From: Bridgette Ramirez
Sent: Sunday, April 11, 2021 5:48 PM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment 4/13/21

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 see no reason to give more money to the police for more training when they have already proven that as a collective body, they are not interested in protecting our most vulnerable communities. If the LAPD truly values training and transformation, they ought to figure it out from the gigantic budgets that they already have. Why place the monetary burden on the city and the citizens of Los Angeles?

I am pleading with you to fund community services rather than the police and to fire Chief Moore immediately for the sake of Los Angeles' well-being.

Bridgette Ramirez
From: Victoria Moreno
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 7:59 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; 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 04/12/2021

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 concerns, I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is the repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. These kinds of reforms have time and again failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, reforms like this keep expanding police violence.
All three reports centrally focus the voices of police. For example the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police but exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. That report even 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.

As for LAPD’s internal report it reprints several false reports spread by police to justify their brutality, for example repeating an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c0af5dcdcd1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C582b8148e86413f63c708d8f9c390a9%7C642f961c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C3753836379823628127CUnknown%7CTWfbGZsb3d8eyJWIjo1MC4wLjAaMDAiLCJQIjoiV21uMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=Y9IF7Y1SBC%2FA5I%2FBeleJZZQXQI8lW9E5dXBehToChntQ%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time the report repeats every of inane and false details - including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative - the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s extremely popular demands to defund the police. 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 is eager to monitor, oppose, 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 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 for your time,

Victoria Lynn Moreno

From: SHERRY VARON
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 8:05 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; LAPCFFails; 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; 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.harriss-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Subject

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is the repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. These kinds of reforms have time and again failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, reforms like this keep expanding police violence.

All three reports centrally focus the voices of police. For example the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police but exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. That report even 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.

As for LAPD’s internal report it reprints several false reports spread by police to justify their brutality, for example repeating an account of “protesters drop[p]ing off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dccc1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission40lapd.online%7C5feb53d319c942a835d088d0f6446725%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C63753836746290776%7CUnknown%7CTwfbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LjJCQ1oiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IkhwaWwiLCJXVlJlMn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=WmGtSFg%2FrgkEhIME4w1n4jN1L13WeW6Pa3UuhqY6kfow%3D&reserved=0 > . At the same time the report repeats every manner of inane and false details - including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative - the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to ignore the community’s extremely popular demands to defund the police. 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 is eager to monitor, oppose, 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 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,
Sherry Varon

From: Jennifer Maldonado Tooley
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 8:06 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: Michel Moore; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; Councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; Councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org; Councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; Councilmember.kevin-deleon@lacity.org; Councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; Councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; Councilmember.Price@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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is the repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. These kinds of reforms have time and again failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, reforms like this keep expanding police violence.

All three reports centrally focus the voices of police. For example the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police but exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. That report even 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.

As for LAPD’s internal report it reprints several false reports spread by police to justify their brutality, for example repeating an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Furl%3Fq%3Dhttps%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Furl%3Fq%3Dhttps%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archival-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcc41d4762822294ce2e2d26amp%3Bsa%253D%2526source%253Deditors%2526amp%3Bust%253D16182430455000%2526amp%3Busg%253DAMoVw6mz6gHPUiD6Q6wjt9xc%2526sa%3D%2526source%3Deditors%2526ust%3D16182430455000%26usg%3DAMoVw6YLRKZHf6iAGFrARAKsYli1qVU%26c%3D1%26eq%3D85%26o%3D1%26source%3Dweb%26v%3Dc%26k%3D1%26hl%3De%26sa%3Dg%26tbm%3Dntchp%26pot%3D41%26prmd%3D1%26start%3D0> . At the same time the report repeats every manner of inane and false details — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s extremely popular demands to defund the police. 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 is eager to monitor, oppose, 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 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,

Jennifer Tooley

From: Jessie Medofer
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 8:10 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; lACPFCalls@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.ripley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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.rodriquez@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 04/12/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports
call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is the repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. These kinds of reforms have time and again failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, reforms like this keep expanding police violence.

All three reports centrally focus the voices of police. For example the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police but exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. That report even 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.

As for LAPD’s internal report it reprints several false reports spread by police to justify their brutality, for example repeating an account of “protesters drop[p]ing off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time the report repeats every manner of inane and false details - including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative - the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s extremely popular demands to defund the police. 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 is eager to monitor, oppose, 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 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,

Jessie Medofer

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 8:17 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 03/30/2021

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:

During this incredibly violent time for the LAPD, it's absolutely shameful that the board that purports to be the “citizens voice in police affairs” and any semblance of “oversight” is canceling meetings. It's extra shameful that you are pretending that the commission is observing Cesar Chávez Day and that's why the meeting is canceled. We know this is a lie, as you met in 2020 on Cesar Chávez Day <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Flapd-assets.lapdonline.org%2Fassets%2Fpdf%2F033120.pdf&data=047C017Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Cba6f9d612424433bce62f08d8tfe69ef7c642f6d1c34da460af8d4435764858837C0%7C7C637538374321143147CUknown%7CTWfpbGzb3d8eyJWj01MC4wLjA6MDAAiLCQIjoiV2luMzIiLCBTiI6Ik1hawW1LLCIXVCI6My63%7C100@&sdate=79vQ%2BNOGkETMbw1mFdqzG3z9dre54SUQyi12wNmp4xw%3D&r eserved=0> . To use the name of a man who spent his life working for the people as a reason to do the absolute opposite is shameful and disgusting.

In the month of March LAPD has continued its assault on LA community members, including a shooting spree where police fired their weapons at people six times in seven days, killing two people. In Echo Park, hundreds of officers in riot gear were amassed quickly and in secret, weaponized by City Councilman and Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee for the LA 2028 Olympic Games Mitch O'Farrell and deployed to clear folks deemed “undesirable” off land despite an ongoing crisis and shortage of safe and affordable housing.

As always, Police Commission Board members remained silent and seemingly oblivious and Mayor Garcetti deemed the military-style action a “success,” despite wide renouncement and rejection from community members the hostile eviction claimed to serve.
All of this serves to underscore that this use of city resources is what the state has always intended; that the police do not keep us safe, and that more funding, training, or structural or policy changes for LAPD are simply a diversion and a distraction from our true goal and plan: To defund the police. We demand defunding not reform, and demand the removal of the person at the head of it all, Chief Michel Moore, who continues to deny and defend LAPD's racist violence and actions, and who leads the push and plan for the department's expansion.

