



Office of the Mayor

CONSENT CALENDAR  
December 15, 2020

To: Members of the City Council

From: Mayor Arreguín, Vice-Mayor Hahn, and Councilmembers Bartlett and Harrison

Subject: Establishment of Reimagining Public Safety Task Force

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Establish a Reimagining Public Safety Task Force, comprised of: one representative appointed by each member of the City Council and Mayor, one representative appointed by the Mental Health, Police Review and Youth Commissions, one representative appointed by the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC), one representative appointed by the Berkeley Community Safety Coalition (BCSC), and three additional members to be appointed “At Large” by the Task Force. The Task Force will be guided by a professional consultant, and will include the participation of City Staff from the City Manager’s Office, Human Resources, Health, Housing and Community Services, Berkeley Fire Department, Berkeley Police Department, and Public Works Department. For visual, see Attachment 1.
2. Appointments to the Task Force should be made by January 31, 2021,<sup>1</sup> and reflect a diverse range of experiences, knowledge, expertise and representation. To maintain the Council’s July 14, 2020,<sup>2</sup> commitment to centering the voices of those most impacted in our process of reimagining community safety appointments should be made with the goal of achieving a balance of the following criteria:
  - a. Active Members of Berkeley Community (Required of All)<sup>3</sup>
  - b. Representation from Impacted Communities
    - Formerly incarcerated individuals
    - Victims/family members of violent crime
    - Immigrant community

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of the “At Large” appointments, which will be selected by the initial appointees with an eye for adding outstanding perspectives, knowledge and experience.

<sup>2</sup> “Be It Further Resolved that the City Council will engage with every willing community member in Berkeley, centering the voices of Black people, Native American people, people of color, immigrants, LGBTQ+ people, victims of harm, and other stakeholders who have been historically marginalized or under-served by our present system. Together, we will identify what safety looks like for everyone.”, [Item 18d, Transform Community Safety, July 14, 2020, Berkeley City Council Agenda](#),

<sup>3</sup> \* At Large Appointees are not required to be Berkeley Residents, as long as they are active, committed Berkeley Stakeholders.

- Communities impacted by high crime, over-policing and police violence
  - Individuals experiencing homelessness
  - Historically marginalized populations
- c. Faith-Based Community Leaders
  - d. Expertise/Leadership in Violence Prevention, Youth Services, Crisis Intervention, and Restorative or Transformative Justice
  - e. Health/ Public Health Expertise
  - f. City of Berkeley labor/union representation
  - g. Law Enforcement Operation Knowledge
  - h. City Budget Operations/Knowledge
  - i. Committed to the Goals and Success of The Taskforce (Required of All)
3. The charge of the Task Force is as outlined in the July 14, 2020, City Council Omnibus Action,<sup>4</sup> and should include but is not limited to:
- I. Building on the work of the City Council, the City Manager, BPD, the PRC and other City commissions and other working groups addressing community health and safety.
  - II. Research and engagement to define a holistic, anti-racist approach to community safety, including a review and analysis of emerging models, programs and practices that could be applied in Berkeley.
  - III. Recommend a new, community-centered safety paradigm as a foundation for deep and lasting change, grounded in the principles of *Reduce, Improve and Reinvest* as proposed by the National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform considering,<sup>5</sup> among other things:
    - A. The social determinants of health and changes required to deliver a holistic approach to community-centered safety.
    - B. The appropriate response to community calls for help including size, scope of operation and power and duties of a well-trained police force.
    - C. Limiting militarized weaponry and equipment.
    - D. Identifying alternatives to policing and enforcement to reduce conflict, harm, and institutionalization, introduce alternative and restorative justice models, and reduce or eliminate use of fines and incarceration.
    - E. Options to reduce police contacts, stops, arrests, tickets, fines and incarceration and replace these, to the greatest extent possible, with

---

<sup>4</sup> [July 14th, 2020, Berkeley City Council Item 18a-e Proposed Omnibus Motion on Public Safety Items](#)

<sup>5</sup> [Transforming Police](#), NICJR

educational, community serving, restorative and other positive programs, policies and systems.

- F. Reducing the Berkeley Police Department budget to reflect its revised mandates, with a goal of a 50% reduction, based on the results of requested analysis and achieved through programs such as the Specialized Care Unit.

4. Direct the City Manager to ensure that the working group of City Staff as outlined in her October 28th Off-Agenda Memo is coordinating with the Task Force.<sup>6</sup>

The Task Force's goal/output will be a set of recommended programs, structures and initiatives to incorporate into upcoming budget processes for FY 2022-23 and, as a second phase, in the FY 2024-2025 budget processes to ensure that recommended changes will be achieved. The Task Force shall return to City Council an initial plan and timeline by April 1, 2021, to ensure the first phase of changes can be incorporated into the FY 2022-23 Budget Process.

## BACKGROUND

On July 14, 2020, the Berkeley City Council made a historic commitment to reimagine the City's approach to public safety with the passage of an omnibus package of referrals, resolutions and directions. Central to this proposal is a commitment to a robust community process to achieve this "new and transformative model of positive, equitable and community centered safety for Berkeley". Item 18d, Transforming Community Safety, provides direction on the development of a "Community Safety Coalition", goals and a timeline led by a steering committee and guided by professional consultants. Recommendation 3 above reflects the original scope voted on by the council. However, that item did not specify the structure, exact qualifications or process of appointing this steering committee. This item follows the spirit of the original referral, and provides direction on structure, desired qualifications and appointment process.

To avoid confusion with the community organization that has independently formed since the passage of that referral, this steering committee is now being referred to as the Reimagining Public Safety Task Force.

City staff has been diligently been working to implement the referrals in the omnibus motion, including the development, release and evaluation of a request for proposals (RFP) for a consultant to facilitate this process.<sup>7</sup> Initially, the expectation was that the development of a structure and process for the Task Force would be developed in consultation with the professionals selected by this RFP. However, to ensure thorough review of these proposals the timeline for selecting the consultant is longer than initially expected. At the July 18, 2020, meeting, City Council clearly stated that the Task Force will begin meeting no later than January 2021. To meet this timeline, the

---

<sup>6</sup>[October 28, 2020 Off-Agenda Memo: Update on Re-Imagining Public Safety](#)

<sup>7</sup> Ibid

Council should adopt the proposed framework and appointment process so that the Task Force and our community process can begin shortly after the RFP process is completed.

#### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The proposed structure creates a Task Force with 17 total seats, ensuring representation from each Councilmember and the Mayor, key commissions including the Police Review Commission, the Youth Commission and the Mental Health Commission as well as representation from the ASUC, the Berkeley Community Safety Coalition (BCSC) and three “at-large” members to be selected by the Task Force to fill any unrepresented stakeholder position or subject matter expertise.<sup>8</sup>

This model was developed with input from all co-authors, the City Manager, community stakeholders including the ASUC and BCSC as well organizations and experts with experience running community engagement processes. Additionally, the Mayor’s office researched a wide range of public processes that could inform the structure and approach for Berkeley, including youth-led campaigns, participatory budgeting processes, and long-term initiatives like the California Endowment Building Healthy Communities initiative.<sup>9</sup>

The proposed Task Force structure and process draws most directly on the processes underway in Oakland and in Austin, Texas.<sup>10</sup><sup>11</sup> In July, Oakland voted to establish a Reimagining Public Safety Task Force with 17 members, including appointees from all councilmembers and the Mayor, three appointees from their public safety boards, two appointees to represent youth and two at-large appointees selected by their council co-chairs<sup>12</sup>. The model proposed for Berkeley draws heavily from the Oakland approach. A key difference is that, unlike Oakland, this proposed structure does not recommend developing additional community advisory boards. Instead, it is recommended that Berkeley leverage our commissions and community organizations to provide additional input and research to inform the Task Force’s work rather than establish additional community advisory boards.

The list of proposed qualifications for appointees (recommendation 2) is also modeled after Oakland’s approach. In July, the city council committed to centering the voices of those that are most impacted by our current system of public safety as we reimagine it for the future. The list of qualifications is intended to guide councilmembers and other appointing bodies and organizations

---

<sup>8</sup> [The Berkeley Community Safety Coalition](#), initially known as Berkeley United for Community Safety, produced a 40 page report that was shared with the council in July. Their recommendations were referred to the reimagining process as part of the Mayor’s omnibus motion. Co-Founder Moni Law describes BCSC as a “principled coalition that is multiracial, multigenerational and Black and brown centered. We include over 2,000 people and approximately a dozen organizations and growing.”

<sup>9</sup> [California Endowment Building Healthy Communities Initiative](#).

<sup>10</sup> [Austin, Texas Reimagining Public Safety Task Force](#)

<sup>11</sup> [Reimagining Public Safety](#), Oakland website

<sup>12</sup> [Oakland Reimagining Public Safety Task Force Framework](#)

to ensure that the makeup of the Task Force reflects that commitment. After all appointments are made, the Task Force will select 3 additional “at large” members to join the Task Force with an eye on adding perspectives, expertise or experience that are missing in initial appointments.

#### ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

The Council could wait for a consultant to be hired and have them develop a model for the Task Force. This would likely result in further delay in the process to reimagine public safety and push the starting point of the process past the Council’s January 2021 deadline. Alternative appointment structures were evaluated, including a citywide application process and an independent selection committee. However, given that the Task Force will ultimately advise the City Council, there was broad agreement that the council should have a strong role in appointing the Task Force.

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

City Council allocated \$200,000 to support engagement of outside consultants in the reimagining process.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

No Environmental Impact.

#### CONTACT PERSON

Mayor Jesse Arreguín                      510-981-7100

#### Attachments:

1. Framework for Reimagining Public Safety Task Force
2. July 14, 2020 City Council Item 18d, Transforming Community Safety
3. July 14, 2020 City Council Item a-e, Proposed Omnibus Motion on Public Safety Items



---

# Reimagining Public Safety Task Force

---



# Task Force Purpose & Goals <sup>Page 7 of 70</sup>

As Defined by July 14<sup>th</sup> Council Action



---

**Purpose:** The Community Safety Coalition, guided by a task force, will serve as the hub for a broad, deep and representative process, and uplift the community's input into a new positive, equitable, anti-racist system of community health and safety.

The work of the task force should include but not be limited to:

1. Building on the work of the City Council, the City Manager, BPD, the PRC and other City commissions and other working groups addressing community health and safety.
2. Research and engagement to define a holistic, anti-racist approach to community safety, including a review and analysis of emerging models, programs and practices that could be applied in Berkeley.

# Steering Committee Purpose & Goals



Continued...

---

3. Recommend a new, community-centered safety paradigm as a foundation for deep and lasting change, grounded in the principles of *Reduce, Improve and Reinvest* as proposed by the National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform considering, among other things:


- a) The social determinants of health and changes required to deliver a holistic approach to community-centered safety
- b) The appropriate response to community calls for help including size, scope of operation and power and duties of a well-trained police force.
- c) Limiting militarized weaponry and equipment.
- d) Identifying alternatives to policing and enforcement to reduce conflict, harm, and institutionalization, introduce alternative and restorative justice models, and reduce or eliminate use of fines and incarceration.
- e) Options to reduce police contacts, stops, arrests, tickets, fines and incarceration and replace these, to the greatest extent possible, with educational, community serving, restorative and other positive programs, policies and systems.
- f) Reducing the Berkeley Police Department budget to reflect its revised mandates, with a goal of a 50% reduction, based on the results of requested analysis and achieved through programs such as the Specialized Care Unit





# Proposed Task Force Structure

Selected by Councilmembers, Mayor & Key Commissions and Community Stakeholders



Parallel Community Engagement

Virtual Town Halls

Surveys

Workshops & Focus groups

More, TBD



# Task Force Membership

## Knowledge, Expertise, & Experience Needed

---

- Active Members of Berkeley Community (Required of All\*)
- Representation from Impacted Communities
  - Formerly incarcerated individuals
  - Victims/family members of violent crime
  - Immigrant community
  - Communities impacted by high crime, over-policing and police violence
  - Individuals experiencing homelessness
  - Historically marginalized populations
- Faith-Based Community Leaders
- Expertise/Leadership in Violence Prevention, Youth Services, Crisis Intervention, and Restorative or Transformative Justice
- Health/ Public Health Expertise
- City of Berkeley labor/union representation
- Law Enforcement Operation Knowledge
- City Budget Operations/Knowledge
- Committed to the Goals and Success of The Taskforce (Required of All)

*\*At Large appointees may not be Berkeley residents, so long as they are active and committed stakeholders*

