

Santa Barbara Community Formation Commission

Draft Recommendations Survey Results

Dates of Data Collection = March 3, 2022 - March 23, 2022

Total number of surveys collected = 1040

- English online = 1027 (98.75%)
- Spanish online = 9 (0.87%)
- English paper copy = 4 (0.38%)

** The number of people who responded to each question is lower than 1040 because people skipped questions. See individual question for the total number who responded to that specific question.*

*** Sometimes the percentages add up to a little less or more than 100% due to rounding.*

Recommendations Summary

I understand the roles of the Civilian Oversight Board and the Office of Police Oversight as described above. (n=1031)

15% Strongly Disagree
6% Disagree
52% Agree
27% Strongly Agree

Perceptions of the Santa Barbara Police Department

I believe the Santa Barbara Police Department is transparent about its existing internal investigation process. (n=995)

8% Strongly Disagree
19% Disagree
16% Agree
14% Strongly Agree
43% I don't know much about the Santa Barbara Police Department internal investigation process

I trust the outcomes of the Santa Barbara Police Department’s current internal investigation process. (n=994)

- 11% Strongly Disagree
- 18% Disagree
- 19% Agree
- 18% Strongly Agree
- 35% I don’t know much about the Santa Barbara Police Department internal investigation process

Role of Law Enforcement on the Civilian Oversight Board

Do you think people with prior law enforcement experience should be eligible to serve on the Civilian Oversight Board? (n=979)

- 42% Yes
- 23% Yes, but only after they have been out of law enforcement for a number of years
- 27% No
- 8% Unsure

➔ How many years do you think this should be? (asked only of those who responded “Yes, but only after they have been out for a number of years”) (n=213)

- 3% 1 year
- 10% 2 years
- 16% 3 years
- 6% 4 years
- 43% 5 years
- 18% 6-10 years
- 5% More than 10 years

Do you think immediate family members of current Santa Barbara Police Department employees should be eligible to serve on the Civilian Oversight Board? (n=971)

- 22% Yes
- 68% No
- 10% Not sure

Complaints of Alleged Santa Barbara Police Department Misconduct

If the city of Santa Barbara had an Office of Police Oversight that could both receive and monitor complaints about alleged Santa Barbara Police Department misconduct and make public reports, my trust in the complaint process would: (n=950)

- 50% Increase
- 16% Decrease
- 21% Stay the same
- 13% I’m unfamiliar with the complaint review process

If the city of Santa Barbara had an Office of Police Oversight that could both receive and monitor complaints about alleged Santa Barbara Police Department misconduct and make public reports, the transparency of the complaint process would: (n=948)

- 56% Increase
- 11% Decrease
- 21% Stay the same
- 13% I'm unfamiliar with the complaint review process

Community Involvement

If Santa Barbara had a civilian oversight process like the one described above, my trust in policing in my community would: (n=927)

- 56% Increase
- 14% Decrease
- 31% Stay the same

If Santa Barbara had a civilian oversight process like the one described above, my belief in the transparency of the Santa Barbara Police Department would: (n=928)

- 60% Increase
- 12% Decrease
- 28% Stay the same

If Santa Barbara had a civilian oversight process like the one described above, the Santa Barbara Police Department's accountability to the community would: (n=924)

- 62% Increase
- 11% Decrease
- 28% Stay the same

Compensation for Civilian Oversight Board Members

Members of the Civilian Oversight Board should receive a stipend for participation. (n=920)

- 23% Strongly disagree
- 19% Disagree
- 42% Agree
- 16% Strongly agree

The Commission has included in its draft recommendations stipends of \$100 per commissioner per meeting, with additional reimbursements up to \$50 for child care and elder care and related expenses such as parking, not to exceed \$400 per month to make community involvement as accessible as possible. (n=916)

- 26% Strongly disagree
- 16% Disagree
- 40% Agree
- 17% Strongly agree

Additional Recommendations

The members of the Civilian Oversight Board should represent the diversity of the Santa Barbara community. (n=917)

8% Disagree
84% Agree
8% Unsure

The Civilian Oversight Board should conduct regular community surveys related to public perceptions and understanding of police investigations and report those survey results to the community. (n=920)

16% Disagree
71% Agree
13% Unsure

The Office of Police Oversight should be able to accept complaints of alleged SBPD misconduct directly and anonymously. (n=922)

