

Communication from Public

Name: Carie

Date Submitted: 08/12/2022 05:26 AM

Council File No: 22-0766

Comments for Public Posting: Do not pass AB 481! It puts the entire LoS Angeles community in more danger at the hands of the LAPD. AB 481 implies that communities have a say in how and if LAPD has military weaponry and equipment and uses it against communities, if we use the proper channels for objecting, as outlined by the state. In reality this is a falsehood, intent on distracting us from making demands against the police and policing. Oversight laws like AB 481 facilitate the inevitable expansion of LAPD's military arsenal, in a process called mission creep. Through reforms like AB 481, LAPD can insidiously increase its resources and weapons all while hiding behind a facade of accountability. AB 481 also provides mechanisms for LAPD to expand the instances in which it is within policy for them to use military equipment on community members, yet another example of mission creep. Surplus equipment, similar to grants and "gifts", given to LAPD justify their expanding budget for the following year when this equipment inevitably becomes a budget line item. We have seen how the LA Board of Police Commissioners, City Council, and the Mayor do not respond to community demands against police and policing. In 2014 and again in 2017 when LAPD acquired drone technology, the community overwhelmingly spoke out against the use of drones by LAPD, but the city approved them anyway. Today LAPD, beside a continuing expansion of its drone fleet and usage, lists among its military inventory a drone from DJI, a manufacturing company that collaborated with Axon on developing drones with real-time facial recognition technology. LAPD's policy and restrictions on drone usage are emblematic of the inevitability of mission creep. Initially drone usage was limited by LAPD policy for exclusive usage by SWAT teams, more recently we've seen drone usage proposed for things like traffic control, further normalizing the everyday usage of a widely rejected piece of surveillance equipment. The police will use military weapons against the community- that this is part of a long history of occupation and community control, whereby the community has been portrayed as the enemy and labelled domestic terrorists, and Black and brown communities especially have been treated and viewed as enemy war zones that required aggressive, militarized policing to contain and control. It is part of LAPD's continued tactics to maintain power and shut down

resistance and uprisings against that control, and we are against AB 481 and also LAPD or any agency having and using these weapons. LAPD asserts that it keeps military weaponry “to assist officers in their duties” and as “a matter of public interest.” We refute this and reject the use of military weapons by LAPD and all police agencies, and how this is normalized. Police having access to military weapons is deadly—especially given the fact that LAPD has shot more than 9 people recently. Some of these deadly weapons already in LAPD’s possession include: TASER Shockwave can hit community members over 35 feet away, oftentimes escalates the situation, and has resulted in the death of community members whether it’s cops confusing guns for tasers or due to the physical toll of having been electroshocked. Mine-resistant ambush-protected (MRAP) vehicles were initially designed to withstand roadside bombs in Iraq and Afghanistan and increasingly being used by law enforcement agencies nationally. “Less Lethal” projectiles, such as Pepper Balls, “bean bag”, or rubber bullets, still maim and kill community members. During the George Floyd Uprising, we saw as local law enforcement aimed these weapons at close range against crowds of people hitting reporters, children, and in several instances permanently injuring those community members. High mobility, multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV), commonly referred to as Humvees, two and one-half-ton trucks, five-ton trucks, or wheeled vehicles that have a breaching or entry apparatus attached; excluding unarmed, all-terrain vehicles (ATV’s) and motorized dirt bikes. Weaponized aircraft, vessels, or vehicles. Example of use against community In 2019, LAPD responded to Joe Britton, who was experiencing a mental health episode, by attempting to break his door, utilizing 2 armored BEARCAT vehicles, shooting tear gas and pepper spray inside of his home, sent in a “recon robot” which deployed more tear gas, sent in another robot, sent in Metro K-9 team, threw a stingball grenade into the room which started a fire, 12 officers fired rifle shots at Britton, and used their taser as 3 officers held him down. On May 1st, 2022, Marisa Baltazar’s finger was partially amputated after being hit by a “less-than-lethal” projectile by Long Beach police officers.

