

CORRESPONDENCE FROM

8/21/2024

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

MEETING

1. AB 481 Military Equipment

Pasadena PD improved this year's AB 481 report in some aspects and should be credited with holding its first community engagement event, however, the annual report does not comply with requirements under AB 481¹. I ask that the Public Safety Committee work with PPD and the CPOC to ensure that AB 481 requirements are met. Some issues in brief:

- Use policy does not include all requirements under Section 7070 (d) such as fiscal costs and product information for the BearCat.
- Report does not include fiscal costs stated in Section 7072 (a) (4) such as personnel and training costs.
- Report does not clearly state the purpose for use as outlined in Section 7072 (a) (1).
- The deployment log is incomplete. There is no entry for the Rose Parade, in accordance with PPD statements. The deployment log for helicopters isn't included either.
- PPD is one of a very few outliers who has chosen to classify assault rifles as 'standard issue' and has omitted them from the policy.

PPD August 26, 2024 Agenda Report

Community Engagement - Should be revised to "On an annual basis, the PPD must hold at least one "community engagement" meeting...". It appears that none of the feedback given at community meeting was incorporated into the report, so PPD should either explain to the public why the feedback was not taken, or hold another event to discuss what feedback they would be willing to integrate into this year's report and policies.

City Council Oversight and Input - The agenda report states "The City Council does not generally play a direct role in approving PPD policies...". Who then is responsible for playing a direct role in approving PPD policies?

Council Policy Consideration - PPD states "...law enforcement continues to have access to equipment that will provide police officers with as many options as possible...". However, AB 481 section 7071 (d) (1) states that the governing body only approves military equipment that, among other things, is necessary because there is no reasonable alternative that can achieve the same objective of officer and civilian safety.

Fiscal Impact - The agenda report erroneously states there is no fiscal impact, when in fact, resources, such as training and associated costs are incurred for the ongoing use of the military equipment.

Conclusion

Several studies show that police departments that acquire military-grade equipment are more likely to use violence.² One study shows correlations between law enforcement who acquire more military equipment leads to having more local residents who are then more likely to die in encounters with police and sheriffs.³ I hope that PPD and City Council will work with the community and CPOC to strengthen trust, transparency and accountability by examining the equipment in possession by PPD, how it is deployed and comply with AB 481.

Yadi
Pasadena Public Safety Committee Meeting
August 21, 2024
1. AB 481 Military Equipment

¹ https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB481

² https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/field_document/jus14-warcomeshome-text-rel1.pdf

³ https://www.afsc.org/sites/default/files/2022_Equipped_for_war_CA_copy_print.pdf

RECEIVED
2024 AUG 21 AM 10:22
CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA