ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals
to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, we are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Cody Sloan

Cody Sloan
pronouns: he/him/his (what's this?
<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fuwm.edu%2F1gbtrc%2Fsupport%2Fgender-pronouns%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C8a781f61161c48d25e4208d8e7c0f5e7c642fd61c344d4fd0af8d443576485883%7C8%7C0%7C637514219165135881%7C%01;cm%7CTWfpbGzsb3d8eyJWlIfoMC4wLjAwMDaIClJQ1joiV21uMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=PxW5LGDQPhND1ZKc73TQ2IbrrJxpRoD5juy4eA9dEjQ%3D&reserved=0> )

UCSD MFA Acting Candidate
www.codydsloan.com
<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.codydsloan.com%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C8a781f61161c48d25e4208d8e7c0f5e>
From: Annica S <annica.s@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 9:38 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfalls@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: public comment march 16 2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Just so you know, the public is aware of the proposal that attempts to revive the Public Disorder Investigation Division that the LAPD began after the uprising in Watts, which infiltrated & surveilled the work of activists and organizers, among others.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We demand answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund
the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, the language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. We all know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. You are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Annica S

From: Asher Guthertz <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 9:41 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org;
paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org;
contactdc4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org;
councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org;
councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org;
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org;
councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Councilors,

I am writing today to emphatically reject a proposal submitted to City Council last week which calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council. Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.
As the people of Los Angeles have been telling this body for months, we do not want the LAPD to redirect funds towards self-regulation or new community outreach programs. The LAPD is and has always been a white supremacist organization, as last month’s horrifying Valentine’s Day stunt only reiterated. The answer is not for LAPD to take money to look into their own bullshit, the answer is to take money and power away from this organization and direct it towards real community services and wealth redistribution.

Signed,

Asher Guthertz

From: Barbara Sazama <bcsazama@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 9:45 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning.

After seeing the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd protests that was submitted to City Council last week, I am appalled. The report calls for the funding
and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to "public order policing" whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration's policies. The L.A. Times editorial board rightly warned that this "infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying." The report's proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD "shadow teams" infiltrated last summer's protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD's "public disorder" agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today's political environment. The proposal to create this new "public order policing" bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing's intrinsic value to the community. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to "redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs." As this sentiment grows, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are questioning its power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and Brown communities and to repress those who dare criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

Finally I reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I'm fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes, which is ridiculous for a city
of this size. You are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Barbara C Sazama

From: SHERRY VARON <redacted>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 9:48 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Sochoroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactccd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.
The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Sherry Varon

From: becca vb <becca vb>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 9:54 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Mayor Garcetti; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; Mayor Garcetti; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org;
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org

Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and
the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Becca von Behren

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This communication and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information for the use of the designated recipient(s) named above. Distribution, reproduction or any other use of this transmission by any party other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited.

From: Erynn Bell <erynn.bell@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 9:57 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern:

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to the City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and
creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.
Erynn Bell

C: 

E: <mailto:>

Connect on LinkedIn

From: Gina Viola

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:19 AM

To: Police Commission

Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyila.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; Councilmember Mike Bonin; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; TeamCD4; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscalno@lacity.org

Subject: Public comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

NO NO NO NO NO! Do you know the definition of insanity? It is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. LAPD has had nothing but big fancy giant expensive trainings the past 30 years and we are still here. It's the entire department that is rotten to the core and continues to have zero oversight.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political
activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes.
Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Gina Viola

Gina Viola (she/her/hers)
<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fmedium.com%2Fgender-inclusivity%2Fwhy-i-put-pronouns-on-my-email-signature-and-linked-in-profile-and-you-should-too-3d3c942c8743%3Fdata%3D04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Cc57e0f74461a4a05147508d8e7d67ed4%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C1%7C6375142555727193880%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1hbWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C2000&sdata=MJeJZK8nX48BKA41KOaxHa2WbjjLyUvi7eOYuiDVv4%3D&reserved=0>

Corporate Address:

Los Angeles, CA 90071

http://www.tradeshowtemps.net
<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.tradeshowtemps.net%2F%3Fdata%3D04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Cc57e0f74461a4a05147508d8e7d67ed4%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C1%7C6375142555727193880%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1hbWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C2000&sdata=ksLWC28dq8ZfNIG7ctkimmRzC39IwKDXnE60prMnPwI%3D&reserved=0>

********************

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and thus protected from disclosure. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer. Thank you, Trade Show Temps.