# Task Force Responsibilities



Active membership & Participation Required of Selected members

---

- Work collaboratively to achieve the purpose and goals established
- Thorough preparation for and active participation in all taskforce meetings (1-2 meetings per month)
- Participate in and support various community engagement efforts
- Other responsibilities – to be determined



Office of the Mayor  
Jesse Arreguín

ACTION CALENDAR  
July 14, 2020

To: Honorable Members of the City Council

From: Mayor Jesse Arreguín, Vice-Mayor Sophie Hahn, Councilmember Ben Bartlett, Councilmember Kate Harrison

Subject: Transform Community Safety and Initiate a Robust Community Engagement Process

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Adopt a Resolution expressing the City Council's commitment to:
  - a. A transformative approach to community-centered safety and reducing the scope of policing,
  - b. Equitable investment in the essential conditions of a safe and healthy community, especially for those who have been historically marginalized and have experienced disinvestment, and
  - c. A broad, inclusive community process that will result in deep and lasting change to support safety and wellbeing for all Berkeley residents.
2. Direct the City Manager to track and report progress on actions to implement this initiative, and other actions that may be identified by the Coalition and referred by Council to the City Manager. Updates shall be provided by written and verbal reports to Council and posted on a regularly updated and dedicated page on the City website.
3. Direct the City Manager to collaborate with Mayor and select Councilmembers to complete the following work, to inform investments and reallocations to be incorporated into future Budget processes:
  - a. Contract with independent subject matter experts to:
    - i. Analyze the scope of work of, and community needs addressed by, the Berkeley Police Department, to identify a more limited role for law enforcement, and identify elements of police work that could be achieved through alternative programs, policies, systems, and community

investments. Analysis should include but not be limited to: calls received by dispatch by type of complaint, stops by law enforcement generated at officer discretion (as contained in the Police Department's open data portal) or on request of other city agencies, number of officers and staff from other city agencies that respond to incidents, estimated time in response to different types of calls, daily patrol activities, organizational structure, and beat staffing. Work to include broad cost estimates of police and other city agency response to different types of calls, and other information and analysis helpful to identify elements of current police work that could be transferred to other departments or programs or achieved through alternative means. Work should be completed in time for the November 2020 Annual Appropriation Ordinance revision.

- ii. Identify immediate and longer-term opportunities to shift policing resources to alternative, non-police responses and towards alternative and restorative justice models, to better meet community needs, that could be considered in the November 2020 AAO#1 budget process. Some areas to be considered include homeless outreach and services, substance abuse prevention and treatment, and mental health/crisis management, as well as alternative models for traffic and parking enforcement, "neighborhood services" and code enforcement. Provide a broad timeline and process for transitioning functions not ready for transition at this first milestone.

Deliverables should coincide with budget cycles, including the November 2020 AAO and FY 2022-2023 Budget processes, and provide a suggested timeline for transitioning functions at these and other budget opportunities, so that alternative investments may be considered for funding and launched in a timely and orderly manner.

- b. Contract with independent Change Management experts to initiate and facilitate a representative Community Safety Coalition, guided by a Steering Committee, that will begin meeting no later than January 2021. The CSC and its Steering Committee should be broadly inclusive and representative of Berkeley residents and stakeholders. The Steering Committee, with the support of Change Management professionals, shall be responsible for engaging the Coalition and the broader Berkeley community and relevant City Staff in a robust process, to achieve a new and transformative model of positive, equitable and community-centered safety for Berkeley.

The work of the Coalition should include but not be limited to:

1. Building on the work of the City Council, the City Manager, the PRC and other City commissions and other working groups addressing community health and safety.
2. Research and engagement to define a holistic, anti-racist approach to community safety, including a review and analysis of emerging models, programs and practices that could be applied in Berkeley.
3. Recommend a new, community-centered safety paradigm as a foundation for deep and lasting change, grounded in the principles of *Reduce, Improve and Reinvest* as proposed by the National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (Attachment 3), considering, among other things:
  - a. The social determinants of health and changes required to deliver a holistic approach to community-centered safety
  - b. The appropriate response to community calls for help including size, scope of operation and powers and duties of a well-trained police force.
  - c. Limiting militarized weaponry and equipment.
  - d. Identifying alternatives to policing and enforcement to reduce conflict, harm, and institutionalization, introduce alternative and restorative justice models, and reduce or eliminate use of fines and incarceration.
  - e. Options to reduce police contacts, stops, arrests, tickets, fines and incarceration and replace these, to the greatest extent possible, with educational, community serving, restorative and other positive programs, policies and systems.
- c. The Coalition's goal/output will be a set of recommended programs, structures and initiatives to incorporate into upcoming budget processes for FY 2022-23 and, as a second phase, in the FY2024-2025 budget processes to ensure that recommended changes will be achieved. The Coalition shall return to City Council an initial plan and timeline by April 1, 2021, to ensure the first phase of changes can be incorporated into the FY2022-23 Budget Process.

## **SUMMARY**

Local government's most fundamental role is to provide for the health and safety of its residents. Cities around the country are acknowledging that they are falling behind in this basic function, and are embarking on efforts to reimagine health and safety, and to consider reallocating resources towards a more holistic approach; one that shifts resources away from policing towards health, education and social services, and is able to meet crises with a variety of appropriate responses.

The current re-energized movement for social justice and police reform highlights a problematic expansion, over many decades, in the roles and responsibilities of the police. As other systems have been defunded, most notably mental health, education, affordable housing and other health and safety-net programs, the police have been asked to respond to more and more crises that could have been avoided with a different set of investments in community wellbeing. Rather than being the responders of last resort, focused on criminal, aggressive and violent behaviors, police are now frontline responders routinely called to address mental health crises, poverty and homelessness, substance abuse, stress in the school environment, traffic and code violations and neighborhood disputes. This is an extensive set of responsibilities that is not traditionally the purview of the police.

This item initiates a restructure and redefinition of "health and safety" for all Berkeleyans, with immediate, intermediate and longer-term steps to transform the city to a new model that is equitable and community-centered. It roots the transformative process in broad, deep and representative community engagement which empowers the community to address social determinants of health and safety and deliver transformative change, with the help of change management professionals and informed by research and analysis of current and best practices.

## **BACKGROUND**

The recent murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor and Ahmaud Arbery have ignited the nation in passionate protest against police brutality and racial injustice. Across the country, community members have gathered for weeks to demand change and called out the enduring, systemic racism, white supremacy and accompanying police brutality that have defined the United States for too long. Among the more immediate demands are calls to reduce funding and the scope of police work and to invest in alternative models to achieve positive, equitable community safety.

These demands for change go beyond necessary efforts in procedural justice, implicit bias training, and improved use of force policies. Activists, organizers and their allies in our community are seeking a broader discussion about the true foundations for a safe and healthy community for all people. For too long, "public safety" has been equated

with more police, while economic and social welfare programs have been viewed as special projects unrelated to health and safety.

Responding from the epicenter of this moment, the City of Minneapolis has voted to disband their police department and engage in a deep and detailed year long process to fundamentally transform community health and safety in their city.<sup>1</sup> Closer to home, Mayor London Breed has announced that San Francisco will demilitarize their police force and end the use of police as a response for non-criminal activity.<sup>2</sup>

As this movement ripples across the nation, Berkeley has an opportunity to lead in transforming our approach to public health and safety. We need the right response for each crisis rather than defaulting to police. This resolution and recommendations initiate a thoughtful, thorough approach to restructuring and redefining health and safety through investment in the social determinants of health, rooted in deep community engagement and empowerment.

Community members are calling on city leaders to be creative in reimagining the city's approach to health and safety and to make clear, demonstrated commitments and timelines for this work.

In order to earn community buy-in for these important changes it is critical that the future of community health and safety be defined by the Berkeley community, centering the voices of our Black, Native American/First Peoples and other communities of color, LGBTQ+ people, victims of harm and other stakeholders that have been historically, and continue to be, marginalized and under-served by our current system. A community-wide process would ultimately inform recommended investments and approaches to achieve a higher and more equitable level of community safety for the entire community.

## **CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS**

Despite strong efforts and leadership on police reform, homelessness, health, education and housing affordability in Berkeley, racial disparities remain stark across virtually every meaningful measure. According to the City of Berkeley's 2018 Health Status Summary Report, African Americans are 2.3 times more likely to die in a given year from any condition as compared to Whites. In 2013, African Americans were twice as likely to live in poverty in Berkeley. By 2018, they were eight times more likely. The Center for Policing Equity (CPE) found that Black drivers are 6.5 times as likely as white drivers to be stopped by Berkeley police officers and four times as likely to be searched. Latinx people are also searched far more often than white people. Furthermore, there is a striking disproportionality in BPD's use of force against Black community members.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://lms.minneapolismn.gov/Download/File/3806/Transforming%20Community%20Safety%20Resolution.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <https://sfmayor.org/article/mayor-london-breed-announces-roadmap-new-police-reforms>



Black people comprise 8% of Berkeley's population but 46% of people who are subjected to police force.<sup>3</sup>

Local government's most fundamental role is to provide for the health and safety of its residents. Cities around the country are acknowledging that they are falling behind in this basic function and are embarking on efforts to reimagine health and safety, and to consider reallocating resources towards a more holistic approach; one that shifts resources away from policing towards health, education and social services, and is able to meet crises with a variety of appropriate responses.

In addition to renewed efforts around policing in places like Minneapolis and San Francisco that were prompted by George Floyd's murder, the financial and public health impacts of COVID-19 had already required Berkeley to reimagine and innovate to meet the moment. Berkeley now faces multiple intersecting crises: the COVID-19 pandemic and its economic impacts, the effects of systemic racism and the ongoing climate emergency. There is no returning to "normal."

COVID-19 has demonstrated that we are only as healthy and safe as the most vulnerable amongst us, and we are in fact one community. There is both a moral and fiscal imperative to restructure the way Berkeley envisions and supports health and safety.

Berkeley is facing a \$40 million budget deficit, and while deferrals of projects and positions can help close the gap in the short term, the economic impacts of the pandemic will require deeper restructuring in the coming years. The current structure of the police department consumes over 44% of the City's General Fund Budget. With the increase in payments required to meet pension and benefit obligations, the police budget could overtake General Fund capacity within the next 10 years. Thus, even before the important opportunity for action created through outrage at the murder of George Floyd, the City's current investments in safety were unsustainable. To provide meaningful safety and continue critical health and social services, Berkeley must commit to, and invest in, a new, positive, equitable and community-centered approach to health and safety - this is affordable and sustainable.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.berkeleyside.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Berkeley-Report-May-2018.pdf>

## **RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1. Resolution expressing City Council's commitment to a new city-wide approach to public health and safety**

Transforming our system of health and safety requires strong commitment from our leaders and the community. This resolution (Attachment 1) is an expression of commitment and a tool for accountability to the public.

The proposed set of principles as well as specific initiatives are the starting point for a robust and inclusive process. Some actions will require significantly more work and additional council direction prior to implementation. For example, moving traffic and parking enforcement from police is a concept that is recommended but would require a significant redesign of city operations. Other changes may be able to move forward more quickly. These ideas are submitted in a spirit of conviction and humility. The future of community health and safety must be addressed in a fundamentally different way and the Council is committed to collaborating with the community to define a new, positive and equitable model of health and safety for everyone.

### **2. Direct the City Manager to publicly track progress on actions that respond to the directives of the principles herein and others identified by the Coalition. Progress shall be updated regularly and available on a dedicated page on the City website.**

This webpage should include a summary of the actions outlined in this item, as well as other work already underway such as the Mayor's Fair and Impartial Working group, the Use of Force policy updates, other work underway by the Police Review Commission and any other Council referrals or direction on public safety, including existing referrals addressing alternative and restorative justice, that reflect the spirit and scope of this item.

Transformative change will only be successful if processes are transparent and information widely disseminated, as the City has so successfully demonstrated in managing the COVID-19 crisis. By publicly posting this information, the public will have the capacity to keep its elected officials, city staff, and our whole community accountable for realizing a new system of community centered safety that meets the needs of all of Berkeley's residents.

**3. Direct the City Manager to collaborate with Mayor and select Councilmembers to complete the following work, to inform investments and reallocations to be incorporated into future Budget processes:**

***(a) Begin the process of structural change including directing the analysis of the activities of the Berkeley Police Department and other related departments.***

Transforming community health and safety has to start by understanding the existing system, the calls to which it responds and other activities. This recommendation seeks to build on Councilmember Bartlett's George Floyd Community Safety Act to immediately engage independent, outside experts to conduct a data-driven analysis of police calls and responses and a broader understanding of how the police actually spend their time.<sup>45</sup>

Engaging the services of outside experts will ensure a transparent and trusted process and provide accurate data required to effectuate substantive change will be identified and that data will inform immediate change and the work throughout the community engagement process. The experts must be knowledgeable about policing, code enforcement, criminal justice and community safety and have deep experience with current and emerging theories, as well as expertise in data collection and analysis to inform recommendations for transformative change.