The police are inherently violent and cannot be reformed. We demand defunding, not reform! Fire Michel Moore and stop silencing the people!

Signed,

Becca vB

From: Asher Guthertz
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 8:49 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; 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; Mitch O'Farrell; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 04/13/2021

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,

There are three reports on LAPD violence during the uprising last summer on this week's agenda. Unsurprisingly, these reports are not only from the perspective and in defense of the police, but the "solution" identified to counter police violence is more money in your filthy pockets. The reports call for new resources, training, communications channels, policies, and powers, but we know that these reforms only
serve to momentarily quiet unrest, and do nothing to combat the greater structural issues of your supremacist force.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

Your commission has spent a year ignoring the clear and present truth: the city wants less of our money in your hands, not more. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” When I stop for a moment and think, it really is insane that while two thirds of the city can agree that at baseline some of your exorbitant budget should be directed to non-police services, you find a way to get away with retaining almost all of your money. Stop pretending that you have the interests of the city at heart. You are the puppets of the police union.

Signed,

Asher Guthertz

From: Andrea
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 8:55 AM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment 04/13/2021

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.
Hi there,

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcdcd1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Cadcaf3b7bab84fb888bd08d8f5db5a66f%7C642f6d1c34dd4f0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C63758397160454455%7CUnknown%7CTWfpbg2zs3dbd8eyJWIjo1MC4wLjAwMDA1LCJQIjo1V2luc3RhbGliLCJkIiwxNhVwIiwiXCJXVCI6Mm0%3D%7C1000&data=WKCo0%2FbVXt9ga%2FeAk13a28aXUX8fSbVA5NgGdbTiwX3D&reserved=0>. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local
programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Andrea Silenzi

Silver Lake, Los Angeles

From: Danielle Castrence
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 9:23 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@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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; Mitch O’Farrell; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, training, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the
community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. 

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website
claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Danielle Castrence

From: Lex Roman
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 9:21 AM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment 04/13/2021

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 commission -

On the agenda this week, there are three reports of LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising. These reports are filled with bias and fail to include the community’s perspective since they were created by police.

The reports call for new training which is not the answer. How many times are you going to tell yourselves this story before you realize decades of training has done nothing to eradicate the harm caused by police?

It’s astounding to watch LAPD make up stories to justify their violence. Lies like “protesters drop[p] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue.” The problem is so many of us have been present. We know these are lies. Whether we’re there in person or online, we see the horrific and deadly actions of the LAPD up close on a daily basis.

We know that LAPD is trying to protect their own force, their own funding, their six figure salaries. The community is demanding defunding of the police dept. The community is demanding less cops, not more training. Maybe you would know that if you let members of the community speak at your meetings.

Let the community speak. Let the community lead. End the deadly echo chamber of the LAPC and LAPD.

From: yoshiki
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 9:42 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: Michel Moore; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; 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.zahnisser@latimes.com; ethics.commission@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 three reports on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5ddc1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.onlne%7C93066465246233477088d8fdd1dbfc%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C637538425089940318%7CUnknow%7CTWFbGzsb3d8eyJWIjo1MC4wLjA4MDA1LCJQTjo1V2luaWQiLCJCI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=CjoiDqSPHIHIsxid1JXRafU96MNxwApYjMEOGgAI8HA%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail - including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative - the Department has been denying and falling to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Grecia Martinez

From: Tiana McKenna
Sent: Monday, April 12, 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 Soboroff; lacpfails@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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports
call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail— including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative—the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Sincerely,
Tiana McKenna
Los Angeles 90032
From: Erynn Bell
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 9:59 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; 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 04/13/2021

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.

Police Commission -

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for the police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to
TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Erynn Bell

--

Erynn Bell

Connect on LinkedIn
<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.linkedin.com%2Fprofile%2Fview%3Ffid%3D218318303%26trk%3Dnav_responsive_tab_profile&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Cee250d61534947d92410088fd056fe5c642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C6%7C0%7C63753843573236100%7CUnkown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjo1MC4wLjAwMDA1LCQIjo1V2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJCQC16M0%3D%7C1000&sdta=ZDi%2FBWZjxe2B%2Bu10tweZn9cawNC7JFjJISd1MfrE%3D&reserved=0>

From: michele dumont
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:07 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@legacyala.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore; William J. Briggs, II; tips@laiost.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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.

I am very upset about the reports on LAPD’s violence recently that will be discussed at the meeting this week. They suggest that more resources should be given to the LAPD to improve their use of violence. I am firmly convinced that no amount of money invested in the LAPD will make any difference. It never has in the past and never will. We need to put OUR money to better uses in the community and not into the LAPD. The PEOPLE have spoken and they do not want their money invested in the LAPD.

The three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5ddcd1d47622822294ce2e8d>
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Dr. Michele Dumont

From: Zach Sherwin
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:16 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; LAPC Fails; 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; david.zahniser@lalstimes.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 am a real individual human choosing to send this email. You will no doubt receive other emails with bodies that are very similar to this one, and you should not construe that as evidence of some robo-emailing operation but rather of widespread support for the points contained below.

Now then:

I scorn you. You are a failed oversight body. You are on the wrong side of history. You enable death. You are cowardly. You abuse bureaucracy to stifle community voices. You are hypocrites. Chief Moore is a bumbling incompetent and you know it.

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.
As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc82.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcdc1d47622822294ce2ee&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Caa18da64f25c4fdece92708d8fdd6d9e51%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0a8d4a3576485883%7C0%7C0%7C637538445520776090%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IkJhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sddata=91U3e7gnGlC855e0nM%2F101eMdI%2BAgDJX%2BjWw8jDvmmU%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail - including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative - the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Zach Sherwin

From: Gina Viola

Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:16 AM

To: Police Commission

Cc: mike.n.fueger@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Falls; lou@legacycla.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; 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: ANOTHER IGNORED AND NOT POSTED 'PUBLIC' COMMENT 4/13/2021

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.

Board of Police Commissioners:

This body is the facilitator of white people's addiction to law enforcement and it is costing Black, Brown and Poor people greatly. Everyday I wake up to news of another person killed by police and I know that bodies such as this one pave the way for that to occur on the regular.

I saw the three reports on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcdc1d47622822294ce2e8d>
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at our meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Gina Viola (she/her/hers)

https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fmedium.com%2Fgender-inclusivity-2-why-i-put-pronouns-on-my-email-signature-and-linked-in-profile-and-you-should-too-d3dc942c8743&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C623c9d5872fd61c34dd4fd0af8d43576485583%7C0%7C6375384435991149754%7Cunknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoieAwxMzg4LjM5MiIsImFjdGlvbiI6NTkzOTc4NzQyNywiZG9jdW1lbnQiOnsidXNlcnZpY2VnaW5lZiI6Ijg2MTM1Nzg0NzQ4OGQxZDc3NmEyODZkZjZkOTFmZCIsImFwaS1pZC1pZCIsImV4cG9ydF9wcm92aWRlZCI6MjY2Nzg2NjU0MzQ0NzEzMiIsInJlc291cmNlX25pZCI6NzQwMjg5OTI3MTQxOTQ4NTYwXSwiYXV0aF90aW1lIjoxODU1MDA4MTQ4LCJhdWQiOiJibHVlLWh1ZGwwLXVwcy0wIiwibGFuZ3VhcyI6Z159&spv=0&rel=0

https://docs.google.com/uc?export=download&id=1YZUY2r_Kc11YeURszZS2X9tb46p9W3L&revid=0BzmF7ak0jv1PRklMenZ51NaMkEzcnFrK29zazhEMGxsBzBPQ
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: Camille Sacristan
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:17 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@legacy-la.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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again,
these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff's report even 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 (POID), 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 City Council.

As for LAPD's internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of "protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue" that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dccdc1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C6a0ce3eead64666dbf808d8fdd6d52b%7C64 2fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C637538444489997%7CUnknown%7C7%7FPgpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjojMC4wLjAwMDAilCJQIjoiV2luZm9iCiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=R0fo 9DDsPwVQON3VbbRjBtqK1T8TRGHBDeO0kXCGh4%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail - including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative - the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community's evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community's demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We're all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who's admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. It also doesn't escape my notice that you're using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap
your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the "citizens' voice in police affairs," stop stifling citizens' voices.

Signed,

Camille Sacristan
Los Angeles Resident

From: Magan Wiles
Sent: Monday, April 12, 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; lapcfails@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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community's experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff's report even 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 (PDD), 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. 

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Magan Wiles

From: Court Val
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:23 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; kevlin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dccc1d47622822294ce2e&amp;data=04%7C0%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C62fda6ec80f84d17324608d8fdd7a536%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d44435764b5883%7C0%7C0%7C637538449926163808%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJwIjoiMC4wIjAwMDA1LCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IkhaWi1CJXCI6Mn0KX30%7Ci000&amp;data=TSj%2BwFlVMgy%28d5rab6yXZuyVYLRkWCilin38cZg0%3D&amp;reserved=0>. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail— including references to
TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Courtney Valentine

From: Hannah Sands <reddacted>
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:28 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.pector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.israkrian@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: Re: Public Comment 04/13/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open
I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communication channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. The report repeats every manner of inane and false detail – including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Hannah Sands
Los Angeles Resident

From: Harrison Weinfeld
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:15 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; Fails Lapc; 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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the
community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 (PVID), 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Furl%3Fq%3Dhttps%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Furl%3Fq%3Dhttps%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Furl%3Fq%3Dhttps%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archival-injustice-2217e8c8af5ddc14d47622822294ce2e2% 526amp%3Bsa%253DD%2526amp%3Bsource%253Deditors%2526amp%3Bust%253D161825856012000%2526amp%3Busg%253DatoVaaw0hOvB-BBPu167TcpH4ZMdx%26sa%253Dsource%3Deditors%26ust%3D161825856012000%26usg%3DAOfVaw0fVuvKKmcoSv4y5q48Yq5_Y2&data=04%7C017%7Cpolicecommission%4 0lapd.online%7C814f740ed7b74d759064888fdeda82b%7C642fd1c34dd4fd0af8443576485883%7 C0%7C63753846261265812%7CUnknown%7C4wFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LjQIjoiV2lu MzI1cJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXViI6IHBi6%3D%3D%3Ci000%3Ddata%3D1EBTAARDMb6aDgKymLHHSdQ%2BhUfNyeJDREryVEEqQ2ZQl3%3D%3D%3D%3Dreserved=0> At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website
claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Harrison Weinfeld

From: kristen studard
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:36 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; 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; Mitch O’Farrell; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

We have all seen that reform doesn’t work and that real change must be made.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD's internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of "protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue" that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcdc1d47e22822294ce2e8&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Cd5d7f9f223254927b7be98d8fdd98485%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485583%7C0%7C0%7C637538457990530591%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjo1MC4wLjAwMDAlLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXViI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=3CqNet80k70QMEEWW1w7VMVyqDw1wYr9%2FFnejyYKZ00%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community's evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community's demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We're all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who's admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. It also doesn't escape my notice that you're using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the "citizens' voice in police affairs," stop stifling citizens' voices.

Signed,

Kristen Studard

From: Monica Monzingo
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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and falling to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,
Monica Monzingo

From: Dawy Rkasnum
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:48 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 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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, training, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts
of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 communities and keep secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges and members of City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5cdcc1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C49b4892db1e144cf8026f8028f9ddbe2e09%7C64 2fd61c3c3edf6af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C637538465114647298%7CUUnknown%7CTWpfbg7szb3db8 eyJWJjoi1MC4wlJAwMDA1LCQfjmoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiIlIiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=GBHx 20MlonT2JhWuw9O05XXKBoq%2FBovgRcn6xKw8Dyg%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail – including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Dawy Rkasnuam

From: Greg Irwin
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:50 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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the
May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail—INCLUDING references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative—the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,
Greg Irwin
90035

From: Chris Riddle [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:53 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: Michel Moore; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; 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; mke.n feu@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 04/13/2021

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 LAPC,

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble
Avenue" that was debunked by the Associated Press last June.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 criticise police.

I do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

--

Chris Riddle
Second AD

www.imdb.me/chrisriddle
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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40
cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Elizabeth Sommer

Los Angeles Resident

From: Margaret Starbuck
Sent: Monday, April 12, 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; 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; 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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30–40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. 

At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community's demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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. This is a moment when the LAPC can take action to actually make changes, reject these reports that seek to increase police funding and resources, call out the lies perpetrated by the reports, and call for defunding of the LAPD.

I do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We're all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who's admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. It also doesn't escape my notice that you're using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the "citizens' voice in police affairs," stop stifling citizens' voices.

