



June 29th, 2020

Dear Los Angeles City Councilmembers,

As one of the largest young democratic organizations in the state, representing over 600 members, the Los Angeles County Young Democrats express our deep concerns over the structural racism that touches every aspect of our society, from poverty to education, health care to homelessness. Change is long overdue. Enough is enough.

We uplift and support the calls for radical change that have echoed throughout the streets. We see the essential truths driving this desire for a dramatic reimagining of our city and our nation and recognize the need to translate justified frustration into concrete policies.

As the Los Angeles City Council prepares to vote on major changes to the City's Annual Budget, we share with you a number of recommendations that illustrate our deep desire to see our City serve its residents in a productive manner, and pivot away from law enforcement choices that have proven to be more destructive than they are protective.

We support a reimagined Department of Community Safety, which would be composed of a significantly reduced force of sworn officers and the addition of social and mental health workers and community aides. An analysis of 911 call data was conducted to inform these recommendations.

We reject the use of sworn officers except where strictly necessary. While we acknowledge that certified peace officers are currently required to enforce certain statutes in State and Federal law, in many cases the presence of sworn officers is counterproductive.

We reject the use of armed officers for any reason outside of violent crimes in progress. We ask that the City immediately begin a hiring process for unarmed community responders.

Attached is a list of specific recommendations, including both cuts to and reinvestments which would be actionable first steps towards this vision and the vision expressed by so many community groups over the last few weeks.



This is not an attempt to reduce the scope of what the People's Budget LA, Healthy LA Coalition, and many other community groups have demanded. We are inspired by and are in full support of their work. In our proposal we have made an effort to outline budgetary actions and restructuring efforts using the People's Budget LA as our guiding document. This is our initial contribution towards answering the movement in our streets with action by our representatives within City Hall.

Our members are the young Democrats who power local campaigns and support your continued work in public service. During this pivotal moment in our nation's history, we ask for your bold leadership and courage. Thank you for your consideration of our recommendations at this time.

In solidarity and service,

The Los Angeles County Young Democrats



## **LACYD Budget Recommendations**

### **Budget Cut Areas**

#### **1. Reevaluate 2020-2021 Sworn Hiring Plan: \$24,383,851**

We recommend ending the Sworn Hiring Plan for the 2020-2021 Fiscal Year. The Proposed Budget increases the funding for sworn officers by \$24,383,851, based on line items from Volume II of the 2020-2021 Fiscal Year Blue Book. In Los Angeles, we have approximately 25 police officers per 10,000 per capita, which is just above the average number for large cities according to 2015 FBI data. Furthermore, according to the [CLA report](#) (dated June 19, 2020), 21% of total 911 calls require armed officers to respond.

Rather than hiring based on a per capita model, we call upon the City to conduct a detailed study on 911 call data, emergency data, and crime data to determine the actual need for armed officers, and inform their decisions on staffing and restructuring of policing in the future. If Los Angeles views itself as leading the country in progressive values, then we need to do just that and change the look and practice of policing in our own city.

#### **2. Reducing and Reimagining the LAPD**

The reimagined alternative to the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) is the Department of Community Safety. The Department will be staffed by only as many sworn officers as are truly necessary. Our Board members have analyzed 911 call data included in the [CLA Report](#) prepared for the Budget and Finance Committee (dated June 19, 2020). For each call description (ie: robbery, illegal dumping, battery, narcotics, etc.), we identified whether an armed officer, unarmed officer, community aide, social worker or mental health worker would be the most appropriate staff to respond to the call. For all 911 calls made in 2019, only 21% of all calls needed an armed response and 31% of all calls would have been adequately addressed by an unarmed sworn officer response. We believe this new model is best equipped to fulfill LAPD's mission of making Los Angeles the safest city in the country.

Currently, the LAPD is often called upon simply because they, along with LAFD, are the City's only around-the-clock department. Due to this, sworn officers are often the only response available after typical business hours for the gamut of scenarios and issues. We hold that this issue can be addressed by creating positions for social workers, mental health workers, and community aides who are on duty at all times of day and night.



To meet this end, the City Council should explore all possible options to reduce, reassign or remagine staffing of the Department to appropriate levels of sworn officers, and expand capacity of other critically-needed workers to provide non-armed emergency response. We offer a three-pronged approach. First, the City can replace the officers that leave the LAPD through natural attrition with the new public safety positions. The attrition rate for LAPD officers is approximately 500 officers per year. Next, the City can offer all sworn officers the opportunity to become unarmed sworn officers. These unarmed sworn officers are assigned to calls where an armed response is not necessary. From our analysis of 911 data, approximately 60% of all 911 calls do not require an armed response. Of the 1.8 billion dollar unrestricted general budget for LAPD, 94% is assigned to salaries. Initially, we wished to recommend officer furloughs at the same rate of civilian furloughs, but this option is not available due to the terms of LAPD's Memorandums of Understanding for sworn officers. Lastly, the City may have to consider other ways to reduce the number of sworn officers. While we don't wish to see any reduction of quality employment opportunities for our residents, we do anticipate a future discussion about sworn officer reductions in order to fund the full staffing and training of our reimagined public safety roles.