This analysis should commence as quickly as possible with the goal of providing some recommendations in time for the November 2020 AAO and then to more broadly inform the work of the Community Safety Coalition.

***(b) Identify immediate opportunities to shift elements of current policing resources to fund more appropriate community agency responses***

This re-energized movement for social justice also highlights a problematic expansion, over many decades, in the roles and responsibilities of the police. As other systems have been defunded, most notably mental health, education, affordable housing and other health and safety-net programs, the police have been asked to respond to more and more crises that could be avoided with a different set of investments in community wellbeing. Rather than being the responders of last resort, focused on criminal, aggressive and violent behaviors, police are now frontline responders routinely called to address mental health crises, poverty and homelessness, substance abuse, stress in the school environment, traffic and code violations and neighborhood disputes. This is an extensive set of responsibilities that have slowly accreted to the police.

---

<sup>4</sup>[https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Update\\_Budget%20Request%20to%20Hire%20a%20Consultant%20to%20Perform%20Police%20Call%20and%20Re...pdf](https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Update_Budget%20Request%20to%20Hire%20a%20Consultant%20to%20Perform%20Police%20Call%20and%20Re...pdf)

<sup>5</sup> [New York Times- How Do the Police Actually Spend Their Time?](#)

By November 2020, with preliminary information provided by outside experts, the City Manager and Council should identify some responsibilities that can be quickly shifted to other programs, departments and agencies. Some areas to be considered include:

- Mental health and crisis management (consideration should be given to possible expansion of the Mobile Integrated Paramedic Unit (MIP) Pilot initiated by the Berkeley Fire Department during the COVID-19 pandemic), and other models for mental health outreach and crisis response, including by non-profits
- Homeless outreach and services
- Civilianizing some or all Code Enforcement + Neighborhood Services and placing these functions elsewhere
- Alternatives for traffic and parking enforcement, and
- Substance abuse prevention and treatment

The consultants should work with the City Manager to provide a specific timeline and process for transitioning functions as quickly as possible, with deliverables to coincide with timelines for budget processes.

**(c) Contract with Change Management experts to initiate and facilitate a Community Safety Coalition (“CSC”) and Steering Committee that will begin meeting no later than January 2021.**

While the Council can make some important changes and investments in the near future, a complete and enduring transformation in community safety is only possible through robust community engagement. It is critical that the future of community health and safety is defined by the Berkeley community, elevating the voices of our Black, Native American/First Peoples and other communities of color, LGBTQ+ people, victims of harm and other stakeholders that have been historically marginalized and under-served by current systems. The Community Safety Coalition, guided by a steering committee, will serve as the hub for a broad, deep and representative process, and uplift the community’s input into a new positive, equitable, anti-racist system of community health and safety.

Berkeley has a history in leading transformational change to achieve a more equitable society. The robust public process that led to school desegregation is an example of our community’s success in bringing about significant, transformative change (Attachment 4).

The robust public process, led by the Community Safety Coalition and its steering committee, will be guided and facilitated by outside experts.

The work of the Coalition should include but not be limited to:

- Build upon the work of the City Council, City Manager, the Fair and Impartial Policing Working Group, the Use of Force subcommittee and other efforts of the Police Review and other City Commissions, and the work of other community agencies addressing community-centered health and safety
- Research and engagement to define a holistic, anti-racist approach to community safety, including a review and analysis of emerging models, programs and practices that could be applied in Berkeley. This research should explore and propose investments in restorative justice models, gun violence intervention programs, and substance abuse support, among other things.
- Recommend a positive, equitable, community-centered safety paradigm as a foundation for deep and lasting change, grounded in the principles of *Reduce, Improve and Reinvest* as proposed by the National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (Attachment 3), considering, among other things:
  - The social determinants of health and changes required to deliver a holistic approach to community-centered safety
  - The appropriate response to community calls for help including size, scope of operation and powers and duties of a well-trained police force.
  - Limiting militarized weaponry and equipment.
  - Identifying alternatives to policing and enforcement to reduce conflict, harm, and institutionalization, introduce alternative and restorative justice models, and reduce or eliminate use of fines and incarceration.
  - Options to reduce police contacts, stops, arrests, tickets, fines and incarceration and replace these, to the greatest extent possible, with educational, community serving, restorative and other positive programs, policies and systems.

The Coalition's goal/output will be a set of recommended programs, structures and initiatives to incorporate into upcoming budget processes for FY 2022-23 and, as a second phase, in the FY2024-2025 budget processes to ensure that recommended changes will be achieved. The Coalition shall return to City Council an initial plan and timeline by April 1, 2021, to ensure the first phase of changes can be incorporated into the FY2022-23 Budget Process.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

\$160,000 from the Auditor's budget to assess police calls and responses

\$200,000 from current budget cycle from Fund 106, Civil Asset Forfeiture, for initial subject matter expertise and engagement of outside consultants

Staff time to support the process of identifying and implementing change.

## REVIEW OF EXISTING PLANS, PROGRAMS, POLICIES AND LAWS

This effort is in support of the following strategic plan goals:

- Champion and demonstrate social and racial equity
- Create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared City
- Create affordable housing and housing support services for our most vulnerable community members
- Provide an efficient and financially-healthy City government
- Be a customer-focused organization that provides excellent, timely, easily-accessible service and information to the community

## ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

No Environmental Impact.

## CONTACT PERSON

Mayor Jesse Arreguin 510-981-7100

Vice-Mayor Sophie Hahn

Councilmember Ben Bartlett

Councilmember Kate Harrison

Attachments:

1. Resolution
2. Safety for All: The George Floyd Community Safety Act - Budget Request to Hire a Consultant to Perform Police Call and Response Data Analysis
3. "Shrink the Beast" A Framework for Transforming Police, National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform
4. School Desegregation in Berkeley: The Superintendent Reports, Neil Sullivan 1968

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The recent murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor and Ahmaud Arbery have ignited the nation in passionate protest against police brutality and racial injustice; and

Whereas, Demands for change go beyond necessary efforts in procedural justice, implicit bias training, and use of force policies and seek a broader discussion about investment in the conditions for a safe and healthy community; and

Whereas, Investment in “public safety” has been equated with more police for too long while economic and social welfare programs have been viewed as special projects unrelated to health and safety; and

Whereas, This movement is highlighting the problematic expansion in the roles and responsibilities of police officers. Rather than being the responders of last resort, focused on criminal, aggressive and violent behaviors, police are now frontline responders to mental health crises, homelessness, drug addiction, sex work, school disruption, traffic and code violations and neighborhood conflicts; and

Whereas, the adopted 2020 budget allocated \$74 million to the Berkeley Police Department, which represents over 44% of the City’s General Fund of \$175 million, and is more than twice as much as the combined City budgets for Health Housing and Community Services, and Economic Development; and

Whereas, It is clear that our current system of public health and safety is not working and is not sustainable in Berkeley. Despite strong efforts and leadership on police reform, homelessness and affordable housing, racial inequity remains stark across virtually every meaningful measure of health and well-being; and

Whereas, Local government’s most fundamental role is to provide for the health and safety of its residents. Cities around the country are acknowledging that they are falling behind in this basic function and are embarking on efforts to reimagine health and safety, and to consider reallocating resources towards a more holistic approach that shifts resources away from policing towards equitable health, education and social services that promote wellbeing up front;<sup>678</sup> and

Whereas, As this movement ripples across the nation, Berkeley has an opportunity to lead in transforming our approach to public health and safety. We need the right response for each crisis rather than defaulting to using the police; and

---

<sup>6</sup> [Transforming Community Safety Resolution-Minneapolis](#)

<sup>7</sup> [San Francisco Mayor, Supervisor announce effort to redirect some police funding to African-American community](#)

<sup>8</sup> [The cities that are already defunding the police](#)

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by The City Council of The City of Berkeley:

That the City Council commits to the principles of reduce, improve and re-invest: reduce the scope and investment in policing, improve the response and accountability of public and community agencies, reinvest in racial equity and community-based intervention initiatives<sup>9</sup>;

Be It Further Resolved that the City Council will engage with every willing community member in Berkeley, centering the voices of Black people, Native American people, people of color, immigrants, LGBTQ+ people, victims of harm, and other stakeholders who have been historically marginalized or under-served by our present system. Together, we will identify what safety looks like for everyone.

Be It Further Resolved that the process will center the role of healing and reconciliation. The process will require healers, elders, youth, artists, and organizers to lead deep community engagement on race and public safety. We will work with local and national leaders on transformative justice in partnerships informed by the needs of every block in our city.

Be It Further Resolved that decades of police reform efforts have not created equitable public safety in our community, and our efforts to achieve transformative public safety will not be deterred by the inertia of existing institutions, contracts, and legislation.

Be It Further Resolved that these efforts heed the words of Angela Davis, “In a racist society, it is not enough to be non-racist. We must be anti-racist.”

Be It Further Resolved that the transformation under consideration has a citywide impact, and will be conducted by the City Council in a spirit of collaboration and transparency with all constructive stakeholder contributors including the Mayor’s Office, the City Manager, the Police Chief, and community organizations.

Be It Further Resolved that the City Council of the City of Berkeley is committed to:

1. A transformative approach to community-centered safety and reducing the scope of policing
2. Equitable investment in the essential conditions of a safe and health community especially for those who have been historically marginalized and have experienced disinvestment
3. A broad, inclusive community process that will result in deep and lasting change to support safety and wellbeing for all Berkeley residents.

---

<sup>9</sup> [A Framework fo Transforming Police- NICJR](#)



Be it Further Resolved that the City Council supports taking the following actions to realize this transformation:

1. Direct the City Manager to track and report progress on actions to implement this initiative, and other actions that may be identified by the Coalition and referred by Council to the City Manager. Updates shall be provided by written and verbal reports to Council, and posted on a regularly updated and dedicated page on the City website.
2. Direct the City Manager to collaborate with Councilmembers later selected by the Mayor to complete the following work, to inform investments and reallocations to be incorporated into future Budget processes:
  - a. Contract with independent consultants/Change Management and subject matter experts to:
    - i. Analyze the scope of work of, and community needs addressed by, the Berkeley Police Department, to identify a more limited role for law enforcement, and identify elements of police work that could be achieved through alternative programs, policies, systems, and community investments. Analysis should include but not be limited to: calls received by dispatch by type of complaint, stops by law enforcement generated at officer discretion (as contained in the Police Department's open data portal) or on request of other city agencies, number of officers and staff from other city agencies that respond to incidents, estimated time in response to different types of calls, daily patrol activities, organizational structure, and beat staffing. Work to include broad cost estimates of police and other city agency response to different types of calls, and other information and analysis helpful to identify elements of current police work that could be transferred to other departments or programs, or achieved through alternative means. Work should be completed in time for the November 2020 Annual Appropriation Ordinance revision.
    - ii. Identify immediate and longer term opportunities to shift policing resources to alternative, non-police responses and towards alternative and restorative justice models, to better meet community needs, that could be considered in the

November 2020 AAO#1 budget process. Some areas to be considered include homeless outreach and services, substance abuse prevention and treatment, and mental health/crisis management, as well as alternative models for traffic and parking enforcement, “neighborhood services” and code enforcement. Provide a broad timeline and process for transitioning functions not ready for transition at this first milestone.

Deliverables should coincide with budget cycles, including the November 2020 AAO and FY 2022-2023 Budget processes, and provide a suggested timeline for transitioning functions at these and other budget opportunities, so that alternative investments may be considered for funding and launched in a timely and orderly manner.


- b. Contract with independent Change Management experts to create and facilitate a representative Community Safety Coalition, guided by a Steering Committee, that will begin meeting no later than January 2021. The CSC and its Steering Committee, should be broadly inclusive and representative of Berkeley residents and stakeholders. The Steering Committee, with the support of Change Management professionals, shall be responsible for engaging the Coalition and the broader Berkeley community and relevant City Staff in a robust process, to achieve a new and transformative model of positive, equitable and community-centered safety for Berkeley.

The work of the Coalition should include but not be limited to:

4. Building on the work of the City Council, the City Manager, the PRC and other City commissions and other working groups addressing community health and safety.
5. Research and engagement to define a holistic, anti-racist approach to community safety, including a review and analysis of emerging models, programs and practices that could be applied in Berkeley.
6. Recommend a new, community-centered safety paradigm as a foundation for deep and lasting change, grounded in the principles of *Reduce, Improve and Reinvest* as proposed by the National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (Attachment 3), considering, among other things:

- a. The social determinants of health and changes required to deliver a holistic approach to community-centered safety
- b. The appropriate response to community calls for help including size, scope of operation and powers and duties of a well-trained police force.
- c. Limiting militarized weaponry and equipment.
- d. Identifying alternatives to policing and enforcement to reduce conflict, harm, and institutionalization, introduce alternative and restorative justice models, and reduce or eliminate use of fines and incarceration.
- e. Options to reduce police contacts, stops, arrests, tickets, fines and incarceration and replace these, to the greatest extent possible, with educational, community serving, restorative and other positive programs, policies and systems.

The Coalition's goal/output will be a set of recommended programs, structures and initiatives to incorporate into upcoming budget processes for FY 2022-23 and, as a second phase, in the FY2024-2025 budget processes to ensure that recommended changes will be achieved. The Coalition shall return to City Council an initial plan and timeline by April 1, 2021, to ensure the first phase of changes can be incorporated into the FY2022-23 Budget Process.



Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

## EMERGENCY ITEM AGENDA MATERIAL

**Meeting date:** June 16, 2020  
**Item Description:** Safety for All: The George Floyd Community Safety Act - Budget Request to Hire a Consultant to Perform Police Call and Response Data Analysis  
**Submitted by:** Councilmember Ben Bartlett (Author), Mayor Jesse Arreguin, and Councilmembers Kate Harrison (Co-Sponsor)

### Rationale:


Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54954.2(b) (2), Councilmember Ben Bartlett submits the attached item to the City Council for placement on the June 16, 2020 meeting agenda. Gov. Code Section 54954.2(b) (2) states that “Upon a determination by a two-thirds vote of the members of a legislative body presents at the meeting, or, if less than two-thirds of the members are present, a unanimous vote of those members present, that there is a need to take immediate action and that the need for action came to the attention of the local agency subsequent to the agenda being posted as specified in subdivision (a).”

This item meets the criteria for “immediate action” as follows:

- 1) The budget is being considered and there is public outcry for Council to take action.
- 2) Racism Is a Public Health Emergency.
- 3) Council is considering numerous police items right now.

Hundreds of thousands of people in every state have marched in solidarity to call for an end to police brutality, to demand police accountability, and to reform law enforcement, bringing justice to the Black lives and people of color who have been wrongfully harmed at the hands of the criminal justice system. Police brutality has taken the lives of 46-year-old Black man George Floyd, 26-year-old Black woman Breonna Taylor, and countless other people of color. Often resorting to violent means of punishment, police officers are not trained to handle noncriminal and nonviolent situations. Unfortunately, the lack of sufficient data and reporting has allowed police misconduct to be swept under the rug, which has increased police militarization, failed to prioritize community safety, and prevented providing the civilian with the necessary treatment to resolve the situation.

To respond to urgent calls for police transparency and accountability, this item requests the City Manager to hire third-party consultants to conduct a data-driven analysis of the Berkeley Police Department’s calls, responses, budget, and expenditures to determine which calls can be serviced to non-law enforcement agencies, ensuring noncriminal and nonviolent situations are properly handled by trained community professionals.



Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

CONSENT CALENDAR

June 16, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
From: Councilmember Ben Bartlett (Author), Mayor Jesse Arreguin, and  
Councilmembers Kate Harrison (Co-Sponsor)  
Subject: Safety for All: The George Floyd Community Safety Act - Budget Request to  
Hire a Consultant to Perform Police Call and Response Data Analysis


RECOMMENDATION:

1. Refer to the Thursday, 6/18/2020 Budget & Finance Policy Committee and the FY 2020-21 Budget Process the \$150,000 to
  - a. Hire a consultant to conduct a data-driven analysis of police calls and responses to determine the quantity and proportion of these calls that can be responded to by non-police services. The third-party consultant must be hired and engaged in work within three months of the item's passage.
  - b. Hire a consultant to conduct an analysis of the Berkeley Police Department's budget and its expenditures by call type. The third-party consultant must be hired and engaged in work within three months of the item's passage.
2. Direct the City Manager to:
  - a. Implement initiatives and reforms that reduce the footprint of the police department and limit the police's response to violent and criminal service calls.

CURRENT SITUATION

In all 50 states and more than 145 cities, Americans are calling to end police violence and brutality, to legitimize police accountability, and to transform the police system to protect the safety of communities and people of color. Police violence and brutality led to the death of a 46-year-old Black man George Floyd and the murders of other Black people, igniting a flame that has been brewing for a long time. These events of police violence gave rise to a wave of demonstrations and demands for change, including many in the City of Berkeley.

Due to the Coronavirus pandemic, the City of Berkeley is facing a nearly 30+ million dollar budget deficit, sharply stalling economic growth with effects that parallel the Great Depression. At the same time, the City is projected to undergo an increase in people experiencing homelessness, trauma, and mental health crises. Therefore, the City must ensure that each dollar is spent for the residents' best interest and will produce the maximum return.



Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

In order to better respond to the needs of the Berkeley community, it is critical that the Council takes local-level action on police reform. In particular, the City must examine the types of calls and responses from the police department and analyze the agency's budgets and expenditures according to call type.

As a component of the **REDUCE, IMPROVE, RE-INVEST** framework, this item works towards the REDUCE goal: *the City should implement initiatives and reforms that reduce the footprint of the police department and limit the police's response to violent and criminal service calls.* Specifically, this item proposes to hire an outside consultant to conduct an analysis of police calls and responses as well as the department budget.

With military-style techniques and structure, police officers are trained to combat crime in a manner that exerts violence through punishments, establishing a monopoly on force in communities. While law enforcement is supposed to protect our communities and keep us safe, crime waves from the 1970s and 1980s have transformed the police community into a body for crime control, maintaining such focus until modern-day despite declines in criminal activity<sup>1</sup>. With this focus on crime control, police officers lack the necessary training to adequately respond to noncriminal and nonviolent crimes. Non Criminal crimes refer to issues involving mental health, the unhoused community, school discipline, and neighborhood civil disputes<sup>2</sup>. Nonviolent crimes are categorized as property, drug, and public order offenses where injury or force is absent<sup>3</sup>. When police respond to these types of matters, they resort to violent means of arrest or problem escalation because they are ill-equipped and not trained to resolve the underlying issues.

According to the Vera Institute of Justice's report between 1980 and 2016, more than 10.5 million arrests are made every year; only 4.83 percent of those arrests were for violent offenses<sup>4</sup>. Eighty percent of these arrests were for low-level offenses, such as "disorderly conduct," non-traffic offenses, civil violations, and other offenses. This criminalization may be attributed to the arrest quotas for police productivity, which promotes punishment by rewarding the number of arrests for police funding instead of finding solutions to these issues<sup>5</sup>. This high percentage of low-level offenses resulted in

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/06/first-step-figuring-out-what-police-are/612793/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-06-12/san-francisco-police-reforms-stop-response-noncriminal-calls>


<sup>3</sup>

<https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/ascii/pnoesp.txt#:~:text=Nonviolent%20crimes%20are%20defined%20as%20possession%2C%20burglary%2C%20and%20larceny.>

<sup>4</sup>

<https://arresttrends.vera.org/arrests?compare%5Boffense%5D%5Bpart1%5D=part1&compare%5Boffense%5D%5Bpart2%5D=part2#infographic>

<sup>5</sup> <https://theintercept.com/2019/01/31/arrests-policing-vera-institute-of-justice/>



Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

arrest when other nonviolent, rehabilitative methods could have occurred from the solutions of community workers with the experience to handle these situations.

It is imperative that the City of Berkeley develops, implements, and enforces a clear and effective roadmap towards making real change, ending anti-Black racism, stopping police violence, and holding police accountable for their actions. Thus, the Council should direct the City Manager to hire third party consultants to conduct a data-driven analysis of police calls and responses as well as their budget and expenditures in order to determine ways in which experienced community workers can reduce the police footprint by addressing noncriminal situations. We recommend that community workers also resolve nonviolent situations.

### BACKGROUND

In order to achieve the aforementioned goals, the City must implement a series of important law enforcement reforms and take action by initiating the following:

#### **REDUCE:**

##### **I. Hire a consultant to conduct a data driven analysis of police calls and responses.**


University of Denver Political Science Professor Laurel Eckhouse stated, “One method of reducing police presence... is to separate and reassign to other authorities various problems currently delegated to the police... such as the problems of people who don’t have housing... mental health issues... and even things like traffic<sup>6</sup>.” Community organizations, civilian workers trained in mental health situations, or neighborhood problem-solvers would better address these specific issues due to their experience, ensuring that the police are not the only force addressing these issues and promoting community vitality<sup>7</sup>.

Conducting a data driven analysis of police calls and responses would signify a report of the calls and responses that police receive and would inform the city where to better allocate resources to resolve specific issues. Noncriminal and nonviolent activities can thus be properly addressed by those who are equipped to handle these situations and would relieve law enforcement from these calls to then pursue more serious criminal situations. For example, the San Francisco Police Department receives approximately 40,000 calls per year about homeless people on the streets<sup>8</sup>. Social workers who can help unhoused citizens and those with mental health disorders are better equipped to help these citizens receive

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.stanforddaily.com/2020/06/04/police-abolition-looks-like-palo-alto/>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/06/first-step-figuring-out-what-police-are/612793/>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-06-12/san-francisco-police-reforms-stop-response-noncriminal-calls>



Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

proper treatment while also protecting the safety of our communities, which would give law enforcement time to handle other crimes.

One suggestion to reduce the costs of policing is to boost productivity by allocating a portion of the calls for service to community organizations who have the resources and training to handle such situations<sup>9</sup>. For example, in Mesa, Arizona from 2006 to 2008, a third of calls for service are handled by civilians; these calls are for incidents of “vehicle burglaries, unsecured buildings, accidents, loose dogs, stolen vehicles, traffic hazards, and residential burglaries<sup>10</sup>.” Approximately half of calls for service in Mesa are handled by police officers, but among those, there are ways to reduce police authority. For example, 11 percent of those calls that police officers handled were in response to burglary alarms, where 99 percent were false. Six percent of those calls included “juveniles disturbing the peace.” This situation in Mesa demonstrates the possibility of reduced police force in exchange for community based response teams who can better resolve these issues with their experience.

The City Manager should hire a third party consultant within three months of this item’s passage to conduct the data analysis, ensuring that the report is completed in an impartial and timely manner.


The third party consultant should create a report with the following information by analyzing and gathering the data from the police department, reporting their findings to the City every two years. We recommend the following data to be considered for analysis:

- a. Number of calls the police department receives per day, week, month, and year, which will be categorized into noncriminal, misdemeanor, nonviolent felony, and serious and violent felony calls.
- b. Demographics for these calls
- c. Characteristics of traffic stops
  - i. Quantity
  - ii. Type/reason
  - iii. Number of those resulting in searchings paired with the frequency at which illegal items were found
  - iv. Police response (i.e. citation, arrest, use of force)
  - v. Demographics of the civilian in the traffic stop that is broken into type of stop and whether a search occurred
- d. Number of complaints against an officer
  - i. Enumerate the officers with a high number of complaints

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/231096.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/231096.pdf>





Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

ii. Reason behind the complaints.

With the results of the data analysis, the City can determine the portion of calls that the community crisis worker pilot can properly address with the resources and experience they have.

**II. Hire a consultant to conduct an analysis of the police department budget.**


Using the analysis generated by a review of police call and response data, a third party consultant should be hired to analyze the police department's expenditures and budgets for various calls of service and report their findings to the City every two years.

According to the 2019 budget, the Berkeley Police Department's expenditures were approximately \$69 million, which consists of 5.6 percent of the city's net expenditures. However, for the 2020 budget, the BPD is expected to have \$74 million in expenditures, reflecting a \$5 million increase from the previous year and approximately \$8 million higher than 2017's expenditures<sup>11</sup>. Unfortunately, anecdotal evidence suggests that only 20 percent of police time is spent on solving crime and the majority is spent towards addressing those experiencing homelessness and mental health crises. The City should reallocate resources to a crisis worker entity who would be tasked with responding to noncriminal calls. We recommend that nonviolent calls also be addressed by this entity. This would give police officers more time to focus on crime, leading to better outcomes for public safety, community health, and a higher quality of life.