26% Disagree
64% Agree
10% Unsure

Individuals with previous law enforcement experience should be allowed to serve as the Director of Police Oversight. (n=920)

36% Disagree
43% Agree
21% Unsure

Demographics

Have you ever done any of the following? (n=835)

10% I did not know a complaint process was available
7% Considered filing a complaint alleging misconduct with the Santa Barbara PD
3% Filed a complaint alleging misconduct with the Santa Barbara Police Department
1% Attempted to file a complaint alleging misconduct with the Santa Barbara PD
81% None of the above

Age (n=706)

Mean age = 51.33 years

Median age = 51 years

Under 21 = 5%

22-29 = 9%

30-39 = 16%

40-49 = 16%

50-59 = 14%

60-69 = 21%

70-79 = 15%

80-87 = 4%

For the following, people were allowed to check all that apply. Some people only checked one. Others didn't check any. Still others checked multiple. We can go back and, for each question, determine the unique number who responded to that specific question, no matter how many boxes they chose, but that will take more time. But presenting accurate percentages based on the full sample is difficult because many people skipped and others only checked one, even when more than one may have applied. The percentages below present the percentage calculated as the number of people who checked that identity divided by the full sample of 1040 people.

Sex/Gender Identity

- 45% Female
- 27% Male
- 4% Cisgender
- 0.9% Non-binary
- 0.6% Genderfluid/Genderqueer
- 0.5% Transgender

Sexual Orientation

- 9% Heterosexual
- 4% Bisexual/Pansexual
- 2% Gay
- 1% Lesbian

Race/Ethnicity

- 55% White
- 11% Hispanic or Latino/Latinx
- 4% Asian/Pacific Islander
- 3% Black/African-American
- 2% Indigenous

Other Identity

- 11% Victim or former victim of crime
- 9% Student
- 8% Personally impacted by the criminal justice system
- 5% Veteran
- 5% Immigrant
- 5% Individual with a disability
- 4% Current or former law enforcement officer/employee
- 2% Currently or formerly homeless

Neighborhood Live/Work (not mutually exclusive)

- 18% Downtown
- 12% Goleta
- 9% Eastside
- 7% Westside
- 7% San Roque
- 7% Noleta

6%	Isla Vista
5%	East Mesa
5%	West Mesa
4%	Upper State
4%	Montecito
4%	La Cumbre
4%	Riviera
4%	Oak Park
3%	Mission Canyon
2%	Lower Eastside
2%	Eucalyptus Hill
2%	West Beach
2%	Lower Westside
2%	Milpas Corridor
1%	East Beach
1%	Samarkand
1%	Hope Ranch
0.5%	Hidden Valley
0.4%	Summerland

There were many fill-ins that only one person noted, not presented here.

97% said they primarily speak English at home (some with a second language too)

Themes from Open-Ended Question Responses

At the end of the survey, respondents were asked if they had anything else they wanted to share with the commission. About 400 people wrote something in. Their responses centered around the following categories:

- The necessity of the Civilian Oversight Board
- Board size and composition
- Law enforcement involvement
- Compensation
- Extent of authority
- Gratitude for the opportunity to provide feedback

Is the Civilian Oversight Board necessary?

The most common response expressed **concern or confusion over what problem the Civilian Oversight Board was meant to solve specifically in Santa Barbara**, and **questioned whether the Board was necessary at all**. Some felt that the development of the Board was more in response to things happening nationally that were not playing out in Santa Barbara. Sample responses that captured these themes include:

It is unclear what the PROBLEM is that is attempting to be solved thru a Commission.

Santa Barbara Police aren't LA, Minnesota or New York.

While there is question regarding community policing in communities across the nation, does Santa Barbara have an egregious relationship in the community? My understanding is that while there are incidents of police misconduct, they are far and in between.

This entire effort is a solution to a problem that exists elsewhere, but not in SB. It is NOT a response to any incidents or cases that have occurred here. Might it be helpful to inoculate against future problems? Perhaps, but it feels either premature or needlessly provocative at this time to me.

Others conveyed apprehension that the Board was **not worth the cost to taxpayers** and that there were already **existing oversight systems in place**.

Will the non-monetary benefit to the community outweigh the administrative cost for the general fund/special revenue funds?

Although well intended, this would be an unnecessary bureaucratic increase at taxpayer expense.

