center for Public Safety Management (CPSM) the City manager recommends the City reinstate CCPD funding for five jailer positions to bring jail services into compliance.

Add (5) Jailer Positions \$500,000

Proposed Pilot Programs

The additional following recommendations are proposed pilot programs that will require additional research to understand any legal considerations or constraints, appropriate staffing levels, policy development, training, and cost considerations including grant opportunities.

Recommendation:

- *Establish an adult pre-booking diversion program* - Other jurisdictions have implemented diversion programs for certain low-level crimes such as drug possession, prostitution, shoplifting and other crimes of poverty. In lieu of arrest, individuals are connected to community intervention programs and case managers who can provide crisis response, psychosocial assessment, and long- term wrap-around services including substance use disorder treatment and housing. There are potential grant funds available through the Board of State & Community Corrections.
- *Create a Fire Department mental health team* - Create an outreach team to include a licensed therapist or social worker and a Culver City Fire Fighter/Paramedic. This team would be managed by the Fire Department and would supplement the current CCPD co-response model. The Fire Dept. team would provide proactive outreach and case management for individuals experiencing homelessness and struggling with mental health and other issues preventing their ability to live fully. The pilot program would begin with two individuals, a Culver City Firefighter/Paramedic paired with a social worker. The team is proposed to work 4 days per week, approximately 8 hours per day. The estimated cost is \$285,000. There are potential grant opportunities available through Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).
- *Restorative Practices Program* - Develop and implement a restorative practices program in collaboration with Culver City Unified School District. This program would work in coordination with the CCPD Juvenile Diversion program with the goal of replacing “zero tolerance” disciplinary practices such as suspensions and expulsions for misbehavior with supportive approaches that aim to get to the root cause of a student’s behavior.
- *Minimize traffic citations* - Establish a practice of issuing ‘Fix-It Tickets’ for correctable offenses such as equipment violations (e.g. broken tail light), expired driver license, vehicle registration or automobile insurance; or for individuals who do not have their driver license or insurance in their possession at the time of violation. If the violation is corrected prior to the deadline, an authorized person at the court, police station or Department of Motor Vehicles can sign the certification on the citation to have the charge dismissed.

Use of Force Policy Update

On June 15, 2020, City Council authorized Mayor Eriksson to sign Former President Barack Obama’s Mayor’s Pledge (“Pledge”). The Pledge commits mayors, city councils and police oversight bodies to the following actions:

1. Review police use of force policies;
2. Engage communities by including a diverse range of input, experiences, and stories in the review;
3. Report the findings of the review to the community and seek feedback; and
4. Reform the police use of force policies.

City Council approved a process to review CCPD Use of Force policy to include:

- Internal administrative review, led by the City Manager’s Office, in coordination with the Chief of Police, of Culver City Police Department Policies 300 (Use of Force) and 301 (Use of Force Review) (collectively, “Policies”);

- Meet with the City’s GARE team members to receive comments and reactions to the Policies;
- Conduct a series of listening sessions with the community to hear about their experiences and perceptions of the Policies;
- Solicit additional feedback utilizing a public survey;
- Discuss the Policies and community feedback with the Police Chief’s Advisory Panel;
- Report findings to City Council and receive direction on potential reforms;
- Incorporate City Council feedback and draft policy revisions;
- Hold community meeting to review proposed revisions;
- Develop an implementation plan, which includes meeting and conferring with appropriate labor representatives as required; and
- Implement policy reforms.

To date, staff has held four meetings with the GARE team members and/or CCPD to review the Policies. In addition, feedback regarding CCPD use of force was solicited in the Culver City Public Safety Review community survey as well as the focus group discussions. The GARE team has recommended revisions to the Policies, which will be shared with the Chief’s Advisory Panel for further input and the City Attorney’s office for review.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

The following table is a summary of the net impact to the CCPD Budget, should City Council determine to implement the City Manager’s recommendations.

FY 2019/2020 Adjusted Budget	47,590,808
Reallocation to PRCS Budget for scholarships and after school program	(115,000)
Reallocation to Fire Department for Mental Health Team	(310,000)
Reallocation of Parking Enforcement, Animal Control Services and Crossing Guards to other City Departments	(1,224,756)
Additional Police Department Training	50,000
Establish a restorative justice program	150,000
Reinstate (5) CCPD Jailer positions	500,000
Budget savings allocated to General Fund	(2,608,574)
FY 2020/2021 Adjusted Budget	44,032,478

Total CCPD Budget Cuts from FY 2019/2020 (3,558,330)
-7.5%

ATTACHMENTS

1. 2020-10-12 - ATT 1_CC_SafetySurveyReport
2. 2020-10-12 - ATT 2_CC_RIPA-best-practices-2020

MOTION(S)

That the City Council:

- (1) Discuss findings and recommendations from the City Manager's Office related to the public safety review; and
- (2) Provide direction to the City Manager as deemed appropriate.

NOTES

1. Throughout the report we refer to the "Community". This is defined broadly to include Culver City residents, visitors, businesses, employees, students, transient individuals and neighbors in surrounding areas.
2. The term BIPOC has been widely used to acknowledge that not all people of color face the same level of systemic injustices.