In Canada, Police Information and Statistics Committee police services Waterloo Police Regional Service and Ontario Provincial Police collaborated with Justice Canada and Public Safety to collect data on their calls for service and determine the costs of policing<sup>12</sup>. Their research reported that in 2013, bylaw complaints were listed as the most frequent call for service in Waterloo at 8,769 calls and non-crime policing activities were listed as the most frequent. In contrast, the only criminal activity listed in the top 10 generated calls were domestic dispute, theft under \$5000, and major violent crime in property damage. Considering the most frequent of costly calls are noncriminal activities such as selective traffic enforcement programs (\$22,212.45 in sum of total unit service time in hours) and vehicle stops (\$206,668.13), the greatest cost in calls were for noncriminal activities. As noncriminal activities result in the greatest costs, it would be more efficient for community workers to handle these situations in order to reduce

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Manager/Budget/FY-2020-2021-Adopted-Budget-Book.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/2015-r018/index-en.aspx#c-1-i>



Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

police department costs, allowing trained professionals to resolve the issue and giving police officers time to spend on more serious criminal offenses.

By analyzing the budget expenditures for the police for each call type, the community can divest from the police and reallocate those funds for trained community organizations who can handle noncriminal and nonviolent offenses. Considering the significantly delayed response to former requests for the police department's budget, the data analysis should be conducted by a third party consultant that is hired and engaged in active service within three months of this item's passage, ensuring that the police department's budget information is transparent to the public and reported in an impartial, timely manner.

#### REVIEW OF EXISTING PLANS, PROGRAMS, POLICIES, AND LAWS


The City Manager provides regular reports on crime in Berkeley and on the policies of the Berkeley Police Department<sup>13</sup>. The data on serious crime is collected annually by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), which consists of over 17,000 law enforcement agencies that represent over 90 percent of the United States population. The FBI's Uniform Crime Report (UCR) reports crime statistics on violent crimes (including murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and property crimes (including burglary, larceny, auto theft, and arson). This data allows the BPD to analyze national and local crime trends, determine effectiveness of response to crime, and plan for future policies and resource allocation. Additionally, the City of Berkeley implements the Daily Calls for Service Log that the community can access to see the volume and nature of police activity.

Currently, Utah requires agencies to report tactical deployment and forcible entries where such reports are summarized by the Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice. Utah Law Enforcement Transparency reporting interface was added to Utah Criminal Justice Information System in 2014 through the use of federal grant funding. Law enforcement agencies are required to report incidents of forcible entry and the deployment of tactical groups, representing data collection of police use of force<sup>14</sup>.

However, these reports do not analyze the demographics or types of calls and responses from the BPD, which makes it difficult to hold police officers accountable for the mistreatment of individuals. Without this information, it becomes difficult to determine how to decrease the police footprint or implement safer policing practices if the analysis only pertains to the quantity and types of arrests and does not include the

<sup>13</sup> [https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Police/Home/Annual\\_Crime\\_Reports.aspx](https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Police/Home/Annual_Crime_Reports.aspx)

<sup>14</sup> <https://justice.utah.gov/Documents/CCJJ/LETR/2018%20LET%20Annual%20Report.html>



Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

background, call of service, reason, demographics, complaints against the police officer, and other important factors to the BPD's response.

Despite voluntary data sharing and crime reports, data collection still remains vague and insufficient, leaving many unanswered questions regarding the number of instances of and reasons for use of force, complaint process against police officers, and other information about police actions. This lack of clarity allows police misconduct to perpetuate due to the lack of research that would hold police departments accountable.

#### ACTIONS/ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

One possible alternative to the community response teams would be to implement better training procedures so that police officers are more equipped to handle nonviolent and noncriminal activities. For example, the state of Washington requires both violence de-escalation and mental health training for police officers<sup>15</sup>. Such reform may render the data analysis on the types of calls unnecessary because the police department would be trained to handle all services regardless of the type of call.

However, training police officers to handle situations such as mental health or homelessness would signify an increase in funding for the police department to provide such training services. Not only would this type of training be difficult to maneuver when police forces are currently trained in a militarized manner, but it would be more efficient for community professionals to peacefully and properly resolve such issues since they have already engaged in this training and experience for years.


Reforming police training may be beneficial, but in this case, it would also indicate the lack of basis for reporting the police department's types of calls and responses, which is necessary to hold the police accountable and ensure safer practices. While reporting the data analysis could still occur without the community crisis workers, only having the police department manage all situations would increase their authority over the communities, which would lead to increased militarization of the police forces if other community organizations do not intervene or hold them accountable.

#### OUTREACH OVERVIEW AND RESULTS

The District 3 Office has consulted with David Muhammad, who is the Executive Director of the National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform; the former Chief Probation Officer in Alameda County; and the former Deputy Commissioner of Probation in New York City. David Muhammad is a leading expert on criminal justice who has helped inform our response to the current situation.

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/06/how-actually-fix-americas-police/612520/>



Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

The District 3 Office has also consulted with Marcus McKinney, the Senior Director of Government Affairs & Public Policy at the Center for Policing Equity.

The District 3 Office has also consulted with Professor Tracey L. Meares, Walton Hale Hamilton Professor and Faculty Director of the Justice Collaboratory at Yale Law School.

### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

Police departments across the country enforce policies and practices that breed a culture of violence resulting in killings--like those of Floyd and Moore, and of countless other people of color. These authoritative, militarized behaviors are often rooted in anti-Black racism, and such behavior must stop being acceptable. Transformation of police departments, their role, and relationship to our communities requires a change in culture, accountability, training, policies, and practices.

To prioritize community safety and reduce police violence, the City must hire a third party consultant to analyze police data in order to decide how to divest from the police to fund experienced community workers who can adequately resolve noncriminal and nonviolent situations. These community workers would protect the community from violence and emphasize revitalization and rehabilitation over the punishment that police officers often enforce. Implementing a data-driven analysis on police data would increase the transparency of the police department and hold them accountable, detecting the issues within the police force that community response teams can help heal. The Council must make informed legislative decisions that will reduce police footprint, improve current practices of law enforcement, and reinvest in the community for the safety of our civilians.


### FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

The third party consultant/s would cost approximately \$150,000 to \$200,000. It is up to the City Manager to hire the third party consultants who will analyze the data of the police department's calls, responses, budget, and expenditures. Consultants must be hired and engaged in service within three months if this item passes. These consultants would ensure that noncriminal situations are handled by those with the necessary training, which may lead to a decrease in repeat offenses when community workers properly resolve the situation and guide civilians to helpful resources.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

We do not expect this recommendation to have significant negative impacts on environmental sustainability.

### OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION



Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
City of Berkeley, District 3

If this item is passed, third party consultants would be hired by the City and engaged in data analysis within three months of passage. These consultants would produce biennial reports regarding the Berkeley Police Department's types of calls and responses as well as the budgets and expenditures in order to inform the City how to reallocate funds from the police into a community response team with better experience to handle noncriminal situations. We recommend that nonviolent situations also be addressed by community crisis workers.

#### CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember Ben Bartlett  
James Chang  
Kyle Tang  
Kimberly Woo

510-981-7130  
[ichang@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:ichang@cityofberkeley.info)  
[ktang@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:ktang@cityofberkeley.info)  
[kimwoo1240@berkeley.edu](mailto:kimwoo1240@berkeley.edu)

#### ATTACHMENTS

1. Cover Letter - Safety for All: George Floyd Community Safety Act
  - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/16pqqd9J6NPRzh6298Bgazo7jw1qxTK6Y/view?usp=sharing>

# SHRINK THE BEAST:

A Framework for Transforming Police

NICJR★  
National Institute for  
Criminal Justice Reform



The killing of George Floyd by Minneapolis police was the match that lit a fire that has been building in our communities for a long time. Nationwide demands for not just reform, but complete transformation of policing have put pressure on local jurisdictions across the country to make rapid and real change.

Since its founding, the National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (NICJR) has worked to reform the juvenile and criminal justice systems through a process of Reduce – Improve – and Reinvest. This framework can also be effective in transforming policing. In the past 15 years, the U.S. juvenile justice system has been reduced by more than half. Youth correctional facilities have been shuttered and investment into community services has increased. While there is certainly more progress to be made, the movement to transform policing can learn a great deal from criminal justice reform.

**NICJR's framework to Shrink the Beast focuses on three areas:** reducing the footprint of law enforcement, significantly improving what remains of policing, and reinvesting the savings from smaller police budgets into community services.

## Reduce

One of the most significant structural reforms we must advance in policing, already happening in the criminal justice arena, is shrinking its scope. Officers are asked to do too much with too few resources. The warrior mentality that police are indoctrinated with, starting as early as the first day of the police academy, does not allow them to handle many of those responsibilities well. It is time for an alternative response network for all non-violent calls for service. Similar to the community-based organizations that provide diversion programs for youth and adults who would otherwise end up in the justice system, a new infrastructure of community safety and problem-solving responders, with expertise in crisis response, mental health, and de-escalation techniques, must be developed. Such a network should be vast and well equipped, including 24-hour on-call community crisis response and outreach workers. The resulting reduced police force would then focus primarily on responding to serious violence. Small, but promising examples of this model already exist:

- › **In Oakland, CA**, non-profit organizations employ street outreach workers and crisis response specialists who respond to shooting scenes, intervene in and mediate conflicts, and sit down with young adults who have been identified as being at very high risk of violence to inform them of their risk and offer them intensive services. These City-funded efforts have been credited with a [50 percent reduction in shootings](#) and homicides in the city.
- › **In Eugene, OR**, Crisis Assistance Helping Out on the Streets ([CAHOOTS](#)) responds to more than 22,000 requests for service annually with its Crisis Intervention Workers. This represents nearly 20 percent of the total public safety call volume for the metropolitan area.
- › **In Austin, TX**, the [Expanded Mobile Crisis Outreach Team](#) is equipped to respond to 911 calls where callers indicate that a mental health response, not police, is needed.
- › **In Albuquerque, NM**, where the police have been involved in numerous unjustified killings, the Mayor has proposed creating a [new non-law enforcement public safety agency](#) that will respond to non-violent calls.

## Steps To Reduction



Create a robust alternative emergency response network with mental health workers, crisis intervention specialists, and street outreach workers – the Community Emergency Response Network (CERN).



Significantly reduce police patrol divisions which are currently primarily responsible for responding to 911 calls. Police will instead focus on responding to serious and violent incidents, a small percentage of all current calls.



CERN Crisis Intervention Specialists would respond to all other calls.



Traffic policing should be replaced by technology to the maximum extent possible.



Violence reduction teams should be created or remain intact: Patrol and investigation units focused on reducing gun violence. Like all remaining police personnel, these units must be trained in and adhere to strict use of force and Procedural Justice policies.



Investigation Units should also remain intact.

## Improve

The primary challenge in police agencies is culture. Many have described it as a warrior culture. Adrenaline-filled young officers want to “knock heads” during their shifts; the “us vs them,” military occupation syndrome. We must confront and transform this destructive culture. Policing should focus on protection and service to the community.

Improving the smaller police departments that remain, after taking the steps to reduction outlined above, includes three components: policy, training, and accountability. Implement new policies including restricting the use of force, mandating verbal de-escalation, community policing, and eliminating stop and frisk. Implement high quality and frequent training on these newly developed policies. And, most importantly, hold all police personnel accountable for adhering to and demonstrating these policies in action.



### Steps To Improvement

- 1 Increase hiring standards to screen out candidates with any signs of racial bias, interest in the warrior culture, or those who have been fired or forced to resign from previous law enforcement positions.
- 2 Prioritize hires of those who grew up in the city and/or live in the city.
- 3 Make deliberate efforts to have the police force representative of the community it serves.
- 4 Revise use of force policies to limit any use of deadly force as a last resort in situations where a suspect is clearly armed with a firearm and is using or threatening to use the firearm.
- 5 All other force must be absolutely necessary and proportional.
- 6 Provide thorough, high quality, and intensive training in subjects including:
  - New use of force policy
  - Verbal de-escalation
  - Bias-free policing
  - Procedural Justice
- 7 Transparency: Provide regular reports to the public on stops, arrests, complaints, and uses of force, including totals, demographics, and aggregate outcomes data.
- 8 Effectively use an early intervention system that tracks various data points to identify high risk officers and implement discipline, training, and dismissal where necessary.
- 9 Use aggressive, progressive discipline to root out bad officers.
- 10 Rescind state and local laws that provide undue protection to police unions and prohibit effective and efficient disciplinary action.