From: Lizabeth Belli <---
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:19 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfalls@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember/buscalno@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress
those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboress has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,
Lizabeth Belli

Lizabeth Belli (she/her)
mailto: lizabeth.belli@lacity.org

#CareFirst
#CareNotCops

From: Zach Sherwin <zach.sherwin@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:20 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Mayor Helpdesk; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboress; LAPC Fails; lou@lacity.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J.
Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaio@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioners:

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.
I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I do not for a second believe your assertion that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. Last week a bunch of people demanded that Dr. Melina Abdullah be allowed to speak – and lo and behold, she was indeed allowed to speak, after literally weeks of being ignored. It’s as laughably pathetic as it is fucked-up. You trip all over yourselves trying to ride these ridiculous lines. Just stop it and act right.

And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

With dismay and revulsion,
Zach Sherwin

From: Alex Cave <alex.cave@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:19 AM
To: Police Commission; mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Mayor Helpdesk; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laiist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; Mayor Garcetti; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; TeamCD4; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org

Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Everyone,
I saw the report on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to "public order policing" whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration's policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this "infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying." The report's proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD "shadow teams" infiltrated last summer's protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD's "public disorder" agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today's political context. The proposal to create this new "public order policing" bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing's value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to "redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs" and over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.
I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,
Alex Cave

From: michele dumont <michele.dumont@lapd.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:20 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 3/16/21

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings:

LAPD is certainly getting a lot of attention in the press lately, even the NY Times. And it is horrible, a disgrace and makes me ashamed to be a resident of this city.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder
Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I'm fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.
Signed,

Dr. Michele Dumont

From: Magan Wiles <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:21 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@lalist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonis@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. It’s no surprise that the response called for in the report is the creation of even more policing. This new public order bureau is reminiscent of the PDID launched in the wake of the Watts rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund
the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Magan Wiles

From: Clint Blakely <clint@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:25 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs; II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harrisdawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org;
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. I saw wholeheartedly and decisively: FUCK THIS SHIT. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council. I reject this disgusting attempt to siphon even more funding for LAPD’s already bloated budget, as it will result in more of the only thing LAPD stands for: violence against Black, Brown, poor, disabled, and houseless folks to protect the interests of LA’s wealthiest class.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police. Therefore, I reject the proposal, and you should too.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation”
appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sobotroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving. Steve Sobotroff, I offer you a hearty "fuck you."

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

--

Clint Blakely (he/they)

Actor, Musician, Voiceover Artist, Teacher

I live, work, and play on ancestral Munsee Lenape and Wappignger land. I invite you to research the Indigenous peoples who live wherever you call home <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https://3A%2F%2Fnative-land.ca%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicedecommission%40lapd.online%7Cfad8daed6e614e9941a308d8e7d7551d%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C637514259327398908%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LCQIjoiV2luMzlIICBTdI1Ii1haWw1LCJXVC16Mn03%7C1000&data=ydIZ5FkT1NXP0QGxn5fXkq4n5%2F2bsgGqiiK6ImTdw%3D&reserved=0>. Please consider paying into a fund <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https://3A%2F%2Fmanhattanfund.org%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicedecommission%40lapd.online%7Cfad8daed6e614e9941a308d8e7d7551d%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C637514259327398908%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LCQIjoiV2luMzlIICBTdI1Ii1haWw1LCJXVC16Mn03%7C1000&data=mXVQSA5jN6KyVMw2RlCmXSyLHDhMaCDFwN7wTqN%3D&reserved=0> for all settlers to acknowledge our relationship and responsibility to Native peoples, and to help rectify the ongoing violence of colonization.

From: Ken Barnard <[email protected]>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:37 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Mayor Helpdesk; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; Mayor Garcetti; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must
be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Ken Barnard

From: Kevin Dieterle <kevin.dietert@lapd.com>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:41 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@lalst.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political
activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes.
Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Sincerely,

Kevin Dieterle

From: Clare Daley <[redacted]>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:46 AM

To: Police Commission

Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org

Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a
time of extreme skepticism of policing's value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to "redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs" and over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I'm fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Clare Daley, Santa Monica
From: kristen stuard <kristenstuard@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:58 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; Mayor Garcetti; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactccd@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

What an absolute disgrace!

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation”
appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Sincerely,

Kristen Studard

From: Julie Henson  
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:05 AM 
To: Police Commission 
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org 
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021 

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I live in LA in the Cypress Park neighborhood and I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PIDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of
community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I ask again that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos like me by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.
Sincerely,

Julie

From: Becca Luce <br>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:08 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@latist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a
time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sobooff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Rebecca Luce

From: Meghan Parkansky 
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:13 AM 
To: Police Commission 
Cc: Mike.N.Feuer@Lacity.Org; Mayor.Helpdesk@Lacity.Org; Ana.Guerrero@Lacity.Org; 
Eileen Decker; Ethics.Commission@Lacity.Org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; 
Steve Sobooff; lapcfails@gmail.com; Lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michiel Moore; 
William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; Kevin.Rector@latimes.com; 
Mayor.Garcetti@Lacity.Org; Councilmember.Ridley-Thomas@Lacity.Org; 
Councilmember.Bonin@Lacity.Org; Cindy.Chang@latimes.com; David.Zahniser@latimes.com;
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular. With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power.