Signed,

Margaret Starbuck

From: Samantha Spaccasi
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:07 AM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mikeskinner@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; 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 4/13/21

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 and members of City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dccc1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C3ecc751e74741b4ca430b8fddd7a8%7C642f6d1c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C637538476266652877%7CUnknown%7CWFpbGZsb3d8eyJNIjo1MC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoYV2luMzI1LCAjT1IhahWw1lCjXVCIE6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=n5%2F2wFUCw07Vzb9%2FxvJ1LdaduNnXPLaZii08S4cZ%2FML%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

From: Ellen DenHerder

Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:01 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@lalist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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: Police Commissioners Meeting Public Comment 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week.

Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, training, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have
failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[pling] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dccd1d47628222294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C5f0df73b4206411d8be608d8fdccfc3%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C63753847858194371%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjo1MC4wLjAwMDA1LCJQIjoyV2luMzllLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCIE6Mn0%3D%7CI00v&sdata=NMzVssRs1bv3y8SNVf95B2a1VXpxW3bja0uY%2BAP%2FZfgk%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail – including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap
your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,
Ellen

---

Ellen Boudreau-Den Herder
Artist | Community Programming Specialist

Pronouns: She, Her

From: Phoebe Neidhardt  [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:10 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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers.
This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5ddcc1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C83752d102f8843abc68e08d8fddde490e%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8bd4357485b83%7C0%7C0%7C6375384784190553%7Cunknown%7C7WfpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjo1MC4wLjAwMDAaLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJCXVCIEhMn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=bK2hnh%2BBAd6Ulf1g30Ak2C7USVhP0hClw3a%2FglLaA%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with
Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Phoebe Neidhardt

From: Michelle King
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:12 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; 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 04/13/2021

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 see the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. These reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail – including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It's evident that you're using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices. LA has reopened, these meetings can resume in-person.

In community,

Michelle King

From: Maraky Alemseged
Sent: Monday, April 12, 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@lalist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; david.zahniser@latimes.com; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; paul.krekorian@lacity.org; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org;
I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5d6c1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Copolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Cedbebef8975b466787da88d8fde007fc%7C642f61c34dd4f8d8435764b588%7C0%7C1%7C63758485939073941%7Cunknown%7CtWpbg7s8d8eyJWjojIMc4wuLjAwMDAiLC3QiIjoiV2JmZwIiLiLC7TiI6Ik1haWiLCjXVCI6Mn0%3D7C3000&data=uD%2Bux5OhOp6FkzFs17Mq9VdDIY7mHMY8IMd40mIRpo%3D&reserved=0>. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of innane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has
been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

BLACK LIVES MATTER

Signed,

Maraky A. Alemseged

From: Ken Barnard
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:26 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.borin@lacity.org; 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 04/13/2021

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.

Commission,

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 (PDIID), 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Ken B.

From: Mike Wodkowski
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:37 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; 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; 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; lapcfails@gmail.com
Subject: Public Comment 04/13/2021

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 am writing regarding the agenda this week, which includes three reports on LAPD’s violence during the demonstrations last summer that were inspired by the nationwide demand for justice for George Floyd and the countless Black and brown victims of police brutality within our city. If those three reports are supposed to be demonstrations of what constitutes “objectivity” and “accountability” within LAPD,
then they make perfect evidence for the argument that the very ideas of objectivity and accountability have been co-opted and weaponized to further cement white supremacist objectives AS A MATTER OF CITY POLICY. These reports are the equivalent of asking a rapist to tell the story of what happened, and for that to be the only admitted evidence in their trial.

A simple look at the basic numbers in these reports proves how flimsy they are as any kind of document of self-examination: the report by Gerald Chaleff consulted over 100 police and a mere TEN community members, all of whom were hand picked by City Council.

A simple look at the lies the reports perpetrate in order to justify police brutality proves how desperate the reports are in the face of what was widely observed and documented. The LAPD internal report reprints several false accounts including one of “protesters dropping off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue.” This report was debunked by the Associated Press last June and STILL the LAPD is trying to use this as justification, as well as dreamed up references to Tik Tok videos and “anonymous tips” that fly in the face of intelligent, evidentiary analysis. I can only conclude that this is because ever since last summer the evidence has overwhelmingly demonstrated that the LAPD bore responsibility for provoking violence, making unjustifiable arrests, and repeated demonstrations of illegal use of force.

A simple look at the proposed solutions in these reports demonstrates the sickening cynicism with which the LAPD is trying to use these expressions of outrage and pain in the face of relentless abuse to leverage their own power. Using the same formula used in the wake of past uprisings dating as far back as the Watts rebellion, the LAPD suggests that the solution to their OWN brutality, corruption and abuse of power is: more power. More “training” more “communication channels” more surveillance, more monitoring of political activity, an entire new bureau devoted to of Public Order Policing?! Those of us who remember the Public Disorder Investigation Division that was used to spy upon community groups and keep dossiers on anyone ranging from citizens to judges who the police found a potential threat to their regime, can smell the racist stink on this proposal.
The LAPD is a desperate, transparent machine that has been given too much power for too long. This was the upshot of the demands by Angelenos for defunding the police and diverting that funding to community services that are COMPLETELY UNAFFILIATED with law enforcement in any way. This is the upshot of continuing and increasing demands by Angelenos that Police Associations be transparent, accountable and held to public scrutiny. As for myself and many others, I would add to that a call for the dismantling of these associations altogether.

The shooting of Duante Wright in Minneapolis demonstrates yet again the imbalance of justice afforded to law-breaking law enforcement in this entire country, and LAPD stands at the top of the heap. Officers are coddled and protected, crying for “investigations” and “due process” and “let’s not judge until we’ve heard the whole story” while another Black man lies dead, and the department scrambles to muster up some gossamer nonsense that everyone can see straight through. The officers keep their jobs, they’re defended by lawyers funded by their associations, and they claim the solution is more cops, more resources, more money. I cannot begin to outline my rage and disgust with the entire institution, and the institutions that support it. Thanks to law enforcement policy and brutality and the racism it perpetuates, you are responsible for a generation of children who don’t trust police in the slightest.

With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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. And this is what these reports describe: an LAPD willing to sling whatever nonsense it can to keep its powers to abuse the predominantly Black and brown citizens of Los Angeles ON BEHALF OF the white and affluent citizens of Los Angeles. Are you just going to sit there in the face of this obvious truth and do nothing?