## Reinvest

A smaller footprint of law enforcement should result in a reduced police budget. Resources should be shifted away from the police department to the CERN and other community-based intervention initiatives, including Credible Messengers/Life Coaches, social workers, and mental health service providers.





The National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (NICJR) is a non-profit organization providing technical assistance, consulting, research, and organizational development in the fields of juvenile and criminal justice, youth development, and violence prevention. NICJR provides consultation, program development, technical assistance, and training to an array of organizations, including government agencies, non-profit organizations, and philanthropic foundations.

---

[NICJR.org](https://www.nicjr.org)

## R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 988

UD 004 752

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN BERKELEY--THE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT REPORTS.

BY- SULLIVAN, NEIL V.

PUB DATE NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.92 21F.

DESCRIPTORS- \*SCHOOL INTEGRATION, \*BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY, \*BOARD OF EDUCATION ROLE, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY COOPERATION, BUS TRANSPORTATION, STAFF ROLE, ELECTIONS, INTEGRATION PLANS, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

DESCRIBED IS THE HISTORY OF THE EFFORTS TO DESEGREGATE THE BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, SCHOOL DISTRICT, WHICH IS SCHEDULED TO BE FULLY DESEGREGATED BY SEPTEMBER 1968. CHANGE BEGAN IN THE 1950'S WITH THE ELECTION OF A "LIBERAL" TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION. FIRST STEPS INVOLVED IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN AND MAKING EFFORTS FOR BETTER RACE RELATIONS. DESEGREGATION BEGAN IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS BUT NOT WITHOUT COMMUNITY FRICTION TO THE POINT OF A DEMAND FOR A RECALL ELECTION OF THE BOARD. HOWEVER THE BOARD WAS VINDICATED ON ITS STAND FOR VOLUNTARY INITIATION OF DESEGREGATION. A NEW SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT WAS FACED WITH THE JOB OF IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN AND BEGAN HIS EFFORTS BY DEVELOPING COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND PRODUCTIVE LIAISON WITH HIS STAFF. THE NEXT STEP INVOLVED DESEGREGATING THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. THE WIDE GEOGRAPHIC SEPARATION OF IMBALANCED SCHOOLS IN THE CITY REQUIRED THE DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN WHITE SCHOOLS AS RECEIVING SCHOOLS AND THE USE OF FEDERALLY FUNDED BUSES AND ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR THE 230 INCOMING PUPILS. HOWEVER THIS WAS ONLY A "TOKEN" EFFORT. VOLUNTARY REVERSE BUSING AND A TIMETABLE FOR COMPLETE DESEGREGATION HAVE BEEN RECOMMENDED. IT IS FELT THAT THE REQUISITES FOR SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ARE FULL COMMITMENT BY THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND THE BOARD, COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT WITH AND FAITH IN THE BOARD AND ADMINISTRATION, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF "WORKABLE" PLANS. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA'S CITIES, SPONSORED BY THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 16-18, 1967. (NH)

04752

**SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN BERKELEY:  
THE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT REPORTS**

Prepared by  
Neil V. Sullivan, Ed. D., Superintendent of Schools  
Berkeley Unified School District-Berkeley, California  
for the  
National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity  
in America's Cities  
sponsored by the  
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.  
November 16-18, 1967

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION**

**THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE  
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
POSITION OR POLICY.**

In recent years Berkeley, California, has been fortunate to have a school district which recognizes its problems and works effectively toward their solution. The city schools already have completely desegregated the junior high schools, and have made a token start at the elementary level. The School Board has committed itself to completing the process in all schools by September 1968. When that goal is reached, Berkeley will be a rare example of a major city working out a solution to this problem without court orders, violence, boycotts, or compulsion, but only with the conviction of the Board of Education, the Administration, and the citizens that it was right.

This has not been achieved overnight. To place the present achievements in their proper context it is necessary to trace the development of events in the recent past.

ED015988

UD 004 752

PRE-1964

The Liberal Renaissance - Prior to the mid-1950's Berkeley's local government -- including the Board of Education -- was typical of those found in most middle-size, middle-class communities. The orientation was pro-business, with a heavy emphasis on keeping the tax rate down. This condition was so pronounced that teachers, in order to obtain a much needed and earned salary increase, were forced to use an initiative petition to get school revenues raised; the Board had refused to do so.

There are many different versions concerning the beginning of the liberal renaissance. There is general agreement that the first concrete step was the election of one liberal to the Board in 1957, followed by another in 1959, and two more in 1961. With the 1961 election the liberals assumed control of both the Board of Education and the City Council. However, even with only one "liberal" Board member in the late 1950's, the Board began to give attention to the problems of race relations in a multi-racial city.

Preliminary Steps - A citizens committee (named the Staats Committee after its chairman) was organized to study race relations within schools. This committee did not come to grips with the question of de facto segregation but sought to deal otherwise with improving educational opportunities for minority youngsters and improving race relations in the schools. For the late 1950's this report was a forward-looking document. It led to two particularly noteworthy developments.

First, the hiring practices for minority teachers were greatly improved. The number of Negro teachers increased from 36 in 1958 to 75 in 1962. Negroes also were advanced to principalships and other high positions in the District's administrative hierarchy. And by 1962 there were about 30 Orientals on the certificated staff.\*

Second was the Intergroup Education Project (IEP). This project was designed to help teachers appreciate cultural diversities and better understand youngsters from other than middle-class backgrounds. It conducted seminars for teachers, mass community meetings, and weekend conferences for this purpose. The IEP helped prepare the ground for the high staff support for later integration efforts.

Junior High School Desegregation - In 1962 a delegation from the Congress on Racial Equality visited the Superintendent of Schools -- and later the Board of Education. Complimenting the School District for progress already made, the CORE delegation suggested that it was time to get on with the task of desegregating the schools. CORE asked that a citizens committee be appointed to study this problem.

The report included a recommendation for desegregating the junior high schools by assigning some students from the predominantly Caucasian "hill" area to Burbank, the Negro junior high school; students from predominantly Negro west Berkeley would be assigned partly

---

\* The distribution of minority teachers among the various schools did not keep pace with progress in hiring. Most of these recruits were assigned to predominantly Negro schools. In more recent years we have made a concerted effort to achieve a better racial balance on all faculties. It is important, especially to combat stereotypes, to the education of all children to see members of all races working together in such respected vocations as teaching.

to Garfield, the Caucasian junior high school. Since the third junior high school already was racially balanced, this recommendation would have eliminated de facto segregation at the junior high school level.

The report struck the community like a bombshell. Although the community was aware that the committee was functioning, most people had not taken seriously the possibility that such a concrete recommendation would be made. The reaction was intense. During the remainder of 1963 and through January of 1964 there was extensive community discussion of the proposal. Two hearings were held -- one attracting 1200 people and other drawing over 2000. PTA's and other groups set up study committees on this problem; never before had such crowds attended PTA meetings!

In the hill area affected by the recommendation many liberals faced a dilemma. Some asked: "How do we express our opposition to this particular proposal without sounding like bigots?" Our response was to ask them to develop a better plan. Many sincere critics of the citizens committee proposal set out to do just that.

One of these alternative proposals was named the "Ramsey Plan" after the junior high school English teacher who suggested it. This plan proposed desegregation of Berkeley's three junior high schools by making the predominantly Negro school into a 9th grade school and dividing the 7th and 8th graders between the two remaining junior high schools.

In February 1964 a five-member staff committee was asked to study the reactions of the Berkeley school staff to the citizens committee proposal and to other ideas that had been offered. Every school faculty was asked to consider the matter.

In March the 5-member staff committee reported to the Board that the staff as a whole was favorable toward integration, and preferred the Ramsey Plan to the original citizens committee proposal. The Board instructed the Superintendent to consider the educational pros and cons of the Ramsey Plan, and its feasibility for September 1964 implementation.

The results of this study were presented to the Board and the community on May 19, 1964, a landmark date in the history of Berkeley schools. Again there were over 2000 people in the audience. The opposition, which had formed the "Parents Association for Neighborhood Schools" (PANS) solemnly warned that if the Ramsey Plan or any such desegregation proposal were adopted, the Board would face a recall election. The Board members did vote for the Ramsey Plan -- and they did face recall.

The Recall - Through the summer months the opponents of the Board collected signatures on recall petitions. A rival group was formed to defend the Board (Berkeley Friends of Better Schools). By late July the PANS group had enough signatures to force a recall election.

There followed a series of procedural skirmishes before the City Council and the state courts. Finally, an election was called for October 6, and after an intensive and heated campaign it was held. It was a stunning triumph for the courageous incumbent Board members. This election was another landmark for Berkeley education and for the cause of desegregation across the nation. There was more at stake than indi-

vidual Board members continuing in office. The basic issue was the survival of a Board of Education which voluntarily took effective action to desegregate schools -- not because of court order or other compulsion, but simply because the Board believed desegregation was right. If such a board of Education could not be sustained the lesson would not be lost on boards of education in other cities facing the same problem. Thus, it was extremely significant that in this election the Board was vindicated by the Berkeley community.

#### SULLIVAN ADMINISTRATION

The New Administration - On September 1, 1964, five weeks prior to the recall election, I took office as Berkeley's Superintendent of Schools in the midst of a climate of change and uncertainty. Of the five-member Board of Education which had unanimously invited me to come to Berkeley, only two remained in office. One had resigned because his business interests led him to move from the city. Another was transferred to become minister of one of the largest churches of his denomination in New York City, and a third was appointed by the Governor to be a Superior Court judge. The two who remained were facing a recall election.

There also was a sweeping change in the school administration. Virtually every top ranking member of the central administration was either new to the District or new in his position. Over one-third of our schools had new principals.

Making the New Plan Work - The decision to desegregate the junior high schools had been made before I arrived. The role of the



new administration was to make it work.

School opened as usual and the new system was put into effect with no marked difficulties. In fact, the orderliness of the transition was an important contribution to the defeat of the recall attempt. It demonstrated clearly that desegregation could be achieved without the dire consequences that had been forecast.

Developing Community Support - Defeat of the recall election meant that courageous Board members would remain in office, and the junior high school desegregation plan would continue. My next task as Superintendent was to attempt to reunite a badly split community, to develop a sense of community understanding, and to provide a basis for school support.

I approached this problem by creating a climate of openness with the public. We immediately established the practice of recognizing and admitting our problems and inviting the community's help in seeking solutions. As a new superintendent, I was besieged by invitations to speak publicly. I accepted as many as I could and during the 1964-65 school year scheduled over 100 speaking engagements.

I issued an open invitation to citizens to visit my office and discuss their school concerns, to share their ideas and suggestions. In addition I telephoned or wrote to dozens of people who had been recommended to me as community leaders deeply interested in schools. For several months I met almost continually, often a few times a day, with citizens individually and in groups. These meetings made me familiar with the Berkeley community and established a climate that encouraged exchange of ideas.

I established a liaison channel between my office and the area-wide PTA Council. I made it a practice to convene three or four briefing sessions a year with the unit presidents and council officers of that organization, and included other groups such as the League of Women Voters. At these sessions problems and issues facing the schools, as well as hopes and plans for improvement were discussed.

The day after the recall election I recommended the formation of a broadly-based School Master Plan Committee, to examine all facets of the School District's operation and to develop guidelines for the future. I urged participation of all elements of the community, making it clear that we wanted cooperation, regardless of positions in the recall election. The response was heartwarming; over 200 highly qualified citizens were nominated or volunteered their services. The Board of Education selected 91 people from this list to serve on the committee. Also named were 47 staff members. The committee has been hard at work for two years, and presented its report in the fall of 1967.

During my first year in Berkeley, I was invited by the local newspaper to write a weekly column on local and national education matters. This column has been a valuable means of keeping the community informed and introducing some new ideas. During the past year I accepted the invitation from a local radio station to conduct a weekly program of fifteen minute sessions dealing with events in the school system and issues facing public education. Each month the final week's program is extended to one hour, and features a direct phone-in from the radio audience.

In addition to developing relationships with the general public, we have worked to maintain good liaison with the staff. We have frequent breakfast conferences with the leaders of both teacher organizations, and meet regularly with the Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council, made up of teacher representatives chosen by each faculty.

The purpose of these communication efforts has been three-fold. First, extensive dialogue with staff and community helps to identify and define problems needing attention. Second, it serves as an excellent source of new ideas and suggestions. Third, it helps interpret our problems, goals, and programs to the community.

Our efforts have been, in short, to "mold consensus" in the community behind the school system. Although we have not achieved unanimity on any single subject (that would be impossible in Berkeley!) there have been good indications during the past three years. It seems that we have succeeded in molding community support for the schools, and in developing sufficient consensus to resolve some of the crucial problems facing urban schools today.