As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

We see right through you,
From: Phoebe Neidhardt <phoebe.neidhardt@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:14 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

LA Police Commission,

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration's policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams”
infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sobotoff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Phoebe Neidhardt

From: Armando Tapia <armando.tapia@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:14 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: Michel Moore; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org;
cindy.chang@latimes.com; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; david.zahniser@latimes.com; ethics.commission@lacity.org; kevin.rector@latimes.com; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Richard Tefank; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; Eileen Decker; William J. Briggs, II; paul.koretz@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; tips@laist.com

Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello all,

Last week, I was reminded of the multiple incidents of police brutality I witnessed in my home neighborhood when I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council.

The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies.

This is absolutely unacceptable, as it stands the LAPD already has +50% of the city funds during this fiscal crisis. Enough is enough, throwing money at a department riddled with misconduct and scandals is not and should not be interpreted as the answer.

This proposal is an attempt to revive the Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.
The tactics of oppression that those of us who grew up in the city witnessed and read about absolutely must not be revisited.

These tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.”

The report’s proposal would institutionalize these inappropriate and oppressive tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

It seems apparent that the real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context.

The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.”

With this sentiment exponentially growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed a change in the language used in by the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation.

As of December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items.
Why has that language changed!? When, it recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD.

As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving and protecting.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes.

Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Thank you,

From: Seth Curcio <sethc@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:19 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I live in LA in the Cypress Park neighborhood and I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau
devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I ask again that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos like me by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.
-Michael Seth Curcio

From: Violet <redacted>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:22 AM

To: Police Commission

Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactccd@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org

Subject: Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.
The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

From: Harrison Weinfeld <harrison.w@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:23 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. LAPD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.
I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Harrison Weinfeld

From: Megan O'Heffernan <REDACTED>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:35 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@lajist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 3/16/21

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council. Again and again, against the wishes of Angelenos, LAPD continues to try to increase police surveillance, which is disproportionately likely to target marginalized communities. Shame on you.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration's policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind
a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrappe members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police. Angelenos need to understand that this proposal threatens their civil liberties and will increase police presence throughout their communities -- whether they can see it or not.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Regards,

Megan
From: Bethany Heykoop <...>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:37 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: Michel Moore; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; david.zahniser@latimes.com; ethics.commission@lacity.org; kevin.rector@latimes.com; lpcf@lapd.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Richard Tefank; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; Eileen Decker; William J. Briggs, II; paul.koretz@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; tips@laist.com
Subject: Public Comment 3/16/21

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report's proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to completely dismantle police departments and give
more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Bethany Heykoop

From: Julia Haft-Candell <haftcandellj@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:38 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcda@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to "public order policing" whose
responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.
Signed,
Julia Haft-Candell

From:  Mads Gauger <[redacted]>
Sent:  Monday, March 15, 2021 11:39 AM
To:  Police Commission
Cc:  mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject:  Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.
The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today's political context. The proposal to create this new "public order policing" bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing's value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to "redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs" and over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I'm fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Mads Gauger

From:  Kelly Mis  
Sent:  Monday, March 15, 2021 11:49 AM  
To:  Police Commission  
Subject:  Public Comment 03/16/2021  

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I want to start by saying, that the following email has been pre-written and I hope
you receive it many, many times today. I agree with everything stated in the following. Please read what the people have to say, please let the people speak.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use
language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I'm fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Kelly Mis

<https://d36urhp7zbd7q.cloudfront.net/dba4266c-0337-4257-aa42-16f437282431/_MG_8087.format_png.resize_200x.jpeg/logo>  |  

http://www.imdb.com/kellymis
<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.imdb.me%2FKellymis&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C45b34b3f4f4b35b608d8e7e2f086%7C642f61c34dd4df0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C1%7C637514309248394817%7CUnknown%7C7FwpbGZsb3d8eyJIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&isf=1>  |  

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.youtube.com%2FFchannel%2FCUSC2-51HaUHRPGsHxiiqZdS%data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C45b34b3f4f4b35b608d8e7e2f086%7C642f61c34dd4df0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C1%7C637514309248394817%7CUnknown%7C7FwpbGZsb3d8eyJIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&isf=1>  |  

Create your own email signature
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether those officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.
The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Courtney

From: Tiana McKenna <removed>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 12:09 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.fuhr@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Sboroff; lacpfaile@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org;
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioners:

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has
that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sobooff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Sincerely,
Tiana McKenna
LA 90032

From: Louise Keshaviah <loikesh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 12:15 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Sobooff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD
also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Louise Keshaviah
Louise K
https://www.showingupforracialjustice.org/

From: Liz Cackowski <lizc@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 12:19 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org;
Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa;
Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore;
William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org;
councilmember.boni@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com;
Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org;
Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcde@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org;
councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org;
councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org;
Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open
attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was
submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation
of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose
responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political
activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This
proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder
Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts
Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret
dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as
judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD
also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump
administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this
"infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind
a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Liz Cackowski

From: Gurney Halleck <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 12:35 PM
To: Police Commission
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising submitted to City Council last week is a joke. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entraped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must
be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Gurney Halleck

From: Phillip Kim
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 12:37 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPCFails; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; Councilmember Mithya Raman; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org;
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration— at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and
the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use
language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears
this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at
the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to
provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that
the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you
stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes.
Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of
Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,
Phillip Kim

From: Monica Monzingo
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 12:47 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: Michel Moore; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; Councilmember.lee@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; councilmember.buscalino@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; david.zahniser@latimes.com; ethics.commission@lacity.org; kevin.rector@latimes.com; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Richard Tefank; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; Eileen Decker; William J. Briggs, II; paul.koretz@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; tips@laist.com
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open
attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was
submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of
a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose
responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political
activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This
proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder
Investigation Division (PIDD), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts
Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret
dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as
judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Monica Monzingo

From: Hannah Gibson <hannahgibson@...>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 12:50 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@lalst.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactccd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I saw the report on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to "public order policing" whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration's policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this "infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying." The report's proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD "shadow teams" infiltrated last summer's protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD's "public disorder" agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today's political context. The proposal to create this new "public order policing" bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing's value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to "redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs" and over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be
eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sobleff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

 Signed,
 Hannah Gibson

From: Hannah Utt <Hannah.Utt@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:06 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@latimes.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello, my name is Hannah, and I live in District 13.
I saw the report submitted to City Council last week on LAPD’s violence during the 2020 protests against police brutality. The report’s proposal to create and fund a "public order policing" bureau is a thinly veiled attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges and members of City Council in the Wake of the Watts Rebellion.

Even after PDID was dismantled, those tactics persisted. Just two years ago LAPD infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this "infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying." I agree. We must not reinstitutionalize these tactics.

The motivation behind this dangerous proposal seems obvious. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power and use it as an excuse to further target BIPOC communities.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. “Reimagine Public Safety” does not mean continue expanding the LAPD, by new and increasingly shady means.

Additionally, I strongly reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.
Thank you for your time.

-Hannah Utt

From: sylke.rene.meyer@lacity.org
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:08 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; loun@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactccd@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political
context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,
Sylke Meyer

From: Liz Levine <lizlevine@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:10 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lappcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laisl.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactc4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to the City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular; a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.
I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,
Liz

From: Kimberli Meyer <[email]>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:12 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@lalst.com; kevin.recto@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

As a subscriber of the LA Times, I saw and followed the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would
institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD "shadow teams" infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s "public disorder" agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today's political context. The proposal to create this new "public order policing" bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to "redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs" and over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sobotoff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Sincerely,

Kimberli Meyer
From: Laura Adery <laura.adery@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:14 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Mayor Helpdesk; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; Mayor Garcetti; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal represents the absolute opposite of what is needed - increasing versus reallocating police funds to community service organizations that are proven to increase safety and protection for all community members-- and appears to reenvoke the Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

It is concerning that despite apparent surface dismantling of that division, two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to


"completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD must not be recruited further or involved in improving our community safety. Robust evidence demonstrates the lack of efficacy and waste of community investment on LAPD if the goal is community safety and improvement- community organizations with only scraps of their budget do a lot more and could have tremendous further positive impact if only the funds were prioritized effectively.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I stand with the community members in urging you to expand the meetings public comment period to allow voices of all Angelenos to be heard by those who have been enlisted to serve us.

Signed,

Laura Adery, Ph.D.