As for the public comment process, we know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It stands to reason that your insistence on the randomness of your speaker selection process is untrustworthy. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment
period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Mike Wodkowskii

Los Angeles

From: Mayank Keshavia[redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:37 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; 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: My Public Comment 04/13/2021

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 Commission:

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the
May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time, the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail—including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative—the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Disgustedly,
Mayank Keshaviah

Los Angeles, CA 90034
From: Allen Martsch <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:51 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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are
on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are
written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports
call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers.
This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking
down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the
May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again,
these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the
community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For
example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10
community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even
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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police
to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[p]ing” off 30-40
cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble
Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June
cle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcd1d47622822294ce2e8d
ata=04%7C0%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C436076234d1b4748108188d8fe3f87a7c64
2fd61c34dd4fd0af8d4435764b5b83%7C8%7C0%7C637538502862618161%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8
ey3W1joicMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMiziIlLCJBTiiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCJ6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=b39rgNpnu1ZHJdfPtsYdph%2F5yyhgm3y16G1MBE1%2F1TM%3D&reserved=0>. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Allen Martsch

N. Hollywood

From: Annedell Walker
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:52 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; 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;
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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5d5dcd147622822294a2e2&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C3627f3b66e6468a927500d88fde410ba%7C642fd61c34dd4f0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C637538503286148267%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=V6fDjFttmjkXX%2Fany31KwOcYR4ybN9jGebjJnyCw%3D&reserved=0>. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail – including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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.

The reality of the uprising over the summer is clear to all who attended, LAPD violently responded to overwhelmingly peaceful protests, abused citizens and broke the law by using excessive force. The citizens of Los Angeles want a new way forward, they want services, not police. The answer is not police reform, it is the redistribution of police dollars into communities of color, who have historically underfunded community programs and supports. I demand that LAPD stop targeting black and brown communities and treating them as if they are dangerous criminals and instead take those tax dollars that are wasted on police, which could be transformational for BIPOC youth, houseless and elderly people.

I do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Annedell Walker

From: sylke rene meyer
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:54 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; 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;
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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We're all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who's admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn't. It also doesn't escape my notice that you're using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the "citizens' voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens' voices.

Best,

Sylke Rene Meyer

From: Kimberli Meyer
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:58 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; 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; 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 04/13/2021

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,
Well. I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcd1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C367f1e2626734d0353608d8fde4ed4b%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d44357648583%7C0%7C0%7C537538506986615090%7CUnknown%7C7WfpbGZsb3d8eyJwujo1MW4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjo1MjIwMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1hamwiLCJCXCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=sLN%2BsfD2g7yfJ16stlcnpfu3jBzVoj2sEk6vRo5PKM%3D&reserved=0>. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail— including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative— the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Sincerely,

Kimberli Meyer

From: Zoë Nissen
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:58 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@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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 04/13/2021

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:

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again,
these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are not those of involved community members, but those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters dropping off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press

https://gcc92.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2FArticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8a5cdcc1d47522b22294ce5e&id=647c017copolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C5079e4219c44cd9e54408d8fde47f9b%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C637538507143635349%7CUnknown%7CTWpFbGZsb3d8eyJWjoiMC4wLjJ4dTAiLCJQIjoiV211MzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1hawWlCJXVCI6Mn03D%7C1000&data=zrg2S%2FGOr6vXp6GA2PmzSjS5ShN5WtM2wDA1cTY%3D&reserved=0 last June. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose those who are confronting its violence and power. LAPD has always used its powers of surveillance to target Black and brown communities, and to repress those who criticize police.

I do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.
Signed,

Zoë Nissen
90026

From: Sarah Bowers
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 12:06 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mike.n.feuern@lacity.org; Mayor Helpdesk; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa; Steve Soboroff; LAPC Fails; lou@legencyla.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; daniel.vazquez@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.buscaiano@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment 04/13/2021

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 Board of Commissioners,

ITEMS 2A-2B:
Lack of Impartiality and Independent Reporting
Why do you think that reports on LAPD’s violence by police will be impartial? Instead of doing a full report on and from the community’s experience, the 3 reports on LAPD’s violence are written to fit police narratives and police desires to expand their department. Even in Gerald Chaleff’s report, he spoke to over 100 police and to 10, ONLY 10, community members who were also picked by the City Council. This is just like how you all only give 45 minutes for community members from a city of 3.9 million people to speak and then you say that you’re “listening” to them.

Reports Include False and Debunked Accounts
LAPD’s internal report includes several accounts that have already been debunked, like the false accusation of protestors dropping off bricks and rocks next to a bus stop. These are false accounts that officers have spread to justify their violence and brutality.

At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail – including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests. This is the epitome of fake news being used by the police for the police. Who is fact-checking and substantiating these videos and tips?
Rewarding LAPD with Expanded Powers for their Misconduct
The reports' suggestions calling for more resources, "training," and greater coordination among the department is merely a rehashing and renaming of what they've always done - rebrand themselves and give themselves more power to crack down on protests and critics. This has happened often in history, from the Watts Rebellion, to the May Day demonstrations, and to Ferguson protests.

What Angelenos Want
LAPD, the City, and its other allies have created these reports to promote a false narrative that we need the LAPD. In truth, we know we don't. You and LAPD know that over a third of Angelenos support dismantling the LAPD and over half of Angelenos support redirecting police funds to other community resources, but you still do nothing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
I demand that you stop capping your meetings' public comment period at a mere forty-five minutes. You give 45 minutes for public comment from a city of 4 million people. 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: Brett Loie [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 12:11 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@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; Councilmember Bonin; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community's experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking
down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff's report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD's internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of "protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue" that was debunked by the Associated Press last June

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and
can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Brett

From: Tiff Guerra
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 12:14 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; LAPC Fails; 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; 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; Mitch O'Farrell; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaimo@lacity.org
Subject: comment police commission 4-13-2021

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.

Hi,

I’m going to focus my comments today on the LAPD report Safe LA Civil Unrest Task Force Blah Blah Report as there is a specific question I have about the numerous mentions of pallets of bricks.

Pallets of bricks are mentioned numerous times in the report, and page 37-38 notes that "On numerous occasions, officers and community members saw protesters being supplied with fireworks and other items that could cause property destruction and/or personal injury. Throughout the City and in cities throughout the nation, large pallets of bricks were found on streets and sidewalks for no apparent reason. It appeared that unknown persons were supplying protesters with objects to use against officers and create destruction."

The reporting of pallets of bricks is also entered into the timeline on the bottom of page 37.

Considering this is a record of events that may be (I hope not) used as a reference for some poor sap in the future regarding LAPD’s version of what happened, did the writers of the report think it was important to also note that the bricks were, in at least 2 instances found to have been (a) not newly there and (b) directly linked
to a construction project, which could be accounted for by a community member?