#### A START TOWARD ELEMENTARY INTEGRATION

Segregation in the Elementary Schools - The Board's adoption of the Ramsey Plan, followed by the defeat of recall election, insured desegregation at the junior high school level. Since there is only one regular senior high school, our entire secondary school program, beginning with grade 7, was desegregated. However, we still face de facto segregated elementary schools. The four elementary schools in south and west Berkeley are overwhelmingly Negro. The seven schools located in

the northern and eastern hill areas of the city are overwhelmingly Caucasian. In between, in a strip running through the middle of Berkeley, are three desegregated schools. Since the racially imbalanced Negro and Caucasian schools are on opposite sides of the city, separated by the integrated schools, boundary adjustments will not solve the problem.

When the Ramsey Plan was adopted the Board tabled a companion recommendation that would have desegregated the elementary schools by dividing the city into four east-to-west strips, each containing three or four schools. The schools within each of these strips would have been assigned students on a Princeton principle, i.e., 1-3 in some schools, grades 4-6 in others.

Educational Considerations - It is not the function of this paper to develop fully the case for school desegregation. However, the basic motivation underlying our progress in Berkeley can be stated concisely.

Many studies, in Berkeley and elsewhere, have documented the fact that segregation hurts the achievement of disadvantaged youngsters. Schools with a preponderance of these boys and girls have low prestige and generally lack an atmosphere conducive to serious study.

The emotional and psychological harm done to children through this type of isolation also has been demonstrated. Regardless of cause, racial segregation carries with it the symbol of society's traditional rejection of Negroes.

The benefit of integration extends to children of all races. We are all sharing this society, and if it is to be successful we must learn to respect each other and get along with one another. This will not happen if segregation remains.

These considerations have been taken seriously in Berkeley as we move toward total school integration.

ESEA Busing Program - The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 allowed the schools to make a beginning on the problem of elementary school segregation. Berkeley's share under Title I of that Act was approximately a half-million dollars. A major share of these funds was used to reduce pupil-teacher ratios in our four target area (Negro) schools and to provide extra specialists and services for students attending them. The reduction of pupil-teacher ratios left a surplus of 235 children. The seven predominantly Caucasian hill-area schools had spaces for these youngsters. Our proposal for the first year's use of Title I funds, then, included improved services and reduced pupil-teacher ratio in the target area schools and the purchase of buses to transport the 235 "surplus" youngsters to the hill area schools.

In the preparation of this project we again employed our principle of mass community involvement. Each school faculty was invited to submit suggestions. Their response was gratifying. These suggestions, when piled together, produced a stack of paper several inches high. When they had been sifted and evaluated, and a project developed, we submitted it to the Board. Copies were made available to the school faculties and the public for their reactions. Two major public meetings were held in different sections of the city, and the Board of Education held a workshop session at which teachers could react. Many valuable suggestions and constructive criticisms resulted and were incorporated into the final proposal.

As might have been predicted, most of the public attention was centered on the busing proposal, although it involved a relatively minor share of the funds. This time the opposition, though by no means silent, was much less severe.

Since the children in the hill area schools were not being asked to go anywhere else -- the hill schools were simply going to receive youngsters from the other areas of the city -- this provided no focal point for the development of opposition. And the proposal included employing eleven extra teachers, paid with local money, and placing them in the receiving schools to maintain the pupil-teacher ratio there. A few scattered voices were raised against the proposal, but the preponderance of community opinion was favorable. Both teacher organizations endorsed the project, and on November 30, 1965, the Board adopted the program for implementation the spring semester.

The proposal went to the State Board of Education and became one of the first fourteen ESEA projects approved in the State of California. We had approximately two months to prepare for its implementation -- the selection of youngsters (this was voluntary on the part of the parents), the employment of teachers, arrangement of transportation, and other administrative details. Parent groups in the receiving schools helped by establishing contact with the parents of the transferring students. The students in the receiving schools likewise participated, and some wrote letters of welcome to the newcomers. Dry runs were conducted with the buses so that by the time the program was implemented in February 1966, the necessary advance preparation had been accomplished.

Results to Date - Although the program has not been in effect long enough for an extensive objective evaluation, early indications are that it has been extremely successful. The children have adjusted well in their new school environment and, by their performance, have made friends for integration. One evaluation, made by an outside consultant employed by the District, found that receiving school parents whose children were in class with Negroes were more favorable to integration than parents whose children were not in class with Negroes. And parents of the bused students were so pleased with the results that many requested that their other children be included.

This limited program provided an integrated experience for the 230 youngsters being transferred, less than 10 percent of the sending schools' enrollment. It also provided token integration for the receiving schools. However, it left the four southwest Berkeley schools just as segregated as they were before, although with a somewhat improved program due to the reduced pupil-teacher ratio and added services.

#### COMMITMENT TO TOTAL INTEGRATION

The Problem - Although the ESEA program has provided a start in the direction of elementary school desegregation, we never regarded the busing of only 235 youngsters as the solution to the segregation problem. The problem will not be solved as long as our four south and west Berkeley schools remain overwhelmingly Negro, and the schools in the north and east overwhelmingly Caucasian. The segregation problem must be solved if minority youngsters are ever to close the achievement gap and if all youngsters, regardless of race, are to be adequately prepared for life in a multi-racial world.

Although we have integrated the schools down to the 7th grade, we strongly believe that integration must begin earlier. In too many cases attitudes already are hardened and stereotypes developed by the time the youngsters reach the 7th grade. It is, of course, politically and logistically easier to desegregate the secondary schools. In fact, a bi-racial city that has not desegregated its secondary schools is by definition not committed to integration. The problem is much more difficult at the elementary level. Buildings and attendance areas are smaller, children are younger, and community emotions are more intense. Yet, the problem must be solved at the elementary level. It is ironic that solutions come more easily at one level, but more good can be accomplished at the other.

The Commitment - The commitment of the Board of Education to desegregation of all elementary schools in Berkeley came in the spring of 1967. In early April a delegation from west Berkeley made a resen- tation to the Board, stating that it was time to get on with the job of total desegregation. The delegation had many other recommendations specifically relating to the south and west Berkeley schools and the programs available to minority youngsters. At this meeting I recommended that the Board authorize the Administration to develop a program of voluntary reverse busing from Caucasian areas to south and west Berkeley. I let it be known that this was to be regarded only as a stop-gap measure to demonstrate good faith and did not represent a solution to the desegregation problem.

At the next meeting, however, before we could develop a reverse busing plan, the issue moved ahead. Both of our certificated staff organizations made appeals to the Board for action either to erase de facto



segregation completely or at least to make a significant step in that direction. Officials of the local NAACP and other members of the audience supported these appeals. A motion was presented to the Board calling for desegregation of all Berkeley schools. The Board concurred and established September 1968 as the target date for desegregating the schools.

The next two or three Board meetings, including one workshop or "open hearing", drew crowds of several hundred spectators and many speakers. Most of the speakers and most of the crowds were supportive of the Board's action; there was a minority who disagreed with the Board's position -- some opposed desegregation altogether, and others felt that 1968 was too long to wait.

On May 16 the Board adopted a formal resolution reaffirming the September 1968 commitment and adding an interim calendar of deadlines for the various steps required to achieve desegregation. The Administration was instructed to develop plans for total integration. We were instructed to make our report by the first Board meeting in October, 1967. The timetable calls for the Board to adopt a particular program by January or February 1968. Seven or eight months would then remain for implementing the program in time for the opening of school in September 1968. This is the calendar on which we now are operating.

The Board included in its Resolution on Integration two other features: first, the assumption that desegregation is to be accomplished in the context of continued quality education, and second, that massive community involvement was to be sought in development and selection of the program. Both of these features I heartily support.

Developing the Plan - We went to work immediately. The Administration compiled information on enrollment and racial makeup of each school, school capacities and financial data. This information was distributed to each faculty. We then called a meeting of all elementary school teachers; I relayed our charge from the Board and asked each faculty to meet separately and develop suggestions. We also sent information packets to over sixty community groups and invited them to contribute their ideas. By the end of June we had received many suggestions, both from staff members and lay citizens.

Meanwhile both local and national endorsements were pouring in. The Berkeley City Council passed a resolution commending the Board on its commitment to integration. Other local organizations and individuals did the same.

During the summer months two task groups were assigned to work on the problem. One was concerned with the logistics of achieving desegregation and the other was concerned with the instructional program under the new arrangement. The Board appointed a seven-member lay citizens group to advise the Administration in development of its recommendations. Even after the Administration's recommendation has been given to the Board, this group will continue to function as an advisory body to the Board. Upon receiving the Administration's recommendation, the Board plans a series of workshop sessions to provide every opportunity for community reaction and suggestion.

As this paper is written (mid-September) we are making excellent progress toward meeting our deadline. Soon after the opening of school, a report from the Summer Task Group outlining four or five

of the most promising plans was sent to each school faculty and to each group or individual who submitted a plan during the summer. These proposals are being made available to the community as well, along with the many suggestions received earlier from staff and lay citizens. School faculties and the community-at-large are invited to react to these proposals and to make suggestions to the Administration. Procedures have been organized to facilitate a response from school and community groups. Each faculty has been asked to meet at least twice. On one afternoon, schools will be dismissed early and the district-wide staff divided into cross sectional "buzz" groups. Each of these groups will submit ideas. Following these steps we will use the task group proposals, along with the reactions and suggestions that come from the staff and community, in developing our recommendation to the Board. This recommendation will be presented to the Board on schedule, at the first meeting in October. From that point on the matter will be in the hands of the Board, which is to make its decision by January or February 1968.

As our plans develop, we have received invitations to appear before many groups, large and small. Some have been hostile at first. However, meeting with them has made possible an excellent exchange of views and an opportunity for explaining our program to people who had not been reached earlier. We anticipate that the fall months will be crowded with such speaking assignments. It is our firm commitment, and that of the Board of Education, to inform the citizens of Berkeley thoroughly about the issue and about prospective plans prior to the Board's adoption of a program in January or February.

## LESSONS LEARNED

While working toward integration in the Berkeley schools over the past several years, we have learned some lessons:

1. Support by the Administration and the Board of Education for the concept of school integration is absolutely essential. The Board must give its consent before any plan of desegregation can occur. The support of the Superintendent and his administrative team is vital in helping to obtain Board support and in making a success of any program adopted. While the Board nor the Administration need broad community support, their leadership role is vital.

2. Integration has the best chance of success when a climate of openness has been established in the community. Lines of communication with Board, Administration, teachers, and the community-at-large must be kept open through frequent use. Anyone who thinks a solution to the problem of integration can be developed in a "smoke-filled room" and then rammed through to adoption while the community is kept in ignorance is simply wrong.

Our citizens are vitally interested; they are going to form opinions and express them, whether we like it or not. It is in our interest to see that these opinions are formed on the basis of correct information. Furthermore, the success of integration, once adopted, depends upon broad community support and understanding between the lay community and the schools. This can be created only through a climate of openness.

3. It can be done! A school district can move voluntarily to desegregate without a court order and without the compulsion of violence or boycotts. Berkeley has demonstrated that a school community can marshal its resources, come to grips with the issue of segregation, and develop a workable solution.

Furthermore, if the new arrangement is well planned and executed, it will gain acceptance on the part of many who opposed it at first.

Many fears and threats which arose in Berkeley were not realized. The Board was not recalled. Our teachers did not quit in droves. In fact, the reverse happened; our teacher turnover rate has been drastically reduced during the last two or three years. Integration did not lead to the kind of mass white exodus being experienced in other cities (which, interestingly enough, have not moved toward integration). In fact, last year for the first time in many years the long-standing trend toward a declining white enrollment in the Berkeley schools was reversed.

The not-so-subtle hints that direct action for integration would lead to loss of tax measures at the ballot box proved to be unfounded. In June 1966 we asked the voters for a \$1.50 increase in the ceiling of our basic school tax rate. Much smaller increase proposals were being shot down in neighboring districts and across the nation. In Berkeley we won the tax increase with over a 60 percent majority.

4. A community can grow. Berkeley did! When the citizens committee report came out in the fall of 1963 with an actual plan for desegregation of the junior high schools, the community suddenly awoke to the fact that desegregation was a real possibility. The furor that

resulted could be predicted in any city. However, as large public hearings and countless smaller meetings were held by dozens of groups, support for integration began to grow and opposition diminish. One area of the city that reacted emotionally at first later provided some of our strongest supporters.