Communication from Public

Name: Olivia Gleason

Date Submitted: 08/11/2022 11:32 AM

Council File No: 22-0766

Comments for Public Posting: Hi, my name is Olivia Gleason, I work with the organization Californians United for a Responsible Budget (CURB) and I am a resident in LA. I am writing to strongly oppose Agenda Item #12, which would grant LAPD unlimited authorized use of military equipment such as assault rifles, armored vehicles, flash bangs, tear gas, "less lethal" weapons, and more. This is not acceptable, the LAPD should not have weapons of war. We have seen time and time again the ways LAPD poses as a direct threat to LA's vulnerable residents, with there being over 150 LAPD killings between 2013-2021, a fifth of which were people showing signs of mental illness. More weapons of war is not how we promote safety in our communities, we promote safety by investing in the community-based, essential services and resources all people need like housing, healthcare, quality food, reentry services, and much more NOT funding and authorizing unlimited use of military equipment. Approving military-grade weapons to impose on fellow Angelenos is irresponsible, wasteful, and catastrophic. Additionally, the proposed policy doesn't follow the law and goes against AB 481 which requires governing bodies to ONLY approve the use policy if it "will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties." This policy does not safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, or civil liberties, in fact it will do the opposite. I am urging the council to not approve this agenda item today. Council has until Oct 26 (180 days after LAPD proposed its policy on April 29) to fully consider the matter. I am also urging the council to significantly reduce if not eliminate the LAPD's arsenal of military equipment. This body has a responsibility of prioritizing the health and well-being of all LA residents, I hope your decision today reflects this responsibility by opposing this agenda item. Thank you for your time, Olivia Gleason

Communication from Public

Name: Stephanie Alcantar

Date Submitted: 08/11/2022 11:34 AM

Council File No: 22-0766

Comments for Public Posting: Hi, name is Stephanie and I live in Los Angeles in District 14. I write to ask you to vote NO on Agenda Item 12 in Friday's City Council. This agenda item should not be approved today. Council has until Oct 26 (180 days after LAPD proposed its policy on April 29) to fully consider the matter. The arsenal of military gear must be reduced. This policy doesn't follow the law and to further militarize LAPD is ethically wrong. We are a city, not a military. These weapons, and the personnel costs involved in training on them and deploying them, are a poor fiscal choice for Los Angeles. This policy does not safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, or civil liberties (and AB 481 requires governing bodies to ONLY approve the use policy if it "will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties"). This policy would not make me feel safer in my community. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Lauren Batten

Date Submitted: 08/11/2022 11:46 AM

Council File No: 22-0766

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to vote NO on Agenda Item 12 in tomorrow's Friday, August 12 City Council Meeting. LAPD should not receive further weapons or funding.

Communication from Public

Name: Dakota Eggert

Date Submitted: 08/11/2022 12:38 PM

Council File No: 22-0766

Comments for Public Posting: I live in Los Angeles County and I urge you to vote NO on agenda item number 12 in Friday's city council meeting.

Communication from Public

Name: Jennifer Tooley

Date Submitted: 08/12/2022 04:39 AM

Council File No: 22-0766

Comments for Public Posting: I ask that you reject the use of militarized equipment by LAPD on our community. AB 481 also provides mechanisms for LAPD to expand the instances in which it is within policy for them to use military equipment on community members, yet another example of mission creep. Surplus equipment, similar to grants and “gifts”, given to LAPD justify their expanding budget for the following year when this equipment inevitably becomes a budget line item. We have seen how the LA Board of Police Commissioners, City Council, and the Mayor do not respond to community demands against police and policing. In 2014 and again in 2017 when LAPD acquired drone technology, the community overwhelmingly spoke out against the use of drones by LAPD, but the city approved them anyway. Today LAPD, beside a continuing expansion of its drone fleet and usage, lists among its military inventory a drone from DJI, a manufacturing company that collaborated with Axon on developing drones with real-time facial recognition technology. Reject the use of Militarized equipment by LAPD!