Regarding nation-wide reports of brick staging, this was also mostly found to be unfounded (like the "white van" phenomenon whereby if you are looking for a white van, you will suddenly see them everywhere, when really they were there all along). There is an AP article

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2F9004370391&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Cacc00f35de2d43f2f77708d8fde717e4%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C63753816267721594%7CUnknown%7C7CWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJ1IiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=xGdMDNHfxEgppnP8kvtM8UAuU9Y%2FtCqE8sk1U%2F4a8o%3D&reserved=0>

regarding the brick reports, and that specifically discussed the bricks on Ventura Blvd.

It feel ridiculous to be talking about bricks, but the larger point is this fits into what LAPD and specifically Michel Moore (and his predecessors before him) love to do through reports and the media... repeat claims and bogus reports of things that may have happened, or that someone said happened,, amplifying it to make it seem as if it were a credible threat.

In the meantime, things like WHY WERE PROTESTORS ANGRY does not get discussed. WHY ARE PEOPLE PISSED does not get discussed. How LAPD beats the shit out of people or harrasses people does not get discussed - those experiences people had get minimized and whittled away and denied and erased, while LAPD says now they need SHIELDS and GOGGLES and ANTI-DRONE TECHNOLOGY and BETTER SOCIAL MEDIA SPYING tech and this and that and this and that.

No. Fuck y'all. Defund the police. We reject these false narratives and police lies. We know LAPD reports for what they are - lies and stories written by those determined to uphold the status quo (congratulations, that's white supremacy, patriarchy, xenophobia, ableism, and heteronormativity).

Steve Soboroff I am glad you read the reports. Please read the LAPD budget next, and here's the key part - also share it! it seems to be something of a mystery so far (or, something LAPD is unable to produce publically? Weird!)

Defund the police,

--

T Guerra
they/them/their
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 three reports on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community's experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff's report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD's internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of "protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue" that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farti
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Danielle Carne

From: Hannah Burstein
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 12:34 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; 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;
Hello,

I'm writing about the reports about LAPD's ridiculous use of violence and terror during the protests for Black Lives in summer 2020. These reports do not reflect the lived experiences of people on the ground but rather take into account only the police perspective. REFORM IS NOT THE ANSWER. LAPD has always and will continue to surveil Black and brown communities and ask for more and more resources to criminalize the most vulnerable while making neighborhoods LESS safe.

FIRE MOORE. DEFUND THE POLICE.

Sincerely,

Hannah Burstein
CD 4
LA born and raised.

From: Kristen McCown
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 12:37 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mke.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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community's experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers.
This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,
Kristen McCown

From: Rachel Rosenbloom
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 12:57 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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 (PVID), 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail - including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative - the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,
Rachel Rosenbloom
resident zip code - 90028
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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaieff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaieff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. See https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Furl%3Fq%3Dhttps%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Furl%3Fq%3Dhttps%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcd1d4762822294ce2e%2F256amp%3Bsa%253DD%2526amp%3Bsource%253Deditors%2526amp%3Bust%253D161825375350600%2526amp%3Bustg%253D9vAvaw2qQNQsayVDH1C8_CI0Eh4Z%26sa%3DD%26source%3Deditors%26ust%3D161
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Jack MacCarthy

From: ashley brim [redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 1:03 PM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment 4/13

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,

Is the only material you are reviewing regarding LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising written by the LAPD? I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence that are on the agenda this week and those reports ignore the community’s experience and
are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, training, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

It is my understanding that LAPD officers have already done training as an effort to "reform" their reaction to protesters after they caused so much harm last June. That "training" wasn't evident a couple of weeks ago at Echo Park where they kettled peaceful protesters, shot unarmed civilians at close range with "less than lethal" bullets, broke someone's arm by beating them with a baton, and gave a young woman who was walking to her house a concussion. If this isn't evidence that "retraining" LAPD doesn't work, I don't know what is.

As for LAPD's internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of "protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue" that was debunked by the Associated Press last June (https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https://3A%2F2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5ddcc1d47622822294ce2e%0d%0data%04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Caaba9dd149954fb563a108d8fdee0b8a%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C6375385461226966223%7CUnknown%7CTkFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoMc4wJAwMDA1LCJqiilS3yiIK1haWwLJCJVICI6ประจำ%3D%7C1000&isdata=0&). It is clear they will cite ANYTHING, even falsehoods, because they have no defense for their actions.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community's demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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.

What are you doing to include the civilians you represent in your consideration of this report? Will you continue to limit the public's input to 45 minutes for your
whole agenda? As a resident of LA who was in the streets during the uprisings, I
know that the reports from the police’s point of view do not paint the whole
picture. The whole picture includes unmasked police in riot gear escalating tension,
providing confusing commands, kettling protestors after declaring unlawful assembly,
and using their weapons to violently attack unarmed peaceful protestors.

- A. Brim

Ashley Paige Brim // she/her/hers
Co-Producer / HOMELAND
Director / An Act of Terror
Fox Directing Lab 2018-19
HALF Initiative Directing Fellow 2017
YES on J!
la%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Caaba9dd149954fb563a108d8fdeee0b
8a%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d44357648588%7C0%7C0%7C637538546122706169%7CUnknown%7CTWFpb
GZsb3d8eyWIjoiMC4wlJAwMDA1LCJCIjoiV2luMztIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=DLHrAHgkC%2B8pNz%2BZzS86alrzB9VM3yw%2BQJoxN7xA%3D&reserved=0>

ashleypaigebrim.com

m%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Caaba9dd149954fb563a108d8fdeee0b8
a%7C642fd61c34dd4fd0af8d44357648588%7C0%7C0%7C637538546122706169%7CUnknown%7CTWFpb
GZsb3d8eyWIjoiMC4wlJAwMDA1LCJCIjoiV2luMztIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=7XjsxDHmC%2F2MQQyCtD4QKNI%2BGlflfIooQFc%3D&reserved=0>

From: Catherine Safley
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 1:07 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; lapcfaills@gmail.com; lou@LegacyLA.org; Richard Tefank; Michel Moore;
William J. Briggs, II; tips@last.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org;
councilmember.boni@lacity.org; 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.

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports disregard the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Rooted in the perspective of police, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This repeats the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Each time they’ve been implemented, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms continue to expand and increase police violence.

In all three reports, the voices of police are centered. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reiterates several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters dropping” off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. 