### **3. Cut Half of Proposed Sworn Overtime: \$65,266,425**

Sworn overtime is often used to staff special events, to staff emergencies such as wildfire evacuations, and to make up for uncovered shifts when a large number of officers are unable to work. In a re-envisioned model of public safety, we are calling for fewer sworn officers to staff these three scenarios. Instead, the City should turn to our newly created public safety positions to staff these matters. This shift eliminates the need for much of sworn overtime funding.

We ask that armed LAPD officers be excluded from sidewalk and encampment cleanup efforts. This cleanup effort can be a stressful time for those individuals experiencing homelessness and the presence of an armed LAPD officer may only exacerbate the situation. Additionally, this kind of homeless services activity does not necessitate armed officers.

### **4. LAPD Sworn Officer Furloughs Before Civilian Staff Furloughs**

A furlough of the civilian staff within LAPD does not fit a progressive model of public safety and is an inefficient use of City funds. Sworn officers are much more expensive to employ compared to their civilian counterparts. We strongly believe sworn officers should only be used in positions where a sworn officer is absolutely necessary. The practice of placing sworn officers



into administrative roles must be ended while the utilization of civilian staff should return to normal levels.

It is fiscally unsound to fill administrative roles with sworn officers simply because the City can only furlough civilian staff. Currently, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for sworn officers protects them from any and all furloughs. This must be altered in the next MOU negotiation in order to lead to the budget efficiencies we are calling for with this request.

#### **5. LAPD Contractual Services**

Contractual Services with the LAPD cost the City \$45,548,118 with an additional \$193,169,157 going to Specialized Enforcement and Protection. We recommend that the City reassess the need for each of these contractual services. Police are ever-present in our public parks, public libraries, cultural facilities, and other City run facilities, yet their presence leaves many of our residents in fact feeling less safe. With so few incidents in these locations requiring an armed officer, it is fiscally unsound to hemorrhage money for these services.

Other US cities such as Portland, Oregon have taken steps to cut their transit authority's police force budget by upwards of 40%. Los Angeles City Council should support Metro in their efforts to reimagine public safety for their ridership and transition away from a police presence associated with public transit.

#### **6. Supply Purchase Budget Efficiencies**

- a. **Firearms, Ammunitions, and Tasers: \$2,365,922**  
(\$1,590,000 of which comes from the Sworn Hiring Program cut mentioned below)

Due to community calls for a re-envisioning of public safety, we recommend replacing a certain number of our current police officers with other unarmed community workers. We arrived at the estimated figure of \$2,365,922 by cutting the amount of this budget item that is proportional to the cuts we've proposed for sworn layoffs. This reduced number of armed officers should reduce the need for such arms and munitions.

- b. **Vehicle Replacements: \$5,000,000**

For the past two years, the LAPD has received \$5 million for vehicle replacements as part of a \$20 million 4-year plan. Given the extraordinary budget circumstances of the 2020-2021 Fiscal Year and the fact that 75% of this program has already been completed, we believe that the elimination of this year's \$5 million allocation is warranted.



- c. **LAPD Printing and Binding Budget: \$942,330**  
(\$500,658 of which comes from the Sworn Hiring Program cut mentioned above)

Due to the ubiquity and ease of digital materials in this day and age, the City must adopt a policy of regularly utilizing digital materials in lieu of printed materials which are wasteful both monetarily and environmentally. With this in mind, we have found budget efficiencies in printing, ink, and binding. As the contract with outside printing services is re-evaluated, we propose a 60% cut of the Printing and Binding funds left over after the elimination of the Sworn Hiring Program. This amounts to a \$441,672 cut, following the \$500,658 cut from the Sworn Hiring Program.

### **Areas of Reinvestment**

1. **Fund and Expand the Eviction Defense and Homeless Prevention Program:**  
**\$20,000,000**

The Eviction Defense Program (CF 18-0610) was adopted in 2018; in the meantime, other peer cities have moved forward to adopt this proven model for preventing homelessness and saving city governments significant costs as a result. While the \$2 million pilot initially proposed was insufficient, our existing housing and homelessness crisis has exploded with the passage of time and with impending COVID-19 driven evictions. Even a tenfold increase to \$20 million would address only a portion of the need; the Healthy LA Coalition, for example, estimate that a fully funded program would need \$70 million. While the Emergency Renter's Relief Program will help tenants make their rent, many landlords are still seeking to illegally evict their tenants--[particularly in black and brown neighborhoods](#).