There is already a complaint process, both local at the PD, through other City Departments, even the Mayor's Office if needed. If the investigation doesn't seem thorough, it can be reviewed by other state agencies.

It is my understanding there are already ways to make complaints. I do believe the SB community can be educated on the process of the SBPD complaint system better, but I do not believe there is an issue with transparency given the new laws on release of information.

Finally, there were numerous responses offering **support for the Commission's recommendations**.

I think it's an excellent idea as a way to hold officers accountable. And possibly increase and build relationships between the public and law enforcement.

I have significant trust in the integrity of the SB Police Department, but believe that the oversight proposals would help increase trust throughout the community.

I looked on the SB police website for how to report potential police misconduct, and I can't find anywhere to do that. So yes, we need this!

Size and Composition of the Board

Some respondents weighed in on the size of the Board, bringing forth a concern that the recommended **11 members was too large**.

Eleven members of the civilian oversight is too many members. Perhaps at least two should be alternates that only listen.

Eleven members is overkill – that's more than the entire County of Los Angeles has overseeing thousands of officers.

Others remarked on the Board composition, with comments on **demographic and geographic diversity**, and the **importance of neutrality**.

I selected unsure regarding the diversity question because the city of Santa Barbara is not very diverse. Perhaps the county. But primarily I think it should represent the diversity of folks who are most affected by police abuse.

Be sure the group would be from various sections of SB. Policing thoughts might be different depending on what part of the city we live in.

I worry that individuals with a political agenda will seek positions on the commission. This commission, if established, must be non-partisan.

For it to work effectively, it must be shielded from influence by the Police Department and its stakeholders. Likewise, it must be shielded from influence both those who do not support law enforcement.

Law Enforcement Involvement

The second most common response was related to law enforcement's involvement on the Board. Many stated that law enforcement **should be eligible**, because they could **provide valuable insight and help increase the Board's legitimacy with the police**.

There are many things an officer has knowledge of that a private citizen does not and this will alter the way an officer responds to an incident versus a private citizen. That perspective is important to note and is equally important to be heard. If the point of the commission is to ensure officers are acting in accordance with the law, then there should be persons on the board with the knowledge of how an officer should be/would be applying it. Individuals with no hands-on experience will obviously be lacking in this area.

Unless you have law enforcement experience with extensive knowledge of police tactics and laws, you will have no credibility with police officers.

Others felt that while law enforcement should be eligible, their **numbers should be limited**.

I don't think it would be bad to have one or two people on the board who were experienced in the field but surely they should not dominate it.

I don't believe the exclusion of folks with prior police experience supports (or leads to) the creation of new forms of working together. Maybe there could be a limit on the number of members who have prior law enforcement experience—no more than one or two people serving at a time.

Still others stated that **law enforcement should not be allowed on the Board**, as they perceived officers as **lacking neutrality** or felt **their presence raised concerns over unequal power dynamics**.

There is a documented, studied culture which occurs within law enforcement that invokes an us vs. them approach to civilians. We don't need a devil's advocate for law enforcement on the committee board, we need citizens who are committed to more transparency within the department.

Any involvement from law enforcement in this commission would greatly jeopardize the efficacy of this commission. There would be potential to intimidate other commission members, simply by presence of law enforcement.

Compensation

Respondents also expanded on their thoughts about the compensation recommendations. Some felt there should be **parity with other Santa Barbara commissions**.

Are other commissioners and committee members compensated? If so, then I think the police oversight commission should be no different. If not, I'm not clear why they're special? ... It

would be good if you guys could clarify that for the public and for members of the community, because right now the compensation piece as presented makes it already look suspicious.

Some stated that the stipend was **too high**—“Cut the stipend in half. \$50 per meeting is plenty!”—or **should not exist at all**—“There should be no compensation as this will lead to members serving for an income source and not a public service.”

There were comments on the additional reimbursements, with some stating that there should **either be a stipend or reimbursement, but not both**—“Stipends to pay for parking, childcare, etc. may be appropriate, but a general stipend does not seem appropriate.”

Extent of Authority

Some respondents commented on **if and how the Board’s decisions would be linked with action**, expressing concern that **the Board would not have real power**.

How much power exactly will they have over SBPD’s policies and procedures? If this board carries out an investigation and finds that misconduct occurred, will they have the power to charge that officer with a crime, or will it just be a recommendation that the DA can override?

