Wow, Pasadena has a lot of military equipment. Why?!

The process for complying with AB 481[1] in Pasadena is rather rushed. Please don't create a policy and ordinance for the use of military equipment in Pasadena that will be rubber-stamped without adequate input from the public and CPOC. The City should conduct more public outreach and awareness about the more than $2.5 million of military equipment (as defined by AB 481) in possession by Pasadena PD. Of note, Pasadena PD is one of a very few outliers who has chosen to classify assault rifles as 'standard issue' and has omitted them from the policy. Lexipol's boilerplate policy template does not adequately meet the requirements outlined in AB 481.

The literal point of AB 481 is to bring transparency and oversight over military equipment acquisition, possession, and use (or if it belongs in our cities at all):

- When is the use of this military equipment authorized? When is it not authorized?
- What are the clearly defined procedures for documenting the use of military equipment? Who will deployments be reported to and how will records be kept?

Is this military equipment for 'anti-terrorism' or anti-protests[2] or what?

BTW, the ordinance needs to include a private right of action to ensure compliance with AB 481.

I urge the Council, PPD, City Manager and City Attorney to fully comply with AB 481's provisions for transparency and community-input on military equipment used by law enforcement. I reject any proposed use policy that does not fully comply with AB 481, and its intent for transparency accountability. Anything short of that is an infringement against our civil liberties.

Name: Yadi
Pasadena resident

Pasadena City Council
Meeting Date: April 25, 2022
Agenda Item: 17. AB 481 Military Equipment

---

[1] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB481
[2] https://www.vox.com/2020/6/25/21303538/american-police-soldiers-1033-program

Wow, Pasadena has a lot of military equipment. Why?!

2022 APR 25 AM 11:27

The process for complying with AB 481[1] in Pasadena is rather rushed. Please don't create a policy and ordinance for the use of military equipment in Pasadena that will be rubber-stamped without adequate input from the public and CPOC. The City should conduct more public outreach and awareness about the more than $2.5 million of military equipment (as defined by AB 481) in possession by Pasadena PD. Of note, Pasadena PD is one of a very few outliers who has chosen to classify assault rifles as 'standard issue' and has omitted them from the policy. Lexipol's boilerplate policy template does not adequately meet the requirements outlined in AB 481.

The literal point of AB 481 is to bring transparency and oversight over military equipment acquisition, possession, and use (or if it belongs in our cities at all):

- When is the use of this military equipment authorized? When is it not authorized?
- What are the clearly defined procedures for documenting the use of military equipment? Who will deployments be reported to and how will records be kept?

Is this military equipment for 'anti-terrorism' or anti-protests[2] or what?

BTW, the ordinance needs to include a private right of action to ensure compliance with AB 481.

I urge the Council, PPD, City Manager and City Attorney to fully comply with AB 481's provisions for transparency and community-input on military equipment used by law enforcement. I reject any proposed use policy that does not fully comply with AB 481, and its intent for transparency accountability. Anything short of that is an infringement against our civil liberties.

Name: Yadi
Pasadena resident

Pasadena City Council
Meeting Date: April 25, 2022
Agenda Item: 17. AB 481 Military Equipment

[1] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB481
[2] https://www.vox.com/2020/6/25/21303538/american-police-soldiers-1033-program