Long before COVID-19 had exacerbated the housing crisis, this City Council had already decided to take this long overdue first step. The urgency of this moment now demands that this critical program actually be funded, and at an increased level more appropriate to the crisis.

2. **Reinvest in EWDD and HCID Staffing to Fulfill Departments' Mission:** **\$3,000,000**

The Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD) and Housing and Community Investment Department (HCID) are crucial departments that exist to help address critical economic and housing issues in our city. They are, however, only operating at a fraction of their capacity due to underfunding and understaffing. We simply ask that the budget add funds to end the hiring freezes and furloughs that currently exist in these two departments so they can be staffed at proper levels. Once that is achieved, they can go about their business doing crucial work to increase the availability of economic opportunities for young and



disadvantaged residents and also to forcefully advocate for the rights of renters and attack the lack of homeless and affordable housing in the City. HCID can achieve this latter point by accessing all available state and federal grants and enforcing existing protections like the Ellis Act, but they need adequate levels of staffing in order to do so.

**3. Augment EWDD budget by 40% and HCID budget by 25%: \$9,214,050 to EWDD, \$20,284,390 to HCID**

The Economic and Workforce Development Department and the Housing and Community Investment Department are underfunded, making up only \$23,035,126 (0.2%) and \$81,137,562 (0.8%) of the General City Budget of \$10,531,300,000 respectively. Much of the EWDD's and HCID's funding comes from federal programs with specific attached uses. This does not allow the departments to use their experience and expertise to create and execute community programs that address community specific needs. We should not expect HCID to run solely according to the vision of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The City must equip department staff with unrestricted funding in order to provide resources and programs that best serve the unique and varying community needs of our diverse city.

**4. Funding Existing Community Health and Social Service Providers: \$200,000,000**

Currently, the City of Los Angeles has no jurisdiction of any health or social services. Health, Mental Health and Public Social Services departments are in the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles.

The City must act and find a way to provide critical health and social services to its residents. Instead of creating a Department of Mental Health and Social Services, which would take millions of dollars just to set up administratively, the City must instead directly fund existing community-based agencies with expertise in providing medical, mental health, and social services. These agencies are already established and trusted organizations within the communities they serve. This funding from the City will significantly scale up these existing community-based agencies to allow them to greatly expand their reach and capacity to serve and care for marginalized and vulnerable populations.

We believe this funding should be unrestricted or minimally restricted, allowing community-based organizations to use funding as they see fit without being tied to a timeline or specific use. If ACA-5 is approved by voters in November, we support priority given to nonprofit organizations led by Black women.



## **5. Funding for 1,000 units of Vienna Model Community Housing: \$100,000,000**

One of the biggest sources of inequity in our communities comes from housing insecurity and segregation. We implore the City to consider alternative methods of supporting housing for our lower-income residents. One model that has been successfully employed comes from Vienna, where 62% of residents live in some form of subsidized housing. These housing developments are integrated across economic classes. The current model relies on a city-administered competition where developers submit bids to develop very large mixed-income projects. In such a competition, a holistic review is used and aesthetic, sustainability, and community-benefit principles are highly valued. As stated during the People's Budget presentation to the City Council, we hold that, "Police don't make communities feel safe, resources do. So what does it look like for us to have the resources and the built environment that reflect that we care about that community?". It is our hope that these new communities serve as models for a future integrated Los Angeles.

We are proposing a pilot program of 1000 units in the form of two approximately-500 unit developments. We propose that 60% of these units should be low- and middle-income while the remaining 40% can remain market rate in order to be financially viable for a developer. Unlike current affordable housing models in Los Angeles where the affordability provisions expire after a certain number of years, we propose that they be made indefinite. Given the high cost of land acquisition for such a large project we propose \$40 million for acquisition, \$20 million for project development and administration, and an additional \$40 million for incentives towards developers as subsidy for the units. The developers would receive the land at a discount but be responsible for building and administering the new community. While there exists a possibility of using City property to host these projects, we anticipate a significant effort to identify a proper site for such a large project. We would ideally like to see something on the order of 5,000 new subsidized units per year, but realize this requires a much larger financial investment approaching \$1 billion. We therefore add that this pilot program looks into forming partnerships with county, state, and federal entities in order to secure sufficient funding.