My complaint is that the entire proposal only gives the committees the ability to make recommendations, which can be ignored or buried. I want them to have the power to require subpoenas, initiate independent investigations, etc., regardless of what the police force rules internally.

It seems like the agencies that you suggest creating are toothless. None of them have the authority to discipline or remove officers, or to force changes on the department. What use is yet another government agency if it has no power? Do you really think that the police department would willingly adopt a recommendation made by such a board if said recommendation actually changed anything? This is theater. Give the board TEETH.

Gratitude

Finally, some respondents expressed their **gratitude for the opportunity to offer feedback** on the commission recommendations.

Good luck and thank you for everyone’s work on this important task which may have seemed thankless and difficult.

Thank you for reaching out with the survey. We hope that the gathered data is incorporated into decision making.

All Open-Ended Question Responses

Is the Civilian Oversight Board necessary?

Is the problem that bad/is there a problem at all?

- While there is question regarding community policing in communities across the nation, does Santa Barbara have an egregious relationship in the community? My understanding is that while there are incidents of police misconduct, they are far and in between.
- There have been very few episodes of serious misconduct in years by the SBPD in areas of excessive force, false arrests, racially motivated misconduct etc. and I believe as follows: there is absolutely no need for the commission.
- It is unclear what the PROBLEM is that is attempting to be solved thru a Commission.
- I hear so many bad stories of insular and defensive police (and police Union) response to criticism in other communities, but I really don't know how bad the problem is in SB.
- What problem are you trying to fix this is overkill for an agency that doesn't experience the issues of a big city.
- Maybe it would've helped to start off with a general question about the respondent's existing view/perception/trust of the PD incident review process, to gauge subsequent responses.
- The need for the proposed oversight is not necessary for our community. I have faith in our Police and what they do for our community and they are being vilified as if they were Police in a large city. This whole idea is unnecessary and a waste of time and money.
- I believe much of the call for oversight was driven by national issues in policing, not local. A year later, this looks like overkill.
- Santa Barbara Police aren't LA, Minnesota or New York.
- I was born in Santa Barbara and have run a business on State Street for over 40 years. During that time I've had countless interactions with the SBPD. All of them have been extremely professional and I have the greatest respect for the job they do. SBPD is a department we should be proud of. The formation of this commission is the result of social change across the country and the BLM movement. The public protests over the killings of black people at the hands of police officers around the county are well founded. ... This commission is the result of a knee jerk reaction to a problem that may exist in other communities but is not a problem in Santa Barbara.
- This entire effort is a solution to a problem that exists elsewhere, but not in SB. It is NOT a response to any incidents or cases that have occurred here. Might it be helpful to inoculate against future problems? Perhaps, but it feels either premature or needlessly provocative at this time to me.
- I don't believe that police transparency is an issue in our community and we can spend the money elsewhere and that using our funds for this would be a waste.
- Santa Barbara police have done a good job, and this will just make things worse.
- The current police and Fire commission could easily do all of these tasks with full transparency.
- We don't need an Office. Where is the evidence that the police department needs oversight? A waste of money to find a solution without a problem.
- I totally disagree that monies should be spent on another commission especially considering the very minimal incidence of complaints about the police department. ... We have small and

some large crime here but we really don't have asymmetric policing by race here and this is what this is about in the end. Creating staff positions for the "racially diverse", we don't even have diversity in Santa Barbara

