

Questions and Comments on the initial concepts:

Questions

1. I think civilianizing IA is interesting. Are there other cities who have done it? Can you share any reports or articles on it?
2. Can you explain what CRTs do? Why would investment in CRTs have a bigger impact on reducing violence crime than, say, investment in criminal investigation?
3. Can we hear more from OPD about their budget reduction recommendations? It seems to be the RPSTF's assumption that officers can be removed from patrol but the budget proposal eliminates other positions in order to fill patrol. Can we hear more about why? Is this because there is no way to reduce patrol response to calls for service?

Comments

- I agree strongly with reducing the calls responded to by patrol, and with reducing patrol in the beats with the least crime. I think we still don't really have the data we need to understand the existing calls for service and to my knowledge there has never been a data-driven patrol allocation plan. I would be explicit about developing such a plan in the recommendations. There are definitely folks willing to help with the data analysis in the Data and Budget AB.
- I agree with moving 911 dispatch to combine with 311 and eliminating sworn positions overseeing dispatch as a result.
- I disagree with the "CERN" fund receiving all \$15 million of the OPD budget reduction. I would suggest something like half to CERN and half to violence prevention strategies. Since this proposal seems to indicate that there will be \$15M reduced per year, then CERN could be augmented in the following years and build up more slowly.
- I disagree that the CERN should be made up of individuals from CBOs or DVP only since presumably there will be people employed as part of the CERN who handle homelessness, poverty and mental health issues. That sounds to me like HSD or CAO not DVP.
- Renewing Measure Z is essential. I strongly agree. In terms of Measure Z, I think there should be 2 ballot initiatives in 2022. One ballot initiative would be to revise the existing measure to get rid of the officer minimum as well as the 40/60 split. I would recommend 100% of the funding go to violence prevention (minus the amount set aside for OFD). This measure would only require a majority vote. The second initiative would re-up the existing Measure Z tax for another 10-20 years. It would require a 2/3 vote.
- I didn't see all of my responses in Appendix A. Here is my list of functions to eliminate or reduce:
 - 911 Dispatch
 - Response to homeless encampments and other (unless call IDs that weapons are present)
 - Response to wellness check requests and substance use and mental health calls (unless call IDs that weapons are present)
 - DV calls for service
 - DV and SA investigation (Family Violence and Special Victims Units)
 - Response to noise complaints, firecrackers, utility theft, other disturbances
 - Car accident response and taking reports, traffic violations, traffic management, traffic enforcement abandoned vehicle and illegal parking (incl. blocked driveway) complaints,

taking stolen vehicle reports. We should look at eliminating/replacing the OPD traffic division altogether.

- Responding to property crimes that are no longer in progress
- Disturbances (except those with weapons present)
- Medical emergencies (no crime in progress or police issue ID'ed)
- Internal Affairs
- OPD Juvenile Services
- DV/ Special Victims/ Sexual Exploitation Units
- CROs (Community Resource Officers)

Guiding Principles for RPSTF principles

Suggestions for Guiding Principles:

- **Prioritize community-led solutions** - meaning solutions developed by community members from the areas impacted and staffed by community members from those impacted areas
- **Fund to the scale of the problem** – meaning do not set up CBOs and City Departments with impossible tasks without the funding necessary to achieve those tasks. When programs are not funded to the scale of the problem, it is usually the most vulnerable communities with the greatest need that are left behind and the highest-impacted areas that draw the short end of the stick terms of service. Funding initial response to a DV call if there is no DV shelter space or mental health or legal support available, for example, is cruel. I'd prefer doing less but doing it to scale than trying a million things.
- **Lift up practice-based evidence, not just evidence-based practice** – meaning that lots of programs that work haven't been rigorously studied and published about but that doesn't mean they don't work. Pay attention to programs
- **Support professionalization of violence prevention and intervention workers** – meaning that people should be trained, supported and paid commensurate with the value of their work. Ideally, the City should support pathways for our native community healers to become paid professionals upholding standards of excellence and accountability that we expect from other City employees.
- **Use the least enforcement necessary** – meaning that solutions should use the least oppressive tools necessary to achieve the goal. Officers without weapons instead of with weapons where possible, non-sworn employees instead of officers where possible, fines instead of arrests where possible, no fines at all where possible. This is part of decriminalizing poverty and mental illness.

Feedback on the proposed principles:

- I generally agree with the ideas behind the proposed principles in the memo dated December 7th, which I take to mean that we should be thoughtful and careful about dismantling current approaches lest the “defund the police” efforts impact poor communities of color as negatively as current “fund the police” efforts do. However:
- I worry that the phrasing of “proven” in the principles (“1. Police reductions will only be made when a suitable alternative is in place that is *proven* to offer an equivalent or better impact on Public Safety”) prevents the RPSTF from taking any action at all without a lot of expensive and

unnecessary research. What is the proof that current policing strategies work better than alternatives? I don't want perfect to be the enemy of the good. I would rephrase this as "Police reductions **should** ~~will only~~ be made when a ~~suitable~~ alternative is **funded** in place that is ~~proven~~ **likely** to offer an equivalent or better impact on Public Safety"

- I think the wording of the proposed principle that "Estimated cost savings from a police budget reduction must first be directed toward the suitable alternative response, prior to being invested in an alternative solution that addresses a different need" makes it unclear if violence prevention is considered a "different need" than what the police do. We can't just replace emergency response with emergency response, and enforcement with enforcement and expect to increase public safety in the long term. I would suggest "Estimated cost savings from a police budget reduction **should address any resulting public safety gap** ~~must first be directed toward the suitable alternative response, prior to being invested in an alternative solution that addresses a different need~~"