## **6. Down Payment Assistance Programs for Black Angelenos: \$10,000,000**

While housing advocates have been tirelessly working to address discrimination, a strong and explicit government response is needed to blunt decades of discriminatory housing policies. The wide disparity in home ownership rates between White Angelenos and Angelenos of color is both a direct result and leading cause of our City's enormous wealth gap. This is seen in a significantly reduced ability of Black families to make down payments and sustain mortgages. Down payment assistance programs will greatly impact the ability of Black families



to transition from renters to homeowners by helping to eliminate the gap created by the lack of intergenerational wealth. The City of Los Angeles can provide grant programs geared towards Black Angelenos. These grants provide funds that go toward the down payment for individuals who qualify based on their census tract data or whose family have been negatively impacted by redlining. According to a report by the Urban Institute (dated February 2018), in the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan area the White homeownership rate is 56.9% while the Black homeownership rate is only 33.5%. If ACA-5 is approved by voters in November, we support priority given to populations with the lowest rate of homeownership, namely, to Black Angelenos.

Type	Description	2017	2018	2019	% of Total 2019	Proposed Responders
110	Narcotics	11665	12275	11016	0.56%	Armed
146	Impersonating an Officer	269	289	242	0.01%	Armed
187	Homicide	217	202	200	0.01%	Armed
207	Kidnap	2952	2988	2947	0.15%	Armed
211	Robbery	14716	14066	13353	0.68%	Armed
242	Battery	64485	66654	66355	3.38%	Armed
245	Assault with a Deadly Weapon	52711	54699	53377	2.72%	Armed
246	Shots Fired	9704	8525	7923	0.40%	Armed
261	Rape	3236	3318	3368	0.17%	Armed
422	Criminal Threats	0	634	3680	0.19%	Armed
447	Arson	1461	1740	1805	0.09%	Armed
459	Burglary	39085	50378	47318	2.41%	Armed
510	Racing Vehicle	4495	4249	2929	0.15%	Armed
900	Unknown Trouble	14004	15508	16607	0.85%	Armed
995	Explosion	53	55	51	0.00%	Armed
996	Bomb	764	778	643	0.03%	Armed
374	Illegal Dumping	646	714	639	0.03%	Community Aide
390	Intoxication	13934	14443	13637	0.69%	Community Aide
415	Disturbance	164475	175652	166863	8.49%	Community Aide
507	Minor Disturbance	66939	69932	65919	3.36%	Community Aide
586	Parking	236	278	315	0.02%	Community Aide
605	Open Door/Window	2654	2311	1924	0.10%	Community Aide
620	Dispute	89149	92421	87408	4.45%	Community Aide
720	Meet	8653	8238	8817	0.45%	Community Aide
314	Indecent Exposure	10094	11736	11509	0.59%	Mental Health Worker
918	Mental Illness	23508	21025	20598	1.05%	Mental Health Worker
930	Screaming person	7269	7827	7576	0.39%	Mental Health Worker

Type	Description	2017	2018	2019	% of Total 2019	Proposed Responders
288	Child	11984	10745	9543	0.49%	Social Worker
594	Vandalism	16739	18788	19099	0.97%	Social Worker
600	Runaway Juvenile	3024	3332	4425	0.23%	Social Worker
820	Goto/Welfare Check	5015	13276	15544	0.79%	Social Worker
907	Injury	20538	21798	21977	1.12%	Social Worker
921	Prowler/Trespa ss	67246	76964	73684	3.75%	Social Worker
110	Other	3401	2529	2661	0.14%	Unarmed
200	Unusual occurrence	26	27	34	0.00%	Unarmed
470	Forgery	1231	1251	984	0.05%	Unarmed
484	Theft	24951	29125	28962	1.47%	Unarmed
503	Vehicle	10920	12193	12033	0.61%	Unarmed
511	Reckless Driving	0	19	621	0.03%	Unarmed
903	Traffic Other	4888	5210	5464	0.28%	Unarmed
904	Traffic Collision	72608	71783	70679	3.60%	Unarmed
905	Animal	3775	3561	3291	0.17%	Unarmed
906	Alarm	71363	68931	69488	3.54%	Unarmed
920	Missing	4925	4896	4894	0.25%	Unarmed
927	Death	5019	4998	5005	0.25%	Unarmed
928	Found	6672	7582	7086	0.36%	Unarmed
929	Person Down	646	615	1195	0.06%	Unarmed
997	Suspicious Activity	397	331	270	0.01%	Unarmed
902	Traffic Stop	82,374	107,750	128,929	6.56%	Unarmed
6	Code6/Officer In	823,552	878,770	861,693	43.86%	Unknown
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,848,668</b>	<b>1,985,409</b>	<b>1,964,580</b>		

Unarmed Officers	341596
Armed Officers	231814
Community Aide	345522
Social Worker	144272
Mental Health Worker	39683
Unknown	861693
Check Sum	1964580

### Proposed Assignments (All Except Code 6)