From: Michelle King <michelle.king@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:16 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactccd@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioners,

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and
the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. We all know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

In community,

Michelle King

From: Carolyn Townsend <xxxxxx>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:41 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I didn’t need to see the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week, to know that the LAPD is a deeply flawed and dangerous organization.
The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.
I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Carolyn Townsend

From: Sean Donahue <redacted>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:51 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@lajist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to the City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would
institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Sean Donahue

From: Madeline Seales <...>
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. ADK knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and
the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I'm fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Madeline Seales

From: Melissa Bierly <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:56 PM
To: Police Commission; mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscalino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to "public order policing" whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.
Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Melissa Bierly

From: Audrey Georg <---
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 2:06 PM  
To: Police Commission  
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfalls@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@lait.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@laitimes.com; david.zahniser@laitimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org  
Subject: My Public Comment for the BOPC meeting on 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

<mailto:councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>

Commissioners:

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The the LAPD affiliated “expert” who prepared this document falls very short of reporting fully on the LAPD misdeeds and illegal behavior, for instance, failing to fully reveal important facts about LAPD’s use of pepper spray on peaceful protesters, wherein the use of such chemical agents is considered unlawful even during war.

The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked and tragic attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued long after PDID was dismantled. Just two years it was publicly revealed that LAPD had also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. It is notable that the L.A. Times editorial board, not generally a supporter of movements to defund and abolish LAPD, warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members
of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? Could it possibly be a result of the recent emergence of scandalous facts about how Commissioner Steve Sobooff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

How long are you other commissioners (i.e., not Sobooff) going to serve as his apologists, if not being his direct accomplices in malfeasance?

Finally, I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

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

From: Erin M <erin.m.feuer@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 2:16 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.busca Reno@lacity.org
Subject: Public comment 3/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration—at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund
the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to "redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs" and over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Erin

From: Michele Wetteland <m.wetteland@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 2:31 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Mayor Helpdesk; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPCFails; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; Councilmember Rodriguez; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Mitch O'Farrell; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

This body is tasked with being the head of the Los Angeles Police Department. Michael Moore is tasked to manage the daily operations of LAPD and implement this board’s policy direction and goals. I saw the LA City Council’s independent report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. It indicated a “chaos of command” by Michael Moore. How is this body to trust Michael Moore with implementing its policy direction and goals, when he has been proven incapable of leading his department?

The report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week also called for the funding and creation of a new permanent LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing.” This new department’s responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. I’m wondering how these duties are different from every current department within the LAPD? This proposal is a thinly veiled attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (P DID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and was used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council. Does this sound like the highest standard of the law to each of you? If not, you might be curious to know those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these nefarious tactics, and if approved by this body would bring a perceived legitimacy to constitutional lawlessness by law enforcement. The report hints to the suggestion of these crimes by LAPD already occurring as it notes how LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing. What would you consider a complete abdication of your duties on this commission? Would it be to turn a blind eye, with rubber stamping approval of LAPD’s actions? Would it be to allow this type of lawless law enforcement to be considered lawful?

It is interesting the LAPD’s proposal to create a new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context, not public
safety. LAPD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular. A Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to "redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs" and over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD appears to be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power with its suggestion of this new surveillance bureau. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police. What will you do to stop these crimes against humanity from continuing unabated in Los Angeles?

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has significantly changed. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has this commission omitted that language? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we hear elected officials appropriate Black Lives Matter language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to expand the LAPD and increase its budget, it appears this Commission believes this saying to mean, "Reimagine Lying and Corruption." What have you all done to prove this idea any different?

Finally, I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. The commission needs to stop capping its public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long. It seems as if you only give voice to the LAPD and its chosen representatives. This commission exists to serve as the citizen’s voice in police affairs. How can you serve our voices, if you don’t hear them?

Signed,

Michele Wetteland
pronouns: she/her

From: Rachel Andersson <rachel.andersson@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 2:45 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: Mike N. Feuer@lacity.org; Mayor.Helptdesk@lacity.org; Ana.Guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; Ethics.Commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa;
Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contact@ch4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscalno@lacity.org

Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Police Commissioners:

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to the Los Angeles City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing,” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies.

I do not support this proposal. It is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police
Commission in December showed that roughly two out of three Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I also reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one; the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

You have the power to gain your community’s support. Use it!

Sincerely,

Rachel Andersson
L.A. resident, 90026

From:    Kevin King
Sent:    Monday, March 15, 2021 2:47 PM
To:      Police Commission
Cc:      mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Sboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org;
I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.
I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. We all know how Zoom works. I'm fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Thank you from a concerned citizen

Kevin King

From: Stephanie Jamieson
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 3:10 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyca.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Have you not learned from this past year that LAPD shady and bad behavior is no
longer going to fly? Wake up because we will not stop fighting for Black Lives and for a better system absent of white supremacy.

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use
language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Stephanie Jamieson

Sent from my iPhone

From: Lyndsey Nolan <lyndsey.nolan@lapd.lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 3:14 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lACITY.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioners,

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation
of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to "public order policing" whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this "infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that
the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you
stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes.
Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of
Angelenos by limiting their access to your meetings, and for how long.