- I do not believe a police oversight commission is necessary. This is just a political move as a result of the Floyd incident, without a justified need basis in SB.
- I question the need for this commission. This is a fairly small city with a low crime rate and rather small police department.
- I'm at a loss as to why we need to establish a new bureaucracy when there does not seem too be a problem. I don't remember hearing about any serious issues with the Santa Barbara Police Department and the way they deal with current complaints.
- I think that our police department is not the same as those in other parts of the country.
- Not convinced there's a problem, but I don't have any direct experience.
- This whole exercise is a solution looking for a problem! The Santa Barbara Police Department has always tried to give the best possible customer service to the citizens of Santa Barbara and has excellent mechanisms in place and a culture of accountability to the citizens that keep it operating in such a way that negates the need for a civilian oversight committee!
- There is no need for a full-time position or new office. This is SB, not LA or San Fran
- What is described as the recommendation may be well intentioned, but seems like overkill for our city.
- I believe there is no reason for a civilian oversight board for the SBPD. The agency has a long track record of professionalism and engagement with the community. This endeavor is unnecessary and costly. With a \$3.5 million budget deficit, it makes no sense to establish this expensive and unnecessary review body. The majority of the people who live and work in Santa Barbara do respect and trust the Police Department, but the Council has listened to and acted upon the loud voices of a vocal minority. Focus instead on giving the Police Department the assets it needs to do its job effectively, and hire a police chief who, like his or her predecessors, will maintain the agency's historically high standards by issuing clear expectations of treating people the right way, and by holding its members accountable.
- I am not aware of any concerns or issues related to Police conduct or behavior and this effort seems to be part of a national social justice movement. Is this a solution in search of a local problem that doesn't really exist?
- For the size of our city and Police agency I believe what is being proposed is better suited for a large city or an agency with more documented incidents of police misconduct. The size and cost of running a Police oversight board of this scale seems not only unnecessary but will come at a financial cost that could better serve our community in other ways.
- This city and police department do not have issues like other communities. We have good officers, who are fair and work hard for their community here in Santa Barbara. Do not try and apply rules, concepts, and unnecessary boards that do not need to be implemented here just because a small amount of other locations in this country and world have problems. Our city hires good employees and that goes for the police department as well.
- I'm not convinced that creating a new city department and staff costs is necessary. There are not problems with SBPD that warrant such costs.
- Seems an overreaction to national defund police calls and is unnecessary in Santa Barbara. Funding committee members will create an environment where they go looking for problems, stirring up the community, to justify their stipend. SB policing, as I've witnessed, has been compassionate and kind. In my opinion, not necessary.

- I would like to know precisely what is the problem we are attempting to solve with this oversight committee. Seems to me the Police and Sheriffs Departments are doing a good job and should be allowed to self-govern. They are public servants and the demands on them are way in excess of any normal "job". They should be rewarded for serving the community. and this feels like a bit of an attack.
- In my opinion, this office of oversight is a solution to a problem that exists elsewhere in the country, but not in the city of Santa Barbara. It appears to me to be born out of politics and a desire to keep up appearances, rather than a genuine need.
- This is complete overstep for the Santa Barbara area. This is much more needed for the County.
- Not necessary in our city. No current problem with misconduct.
- It appears as though this is creating a large oversight body that is not needed at the expense of taxpayer money. Our police department has a high approval rating, low use of force numbers and in large does not need any additional layers of oversight. Why isn't this being discussed about the SB Sheriff Dept?

Is it worth the cost?

- While I understand the aims of these two new entities, I don't think the current situation with regard to police transparency, responsiveness, and treatment of various community groups is negative with respect to what can be expected of any government enforcement agency. I think we are creating unnecessary additional layers of bureaucracy and wasted spending, but perhaps we can re-evaluate in a couple years. If it turns out these two entities do help our community, then we may keep them. But if not, they should be scrapped.
- The cost to the city for this proposal is unacceptable. The Grand Jury deals with the oversight of the Police Department and other SB City departments. No need for a panel that has no experience in the matters to be considered and judged upon.
- Will the non-monetary benefit to the community outweigh the administrative cost for the general fund/special revenue funds?
- The costs of the Commission's recommendations seem out of alignment with the problems/complaints present in our Police Dept
- Although well intended, this would be an unnecessary bureaucratic increase at taxpayer expense.
- It is a complete waste of money. The police department already has an internal review system.
- Recommend completing a Cost Benefit Analysis on layering oversight committees: At what point will an increase in (perception of) transparency outweigh the increase in resource needs (\$, new employees) that will be required to support the work of both committees?
- Please, no more bureaucracy and none of the inevitable tax increases that that entails.
- All this seems unnecessary and a waste of resources.
- Police oversight Board is not necessary for SBPD, a waste of taxpayers' money.
- We don't need another city department. It would not feel all that different than what we already have... it would be just another layer of bureaucracy with little transparency and a big budget.
- I think the police oversight committee is unnecessary and will be one more budgetary drain on city expenses - for an agency already flush with opportunity for public participation. I wish this whole effort could be shelved.

- Concerned about increased cost (paid by taxpayers) related to this.
- I feel this a waste of valuable city funds that could be spent elsewhere.
- Another level of bureaucracy is being created, costing over \$40,000/yr for the 11 members, not counting whatever the Director will be receiving.