An example in a different but related field can illustrate this point. Berkeley held a referendum election on a Fair Housing Proposal early in 1963, before the citizens committee report, and the measure was defeated by a narrow margin. A year and a half later the community, together with the rest of California, voted on the same issue -- Proposition 14. Although the statewide vote on that issue was a resounding defeat for Fair Housing, the City of Berkeley voted the direct opposite by almost a two-to-one margin. The Proposition 14 election was held only a month after the recall election, after almost a full year of intensive community involvement with the school desegregation issue. In other words, a city that voted down its own Fair Housing proposal, later voted two-to-one for Fair Housing in a statewide election. Many of us feel that this change of direction was substantially influenced by the extensive community involvement in the school integration question between the two elections. The community grew in understanding as it studied the issues.

5. Community confidence in the good faith of its school administration and school board must be maintained. Berkeley has been successful in doing this. The good faith of our Board and Administration has been demonstrated. There have been no court orders, no pickets, no boycotts, no violence. Each advance has been made, after extensive

study and community deliberation, because the staff, the Board and the community thought it was right. By moving in concert with the community we have avoided being placed in polarized positions of antagonism. The climate thus produced has enabled us, as we move step by step, to work with rather than against important segments of the community in seeking solutions. If this climate of good faith is missing, even the good deeds of school officials are suspect.

#### CONCLUSION

There is no greater problem facing the schools of America today than breaking down the walls of segregation. If our society is to function effectively its members must learn to live together. Schools have a vital role to play in preparing citizens for life in a multi-racial society. The Berkeley experience offers hope that integration can be successfully achieved in a good-sized city. This success can be achieved if the Board of Education, the school staff, and the citizens of the community are determined to solve the problem and work together toward this end.



Office of the Mayor

## SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA MATERIAL

**Meeting Date:** July 14, 2020

**Item Number:** #18a-e

**Supplemental/Revision Submitted By:** Mayor Arreguin

**“Good of the City” Analysis:**

*The analysis below must demonstrate how accepting this supplement/revision is for the “good of the City” and outweighs the lack of time for citizen review or evaluation by the Council.*

The City Council has before it tonight five different proposals to initiate a robust community process to reimagine policing, and also specific proposals to conduct analyses and initiate new approaches to public safety.

The Mayor is proposing an omnibus motion that adopts elements of every one of the five proposals with some modifications.

Given that the Council is discussing various proposals relating to public safety tonight, and there is strong community interest in Berkeley initiating reforms in light of the murder of George Floyd and the nationwide movement for racial justice, the Good of the City outweighs the lack of time for prior citizen review or evaluation by the Council.

***Consideration of supplemental or revised agenda material is subject to approval by a two-thirds vote of the City Council. (BMC 2.06.070)***

A minimum of **42 copies** must be submitted to the City Clerk for distribution at the Council meeting. This completed cover page must accompany every copy.

Copies of the supplemental/revised agenda material may be delivered to the City Clerk Department by 12:00 p.m. the day of the meeting. Copies that are ready after 12:00 p.m. must be delivered directly to the City Clerk at Council Chambers prior to the start of the meeting.

Supplements or Revisions submitted pursuant to BMC § 2.06.070 may only be revisions of the original report included in the Agenda Packet.





Office of the Mayor

**Proposed Omnibus Motion on Public Safety Items (Items 18a-e)  
July 14, 2020**

RECOMMENDATION

That the Berkeley City Council adopts the following motion:

1. To APPROVE item 18a “George Floyd Community Safety Act - Budget Request to Hire a Consultant to Perform Police Call and Response Data Analysis” (Bartlett) as revised in Supplemental Packet 1 and further amended below:

- Reaffirming the Council’s prior action adopting Recommendation # 1 through its allocation of \$160,000 for an Auditor I position in the FY 2021 Budget to conduct a data-driven study that includes analysis of police calls and responses, as well as analysis of the Berkeley Police Department (BPD) budget and expenditures by call type, including FTE (full-time equivalent position), cost per FTE, overtime and special pay expenditures and supervisory structure. Recommended data points/areas of focus are included in pages 4-7 of the Bartlett item. The Auditor is encouraged to consult subject matter experts in developing the scope of work for this study and to consult with the community-based organization selected for community outreach (Item 18d) throughout her work.

- Approving Recommendation # 2 as revised below:

Refer to the City Manager and the public safety reimagining process in item 18d to evaluate initiatives and reforms that reduce the footprint of the Police Department and limit the Police’s scope of work primarily to violent and criminal matters.

- Allocate \$100,000 from the FY 2021 Unallocated General Fund Balance (of \$141,518 unallocated in the FY 2021 Adopted Budget) to analyze and develop a pilot program to re-assign non-criminal police service calls to a Specialized Care Unit. This Specialized Care Unit (SCU) consisting of trained crisis-response workers would respond to 911 calls that the operator evaluated as non-criminal and that posed no imminent threat to the safety of first responders. The program would be designed by staff based on existing successful models and likely employ a combination of mental health professionals as well as EMTs and/or nurses, who would be unarmed. The program should be designed to reduce costs while enhancing outcomes in public safety, community health, mental health, social services, civil rights, and overall quality of life. Based on pilot results, a proposal to adjust and/or expand and continue the program, and related reductions in policing services, should be presented to the City Council for consideration in time for

inclusion in the FY 2022 budget. *(Council previously approved a study of the creation of a Specialized Care Unit pilot on June 16, 2020)*

2. To APPROVE the following recommendations based on Councilmember Davila's item 18b "Support Redistribution of City Resources and Operations from the Berkeley Police":

- As previously recommended in other areas of this motion by other Councilmembers, refer as part of the public safety reimagining process to evaluate functions currently served by Berkeley Police personnel which could be better served by trained non-sworn city staff or community partners and how those positions/responsibilities could be transferred out of the police department as soon as practicable. (Davila Recommendation 1 modified)
- Refer to the public safety reimagining process the goal of reducing the Berkeley Police Department budget by 50%, to be based on the results of requested studies and analysis and achieved through programs such as the Specialized Care Unit. Functions to consider shifting away from the Police Department include non-emergency calls that are evaluated to pose no danger to the safety of responders, such as calls related to enforcement of COVID-19 Shelter in Place orders, mental health calls (including wellness checks), calls related to quality of life crimes, calls related to homelessness, and any other calls that can be safely served by another new or existing city or community partner resource (Davila Recommendation 2 and 3 modified)
- Engage in a full and complete operational analysis, undertake meaningful community consultation and develop a transition plan. This reduction will enable a reallocation of public safety resources so that Police are focused on violent and criminal matters, and consider how to shift resources to, among others, non-sworn mental health, homeless outreach, and parking and traffic enforcement professionals. This will also enable the reallocation of existing police dollars for community programs and priorities to support communities of color, promote violence prevention and restorative justice and improve community health and safety. (Davila Recommendation 3 modified)
- Reducing the Berkeley Police Department budget will allow funding to be considered for these and other similar priorities: youth programs, or community groups and programs, violence prevention and restorative justice programs, domestic violence prevention, housing and homeless services, food security, mental health services including a specialized care unit, healthcare, new city jobs, expanded partnerships with community organizations, public health services, and the creation of a new Department of Transportation to administer parking regulations and traffic laws. (Davila Recommendation 4 modified)
- Refer to the City Manager and the public safety re-imagining process to identify the expertise needed for non-police responses to calls, taking into account comparable

approaches including CAHOOTS and other existing programs that might be expanded such as the Berkeley Free Clinic, Building Opportunities for Self Sustainability (BOSS), and the Women's Daytime Drop-in Center, Consider the Homeless and others. (Davila recommendation 6 modified)

- Create plans and protocols for emergency/911 dispatch to send calls to the preferred responding entity and consider placing dispatch in the Fire Department or elsewhere outside the Police Department. (Davila recommendation 7 modified)
- Request that the Berkeley Unified School District end programs that place police officers in schools. (Davila recommendation 8 modified)

*(Councilmember Davila's suggested language encouraging BUSD to adopt policies to safeguard information from ICE is already adopted district policy. BUSD was one of the first districts in the country to adopt a sanctuary schools policy and should be commended for its forward-thinking leadership.)*

- Refer to the City Manager and public safety reimagining process to explore the creation of a city policy to prohibit the expenditure of Police Department settlements from the General Fund. In the interim, it is recommended that the projected cost of settlements be included in the Police Department budget and the Department be responsible for requesting additional funding as needed. (Davila recommendation 9 modified)

3. To APPROVE the report and resolution in item 18d "Transform Community Safety and Initiate a Robust Community Engagement Process" (Mayor/Hahn/Bartlett/Harrison) with the following revisions below:

- Amend recommendation 3 to clarify that the City Manager would "collaborate with the Mayor and **all** Councilmembers to complete the work, to inform investments and reallocations to be incorporated into future Budget processes."
- Amend recommendation 3 to refer all of the recommendations from the Berkeley United for Community Safety coalition (see attached) to the City Manager and public safety reimagining process.
- Amend recommendations 3(a) (ii) to clarify that the analysis and initial recommendations on shifting police resources to alternate, non-police responses and toward alternative and restorative justice models will coincide with the November 2020 AAO#1 process and the **June 2021 budget process**.
- Amend recommendation 3(b) to add the following language proposed by Councilmember Wengraf in item 18c:

This work should include public, transparent community forums to listen, learn and receive people's ideas about how policing should be re-imagined and transformed so that communities of color can be safer within their neighborhoods, the City of Berkeley, and trust in the Berkeley Police Department can begin to be rebuilt.

- Amend recommendation 3(b)(1) to read:  
Building on the work of the City Council, the Council Public Safety Policy Committee, the City Manager, the PRC, other City commissions and working groups (e.g. the Mayor's Fair and Impartial Policing Working Group) addressing community health and safety, the Community Safety Coalition and community process will engage relevant city commissions in this work on an ongoing basis.

4. To APPROVE Item 18e "BerkDOT: Reimagining Transportation for a Racially Just Future" (Robinson) as revised in Supplemental Packet 1:

Refer to the City Manager, the FY 2021-22 budget process, and the proposed community engagement process to reimagine public safety to:

- (1) Pursue the creation of a Berkeley Department of Transportation (*BerkDOT*) to ensure a racial justice lens in traffic enforcement and the development of transportation policy, programs, & infrastructure, and
- (2) Identify & implement approaches to reduce and/or eliminate the practice of pretextual stops based on minor traffic violations.



## Berkeley United for Community Safety

### June 27, 2020 / Event Recommendations (Partial List)

- Adopt best practices, one example Alameda County Connect: access screening, resources, mobile crisis team.
- Look for models that provide services that keep the community healthy and safe. Research the Oakland Model and the Oakland Power Project.
- We need an all new well-resourced, holistic and intersectional first responder team that responds to mental health, addiction issues, sexual harm, and homeless camp response. One that does not involve the police.
- We need more licensed and trained mental health professionals; culturally competent, compassionate, and aware. Diverse therapists also needed to relate to clients.
- We need to train professionals; “mental health clinicians” in both substance abuse and mental health issues. Outreach workers are needed who can de escalate and properly assist fellow community members in crisis.
- Fund a program with Community Care Workers on the street with proper training and resources to assist - leaving police to work on investigating and arresting criminals.
- Consider whether Berkeley Free Clinic can assist with developing a group of Community Care volunteers who assist in responding to crisis in homes and on the street that exhibit mental health, substance abuse when no crime is being committed.
- Create a City Department that focuses on Social Equity and Racial Justice.
- Make the city budget process MORE TRANSPARENT. Invest in Budget Town Halls that break down how the document works.
- Protect funding for youth programming including schools, Anticipated cuts to BUSD (2-6 million) due to COVID-19. Black and Brown Youth disproportionately affected by these cuts (fund and fast track African American Holistic Health Center)
- Divest funds from BPD into restorative justice programming run by the city or contracted to a community organization.
- Bolster nutrition programs that are at risk of being cut.
- Offer officer trainings that align with annual goals for the department. Professional development opportunities are to be made available only when these trainings support achievement of the annual goals for the department.



- BPD should not accept, request or seek to acquire military grade weapons or materials.
- BPD should receive a revised mission statement as a result of community discussions that redefines what is wanted from a "police force".
- Grant the community the ability to be autonomous.
- Have a specific public security priority to consolidate funding for all the communities' security efforts and needs. This will help create a system that will help further accountability in the police department.
- Create a stronger police accountability board.
- Ban rubber bullets as tear gas has been banned. Use less lethal tools.
- Council members need to fight for accountability and for what the community needs.