Sincerely,

Lyndsey Q. Nolan, MPH
She/Her
L: linkedin.com/in/lyndseyqtnolan
<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Flinkedin.com%2Fin%2Floynstein%2Flong&data=04%7C01%7C0policecommission%40lapd.online%7C0%0e2f372f410331ff
08d8e7ffad4a%7C642fd61c34dd4fcdafa8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C637514432613530465%7CUnkno
wn%7CTWfpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC44LjAwMDA1LjQ1QjoiMzI1LjIyNGIzNWI1LjJkMjE0LjIyMjA0LjE0I
7C1000&data=mJcx1vckiH968tZBCwGZnj%2BYyNKh08k72FJ2FfCYoKSe%3D&tвето=0>
proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration— at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.
Signed,
Dawy Rkasnuam

From: Sarah Bowers
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 3:37 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; Mayor Helpdesk; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; Mayor Garcetti; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021: REJECT "Public Order Policing" + DEFUND

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

Public Comment - City Council's LAPD Report.
I am deeply disturbed by the violence and misconduct LAPD committed against citizens during the George Floyd uprisings, as reported by the LA City Council and highlighted by LA Times and New York Times. Despite the fact that the report itself says that LAPD has been warned and directed again and again to stop this violence and misconduct and that those warnings have done nothing, they now call for an expansion of LAPD devoted to "public order policing" whose responsibilities include internet surveillance and monitoring public activity.

This is ridiculous. The report has clearly stated LAPD has perpetuated mass abuses and mass disobedience to chain of command and to previous mandates, but the city council now wants to EXPAND LAPD and give them MORE mandate to invade people's private rights- the right to assemble to protest THE LAPD's criminality?

This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.
Those behind this proposal know that over 1/3 of Angelenos support the dismantling of police departments (as stated by the Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission) and are trying to use a revival of PDID as a masked effort to instead expand and stabilize LAPD's presence in the community.

Public Comment - LAPD's Shadow Teams.
The city of Los Angeles needs to know more about LAPD's "shadow teams" and improper LAPD spying. What did LAPD officers instigate? Which community members did they entrap? LAPD's tactics are immoral and dishonest, and I'm betting you will do nothing to hold them accountable.

Public Comment - LA Police Foundation Donations.
LAPD Commission agenda language surrounding regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

Public Comment - Allowing Public Comment
I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,
Sarah Bowers
From: Catherine Safley
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 3:56 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lacpcaigns@gmail.com; lori@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I viewed the report submitted to City Council last week regarding LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing,” the responsibilities of which would include internet surveillance, monitoring political activity and exchanging information with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a disgraceful attempt to bring back the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID) which LAPD implemented in reaction to the Watts Rebellion, which infiltrated hundreds of community groups and kept secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges and members of City Council.

LAPD continued employ those tactic well after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s PDID proposal would cement these tactics within policing. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration; at the very least we should know whether these officers provoked or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes at a time of deep skepticism of policing’s value and necessity. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of L.A. residents support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over one-third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” As this sentiment continues to grow, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spying powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police. This commission is charged with representing the people of Los Angeles and your actions should align with that duty. It would be completely unconscionable to endorse this dangerous expansion of LAPD’s power, syphoning more funds off Angelenos at a time when Angelenos are demanding that our money be divested from policing and invested into care-oriented alternatives.

I also noticed that the language in the LAPD Commission agendas pertaining to the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has significantly altered. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weigart Foundation and the LA Police
Foundation and the LAPD. As elected officials try to co-opt language like ‘Reimagine Public Safety’ to justify the continued expansion of the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to ‘Reimagine Lying and Corruption’ to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos it is your duty to serve.

I vehemently reject your assertion that the process for deciding who can give public comment is random. I know that the Zoom meeting host can select who is able to speak and who isn’t. I also demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at only forty-five minutes. This meager time limit functions to silence the voices of Angelenos by restricting who is able to speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed, Catherine

From: Melissa Silva
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 3:58 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laitst.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcdn@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

I am disturbed by the report calling for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau.

This is not giving more safety to us, but rather taking it away when we should be examining POLICE and not PEOPLE OF THE COUNTY.

The LA Times has brought to light further the improper behavior the LAPD has had in the past spying on community organizations.
Police at the minimum need to regain some semblance of trust from the communities that were ravaged this summer, not to mention the deeply racist roots of our current system.

Also of concern is the capping of public comment during meetings. You work for the people of Los Angeles and they deserve to be heard whether it is something you want to hear or not.