At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Catherine Safley

From: Erin English
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 1:58 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@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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 04/13/2021

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 members of the Police Commission,

Like many others writing you today, I've seen the three reports on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is NOT what constituents are asking for when we talk about the reallocation of resources away from law enforcement—this is ratcheting up funding for the LAPD, the very opposite! This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June (<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcd1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C8869eadd83ca45aa92a908d8df5ab1c%7C642f61c34dd4fd0af8d4435764b85883%7C0%7C17%7C637538578873042740%7CUnknown%7CtwFpbGZsb3d8eyJvIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LjQ1OTx2LzllIiI6IkhvLVJvIiN0%3D%7C3000&sdata=Lnh731muPkd1syQLKsv9yUKjvDHPwvtRMBaF%2BhCvQfY%3D&reserved=0>). At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail—including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative—the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

One of the most powerful developments of the last year has been the democratization of the access to participate in local civic life and politics. We as a community are more engaged than ever before and this is the time to listen to the demands of the people you serve.

With concern,

Erin English

CD4 Resident of Los Feliz

From: Madeline Seales
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 2:02 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; 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;
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 Police Commission,

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. 

At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of
brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Madeline Seales
From: elizabeth windom [redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 2:22 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@lalst.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; Mayor Garcetti; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June

https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5ddcc1d47622822294ce2ed ata%3D04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7Caaceceb33067b495180dc08d8fd92be8%7C64 2fd61c34dd4fd0a8fd443576485883%7C0%7C0%7C637538593865334765%7CUnknown%7CTWfpbGZsb3d8 eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAilLCJqiOiV2luMzIiLCJBiIiI6Ik1haWw1LCJCXCI6Mn0%3D%7C0808sdata%3D4Ky D49706QDN6Iw1K4mImof%2BNDXRHX9axHxL%2F0%3D&reserved=0>. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail - including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative - the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Windom

From: Bethany Heykoop
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 2:49 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: Michel Moore; Councilmember.Blumenfield@lacity.org; Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; 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; lapcfail@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 4/13/21

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again,
these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June.  

As the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and
can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

-Bethany Heykoop

From: Cody Sloan
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 3:06 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; LAPC Fails; 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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters dropping off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap a public meeting period at a pa...
From: Hannah Gibson
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 3:07 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@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; 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: 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.

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 Commission,

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.
In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail – including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host seizes who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Sincerely,

Hannah Gibson

---

From: T Sches
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 3:17 PM
To: Police Commission
Cc: mke.n.feuer@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Eileen Decker; ethics.commission@lacity.org; Dale Bonner; Sandra Figueroa-Villa;
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 three reports on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week ignore the community's experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. The report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, each from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff's report even 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 thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges and members of City Council.

As for LAPD's internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of "protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue" that was debunked by the Associated Press last June.

Subject: Public Comment 04/13/2021
At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail—including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative—the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

We see very clearly the real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports which is to override the community’s widely held demands for defunding the police. A Loyola Marymount study presented to the Police Commission in December showed that two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs,” and that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It is also transparent that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Tyan Schessner

From: Rick Lesser
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 3:31 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; 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 04/13/2021 - The Pro-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.
Like many American citizens, I am tired, disappointed, and frustrated to watch your reactions to direct protests by Black Lives Matter, WP4BL, and members of LAPCFails over LAPD’s violent, militaristic handling of protestors’ legal, but loud and often angry demands that things in LA change. As usual, your work, supposedly as a citizen commission to keep an eye on, and help enforce sound police policies, but too reject often-failing “reforms,” like—yes, once again—recommending revised training that over decades, even centuries, has failed to impact the racist treatment of people of color in the United States by the law’s supposed enforcers.

The police culture in this country is out of step with the people, which is especially noticeable in recent years where a camera is in most people’s pockets and they promptly show the public what is actually happening on too many American streets.

Wake up! The times are changing, as they are bound to do, and you folks mostly seem to be fighting what a majority of Americans want from our politicians, corporations, and our law enforcement officers. Big broad change is required to fix this deadly epidemic of cops shooting to kill, and way too often at people of color.

LAPC: Wake up and properly perform your jobs.

The three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5ddcdec1d4762282294ce2e8&data=0%7C0%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C0%7C0%7C0%7C63753834649902832%7CUknown%7CTWpGbGZsb3d8eyYWJiSj1MC4wLjAwMDA1LjQ1NjQwNzN0%3D%3D%7C30000&sddata=PKr0L3kn7wGKsQsd5S2QSLSxIlgU2IaXr3p7zG7N2018HxX%3D&reserved=0> . At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail – including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Richard Lesser
From: Ted Trembinsk
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 3:44 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; 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 04/13/2021

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,

Based on the three reports on LAPD’s violent response to the community uprising we saw this summer, the police need more resources, training, policies, and powers. I REJECT this notion, as it has been delivered from and for police themselves. As a community member, I REJECT any notion that the LAPD requires more resources or funding, but that we need to allocate monies that could go to policing to preventative community management and growth. I am completely unconvinced that reforms like body cams and bias training will result in less police violence in LA. I fear that it will give more context for police brutality in the future.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time that
the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community's evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community's demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to "completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs." With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 ask to end the 45 minute public comment time limit. I believe this further limits the voices of the public, especially those most disenfranchised.

If you could screen share the waiting list of people in line to give comment, community members, like me, could at least know if they might have a chance to speak at the meeting. I ask this commission to brainstorm a way that encourages and builds community interaction. As someone who hears many of the same voices calling in week to week it is frustrating to continuously be denied an opportunity to speak while I patiently wait and hear other community members voice their opinions.

Finally, I continue to see unmasked officers in public - I worry not only for their health but also for the health of all the LA citizens they interact with. Especially while LA continues to enter this "new phase", public safety should be the highest priority for the department, especially when it is something as easy as staying masked in public. As long as officers have positions of authority and power on our streets, I demand that they model safety for all, especially after the department has had so many already affected by COVID.