Signed,

Melissa Silva

From: Margaret Starbuck
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 3:59 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soberoff; lapcfails@gmail.com; loul@legacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Whom It May Concern:

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges and members of the City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this
"infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying." The report's proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD "shadow teams" infiltrated last summer's protests. We need more answers about this infiltration - at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD's "public disorder" agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today's political context. The proposal to create this new "public order policing" bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing's value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to "redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs" and over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the "appearance of conflicts" and "no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation" appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like "Reimagine Public Safety" to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to "Reimagine Lying and Corruption" to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I'm fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,
Margaret Starbuck

From: Sarah Bowers
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 3:59 PM
To: councilmember.bonin@lacity.org
Cc: LAPC Fails; Police Commission; Mayor Garcetti
Subject: REJECT "Public Order Policing" + DEFUND
ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Councilmember Bonin,

As one of your constituents in District 11, zip code 90045, I'm writing to express grave concerns about LAPD, the City Council's report on LAPD, and the LAPD Commission.

I'm writing and directing this to you as my city council member as the LAPD Oversight Commission fails to heed my and other Angelenos' concerns, but continues to rubberstamp everything LAPD wants to do.

City Council's LAPD Report.
I am deeply disturbed by the violence and misconduct LAPD committed against citizens during the George Floyd uprisings, as reported by the LA City Council and highlighted by LA Times and New York Times. Despite the fact that the report itself says that LAPD has been warned and directed again and again to stop this violence and misconduct and that those warnings have done nothing, they now call for an expansion of LAPD devoted to "public order policing" whose responsibilities include internet surveillance and monitoring public activity.

This is ridiculous. The report has clearly stated LAPD has perpetuated mass abuses and mass disobedience to chain of command and to previous mandates, but the city council now wants to expand LAPD and give them MORE mandate to invade people's private rights- the right to assemble to protest LAPD's criminality?

This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those behind this proposal know that over 1/3 of Angelenos support the dismantling of police departments (as stated by the Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission) and are trying to use a revival of PDID as a masked effort to instead expand and stabilize LAPD's presence in the community.

I completely reject the creation of an additional LAPD bureau in charge of "public order policing."

LAPD's Shadow Teams.
The city of Los Angeles needs to know more about LAPD's "shadow teams" and improper LAPD spying. What did LAPD officers instigate? Which community members did they entrap? LAPD's tactics are immoral and dishonest, and the LAPD Commission will do nothing to stop them.
LAPD Oversight Commission
The LAPD Commission is supposed to reflect the voice of Angelenos, but they consistently ignore that voice, limit public comment, and fail to hold LAPD accountable. In addition, the Commissioners are supposed to be normal Angeleno citizens but instead are appointed by Mayor Garcetti and are embedded with him, LAPD, and LA Police Foundation in various ways, such as Commissioner Sobooff.

Please use your voice on the city council to demand an investigation into LAPD Oversight Commissioners.

Signed,
Sarah Bowers

From: Tiff Guerra
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 4:08 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Sobooff; LAPC Falls; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; Rector, Kevin; Mayor Garcetti; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaño@lacity.org
Subject: public comment tomorrow March 16, 2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioners and Mayor Garcetti,

I am writing to again object to the actions of Steve Sobooff and the fact that he is on the Board of Police Commissioners. To be clear, we understand that the BOPC operates as the head of LAPD, and operates to help and assist LAPD while also providing the city and Mayor a place to point and say "look, civilian oversight!" We don't hold high standards for this board or expect revolution but we do expect that certain behaviors will not be tolerated. Commissioners, I can't even keep up with all the ways that Steve Sobooff is doing dealings and having communications with people in power to the benefit of police. So while homeless people are dying on the streets every day from lack of access to housing, healthcare, all the things they need; and other folks have their lives shortened or ended by the weight of systemic racism, experienced in the city of LA and enacted by all the systems they have to come in contact with, Steve is fighting for the people who already have the most power - LA's wealthy, white business owners, police unions, and the police. This is white violence; this is the way systemic racism is upheld. And you are complicit in this.
We will also continue to expose and demand answers regarding the LA Police Foundation, which you all are way too excited about in terms of them being an additional channel of funding for police. It's not good to have extra, quick, less supervised channels for funding LAPD's direct requests and projects. Not awesome. Not increasing community safety. And another indication of Sobo's anti-Blackness is how eager he is to keep the fund rolling through that channel. (why anti-Black? Because these policing programs and technology, funded by LAPF quickly and quietly, are most frequently deployed in predominantly Black communities, which are used as "testing grounds" for the equipment. This was the case with facial recognition tech in 2004, this was the case with ALPRs; deployed in Skid Row, and also Jordan Downs; and this was the case with Body Worn Video, first tested in Central Division. Black neighborhoods are not testing grounds for LAPD and tech surveillance corporations. These are people's lives and folks deserve actual funding, not more deals being figured out for LAPD). Also, Steve is quick to find tears when it comes to migrant children being jailed at the border, but doesn't see how police here in LA also separate children from their families and jail youth and family members?? Why is Steve able to see the humanity of folks in one situation, but not here in LA? In both situations families are being harmed and deeply traumatized. Bring that compassion here to LA, Steve!