Signed,
Ted Trembinski

From: Natalia Ospina
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 3:47 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 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; 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;
I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters dropping off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Furl%3Fq%3Dhttps%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Furl%3Fq%3Dhttps%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dc81d4762282294ce2e2526amp%3Bsaa%253DD%2526amp%3Bsource%253Deditors%2526amp%3Bust%253D16185985932100%2526amp%3Bust%253D26amp%3Bsg%253D3DAOvav22CPIqMUE5xyv1Uj9CjyY%26sa%3DD%26源泉%3Deditors%26ust%3D16185985937700%26usg%253D3DAOvav3YABqxOVA8SwEeK0eEv%3J&data=04%7C01%7C0policecommission%40lapd.online%7C1%7C4af8%0856154254341408d%8fe6d4dcd7%642fd61c34dd4fd68d443576485883%7C8%7C1%7C6153R4445192749%7CUnknown%7CTWfpbG2s68eYWjoiMC4wLjAwMDA1LCIQjoi1VuMzIiLCJ3BTiI6Ik1haww1LCJXCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=Vyz0QnzfH%287j1yAvd44tPKI6brHeKpvJUeqBAHRpti8%3D&reserved=0>. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not trust the assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Sincerely,

Natalia

Sent from my iPhone
From: Jenny Reed
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 4:01 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; 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 04/13/2021

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open
I saw the three reports on LAPD's violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community's experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff's report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD's internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of "protesters drop[p]ing off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue" that was debunked by the Associated Press last June.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community's demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

-Jenny Reed

From: Jenn Murphy
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 4:03 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; 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; 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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking
down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Jenn Murphy
From: Michele Wetteland
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,

The three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on LAPD police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding abusive, traumatizing, wasteful police violence. How much trauma and waste must occur for this body to dismantle itself and adopt a 21st century preventative approach to community safety? Will you ever reimagine public safety?

All three reports are propagandized spin, where the primary voices are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff contained input from over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 thinly veiled 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 while keeping secret dossiers on thousands of activists, organizers, and community members as well as judges and members of City Council. The LA Times reported 73 allegations of less serious force. Were any of these people included in your reports? More than 3,000 people were arrested by LAPD in the 2020 Summer protests. Did you receive any feedback from any of them for your support of
an expanded LAPD presence?

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters dropping off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests. Chief Michael Moore has been documented repeatedly lying to the public and press. Is this a culture that his leadership encourages and empowers? Is there nothing this body will do to stop this atmosphere of mistrust? Do you also support it? Is this why you keep Michael Moore employed as the Chief of LAPD? Is there no bar too low for you to fire Chief Moore? Do you support documented lies? Is this why there has been no response to Commissioner Soboroff’s backroom deals for funding? Is this why this body does not require documentation on original sources of LAPPL donations? Are lies and abuses of power what this body is happy to uphold? Do you even desire a community safety model that builds trust? If so, where is your track record to prove this? What is your example of requiring transparency and accountability for facts?

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the widely held community’s demands for defunding the police. Sadly, LAPD shows itself as eager to monitor and oppose 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, these reports are more of the same wasteful abuses. This body is well aware of the Loyola Marymount study presented to this Commission in December 2020. I watched as it was presented in print and power point to all of you. It showed that around two-thirds of Angelenos support proposals to “redirect some money currently going to the police budget to local programs,” and that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” Why then did this body send a recommendation for an expanded budget to City Council? Do you operate to only support data which expands LAPD?

Finally, I do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting and can select who gets to speak and who does not. It also does not escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to
cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices. Why are you content to allow mundane details points of division?

Signed,

Michele Wetteland
pronouns: she/her

From: Thea Rodgers
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 4:32 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@laist.com; kevin.rector@latimes.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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 04/13/2021

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.

Hi,

My name is Thea Rodgers and I’m writing from CD13 about the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd protests that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the experience of civilians and protesters from the LA community and are written from, by, and for police.

Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even
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 City Council.

As for LAPD’s Internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail – including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative – the Department has been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t.

It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

--

Thea Rodgers

From: Elizabeth Bates
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 4:33 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 Falls; 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 Mike Bonin; 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 4/13/21

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.

Hello,

I saw the three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 City Council. This is atrocious and would be a threat to privacy.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June. <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcd1d47622822294ce2e&data=04%7C01%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C3a93e78a56f74c4c875f08d8fe0b67e9%7C64>
The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed

Elizabeth, 90034

From: Dain McClurg
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 4:41 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; counciilmember.bonin@lacity.org; 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.rodriquez@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 04/13/2021

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 three reports on LAPD’s violence during the George Floyd uprising that are on the agenda this week. Those reports ignore the community’s experience and are written from, by, and for police. Based on that police perspective, the reports call for new resources, trainings, communications channels, policies, and powers. This is a repeat of the same cycle that followed past examples of police cracking down on their critics, including during the Watts Rebellion, the 1992 uprising, the May Day demonstrations, and the Ferguson uprising in 2014. Time and time again, these sorts of reforms have failed to reduce police violence the next time the community protests. Instead, such reforms simply keep expanding police violence.

In all three reports, the voices given center stage are those of police. For example, the report by Gerald Chaleff spoke to over 100 police and exactly 10 community members, all from a list handpicked by City Council. Chaleff’s report even 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 rarely 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 and members of City Council.

As for LAPD’s internal report, it reprints several false accounts spread by police to justify their brutality, including an account of “protesters drop[ping] off 30-40 cages of bricks and rocks next to the bus stop on Ventura Boulevard and Noble Avenue” that was debunked by the Associated Press last June <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapnews.com%2Farticle%2Fmedia-social-media-archive-racial-injustice-2217e8c8af5dcd1cd47622822294ce2e&data=84%7C0%7Cpolicecommission%40lapd.online%7C7%5a143854b8f41504c58088d8fe0c67b4%7C642fd61c34d4f0fa8d44357648588%7C0%7C1%7C637538676518026891%7CUnknown%7C6WfpgZsb3d8ey9WItjoIMc4wJjAwMDA1LCQjCjo1V21uMWzIiLC3BTi11k1hawwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=okIcZYBoNTRGYk8X8faOcCqenrFmDrKx9Xe4WwuoPlk3D%&reserved=0>. At the same time that the report repeats every manner of inane and false detail — including references to TikTok videos and anonymous tips that fit the police narrative — the Department has
been denying and failing to substantiate the community’s evidence-backed reports of brutality at protests.

The real motivation behind the dangerous proposals in these reports is to override the community’s demands for defunding the police, which are widely held. 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 that over a third support proposals to “completely dismantle police departments and give more financial support to local programs.” With this sentiment growing, LAPD is eager to monitor and oppose 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 do not for a second believe your assertions that the selection process for who gets to provide public comment at your meetings is random. We’re all familiar with Zoom by now. We know that the meeting host sees who’s admitted to the meeting, and can select who gets to speak and who doesn’t. It also doesn’t escape my notice that you’re using the technological constraints of these meetings as a pretext to cap your public comment period at a paltry forty-five minutes. If, as your website claims, you are indeed the “citizens’ voice in police affairs,” stop stifling citizens’ voices.

Signed,

Dain M.