So we see who you are when you let Sobo operate this way. He will do what he wants anyway, he is a white dude who has lived his life that way, but it is made even more clear who the BOPC is, who Garcetti is, when this is what passes for standard.

Mayor Garcetti you have got to order hotels to house homeless people. You are killing people with your lack of urgency and lack of action.

Defund the police,

T Guerra
they/them/their

From: Jason Reedy <jason.reedy@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 4:52 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa;
Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org

Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioners,

I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-­Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration – at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give
more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Sobraoff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Jason Reedy

From: Camille Sacristan
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 4:54 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Sobraoff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open
I saw the report on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that was submitted to City Council last week. The report calls for the funding and creation of a permanent new LAPD bureau devoted to “public order policing” whose responsibilities would include internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging intelligence with local, state, and federal agencies. This proposal is a barely masked attempt to revive the notorious Public Disorder Investigation Division (PDID), which LAPD launched in the wake of the Watts Rebellion and used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges as members of City Council.

Those tactics continued even after PDID was dismantled. Just two years ago LAPD also infiltrated Refuse Fascism, a group organizing rallies against the Trump administration’s policies. The L.A. Times editorial board warned that this “infiltration of an anti-Trump activist group is deeply troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD spying.” The report’s proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report even notes that LAPD “shadow teams” infiltrated last summer’s protests. We need more answers about this infiltration — at a minimum, whether these officers instigated or entrapped members of the community, as LAPD’s “public disorder” agents have a long history of doing.

The real motivation behind this dangerous proposal is likely today’s political context. The proposal to create this new “public order policing” bureau comes as a time of extreme skepticism of policing’s value. APD knows that demands to defund the police are extremely popular: a Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that around two-third of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs” and over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD must be eager to monitor those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its spy powers to target Black and brown communities and to repress those who criticize police.

I also noticed that the language used in the LAPD Commission agendas regarding the acceptance of donations from the Los Angeles Police Foundation has changed significantly. As recently as December, language around the “appearance of conflicts” and “no personal relations or conflicts with the [LA Police] Foundation” appeared in donation reports from Chief Moore attached to agenda items. Why has that language changed? It recently emerged that Commissioner Steve Soboroff has been lying about his role in facilitating donations between Weingart Foundation and
the LA Police Foundation and the LAPD. As we see elected officials attempt to use language like “Reimagine Public Safety” to continue expanding the LAPD, it appears this Commission continues to “Reimagine Lying and Corruption” to that same end, at the expense of the very Angelenos you are tasked with serving.

I emphatically reject your contention that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment is a random one. I know how Zoom works. I’m fully aware that the meeting host can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. And I demand that you stop capping your meetings’ public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. Despite your weekly protestations to the contrary, you are silencing the voices of Angelenos by limiting who can speak at your meetings, and for how long.

Signed,

Camille Sacristan

From: Lex Ryan
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; lapcfails@gmail.com; lou@legacyla.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; cindy.chang@latimes.com; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 03/16/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello LA Police Commissioners,

The report which was submitted to City Council last week re LAPD’s violence over the summer calls for the funding and creation of a new (and permanent) LAPD bureau is not going to serve the community. The proposal is basically an attempt to revive the Public Disorder Investigation Division, which was used to infiltrate hundreds of community groups. It would give the bureau responsibilities like internet surveillance, monitoring of political activity, and exchanging information with local, state, and federal agencies.

The LA Times has spoken out about the infiltration of Refuse Fascism by LAPD saying that it’s “deep troubling and brings to mind a long history of improper LAPD
spying.” The proposal would institutionalize these tactics. The report also mentions LAPD’s infiltration of the protests last summer, and we need more information about that.

LAPD knows that the calls to defund the police are growing in popularity. So they must be eager to monitor the folks who are confronting its violence and power and demanding accountability. There are many issues with this, not least of which is the way in which Black and Brown communities are impacted.

It is deeply upsetting that elected officials are coopting the language from community members and organizers and activists with calls to “Reimagine Public Safety” in order to further expand the LAPD’s reach.

I strongly reject your claim that the selection process for who provides public comment is a random one. I am a virtual event producer. I understand on a deep level how Zoom works. I know that the meeting host selects who speaks and who does not speak. I demand that you stop capping your public comment portion of your meetings at 45 minutes. You are silencing the voices of Angelenos and therefore negating the very purpose you are supposed to be serving.

Signed,
Lex

--
Lex Ryan

WWW.lexryan.co

pronouns: they/them

Black Lives Matter - Los Angeles

White People For Black Lives