Does it duplicate existing oversight?

- Grand jury serves this purpose- no need for this commission or more city employees
- That's what city council elections were for, not for the Council's action to divest itself of its responsibilities.
- There is already a police commission. Why not use them?
- I understand and commend the spirit of these initiatives. However, I have concerns about the office within the police department. Oversight certainly has a role in adequate and appropriate policing, but in the face of limited resources, it seems deficit-based and might detract from other effective positive policing strategies e.g., community policing and community engagement programs that directly improve relationships between police and the local community. Reinvigorating such programs is more of a priority for me than increasing oversight. Further, there are a number of collaborative, interagency, city- and county-wide committees who regularly meet to address criminal justice-related issues. Redundancy in services and committees is already an issue across the county, and it seems the energy of the community can be better directed at integrating into already-existing initiatives. For example, there has been a great deal of work dedicated to crime prevention and diversion of offenders away from the criminal justice system and into more prosocial, asset-based, culturally-responsive interventions. This work pre-dates the pandemic and increased scrutiny imparted on policing systems. It also actively engages local police departments. My question is whether the commission practiced due diligence in researching the initiatives that are already in place or in motion, and if the commission drew on the professional expertise of those who work in the field or have longstanding association with it.
- There is already a complaint process, both local at the PD, through other City Departments, event the Mayor's Office if needed. If the investigation doesn't seem thorough, it can be reviewed by other state agencies.
- Many of the processes the oversight committee proposes to offer are already offered by the SBPD and are totally transparent and available, including anonymous and third party complaints (for example complaints are commonly received and forwarded from City Hall staff). These mechanism exist and are working; it seems like some of the services being proposed are not tailored for the citizens' needs and are "solutions desperately in search of problems" that do not exist.
- I do not know how complaints are currently being handled in the police dept. and would like to know before approving the new oversight commission's responsibilities.
- It is my understanding there are already ways to make complaints. I do believe the SB community can be educated on the process of the SBPD complaint system better but I do not believe there is an issue with transparency given the new laws on release of information.
- I think this duplicates existing accountability and is a waste of tax dollars.
- an additional office of oversight would be redundant and a negligent use of public funds.
- Trust in the local police is essential for the police to be effective in any community, so this is a very important area of concern. I'm just not sure that some new "structure" would have much benefit and it could have a detrimental effect if not done well.

Could the money be better spent?

- I think this is a waste of time and resources. There is currently a bigger issue with the leadership at the SBPD that needs to be addressed. The department is currently losing officers and civilian personnel at a rapid pace. However, this oversight committee will probably end up causing more officers to leave the profession and have less trust in the command staff.
- There should be fewer police officers and more employees who can support mental health and social work. This commission sounds like you're not actually addressing issues within your law enforcement employees, rather stick a load of bureaucracy over them and maybe allow transparency. It's better than what is currently in place, but I would ask what other options could be explored.
- I favor creating the civilian board, but not the other (listed 2nd on the survey). I see much potential for unnecessary overlap.
- Use the police oversight money to hire more police officers. How much are we paying for police pensions? Is that dragging down the number of officers in SB. Our public safety has waned substantially and needs to be rebuilt. That is more important than another taxpayer-funded committee.
- The City should invest more in community services like Parks and Recreation, Library, and collaborate with other agencies to support social services and cut the Police budget. Policing is inherently racist and classist and reforms will do little good.
- A better point of impact to increase appropriate police behavior would be at the recruitment level so as to exclude candidates identified as having anger management or related issues.
- There is a serious problem with these police accountability boards. Very often, they are just shells, as a place to direct people with complaints, and then they kill off the complaints. ... Instead, I would like to see the police unions give up their need to hide behind immunity the way they do, and I would like to see them have to follow the law, I don't know if the police in Santa Barbara have to take drug tests, but I think every single police officer should have to pass drug tests every month. I don't think that police who interact with people who have drugs and use drugs should be involved in taking drugs themselves and police unions have fought tooth and nail to keep police from being drug tested. ... So first of all, let's get the Santa Barbara Police to have to all be drug tested every month so we know that they're not drug addicts. ... Secondly, we need a police liaison commission that is not associated with the city and is not associated with the police union. This third party commission is still too close to who pays out the damages. If the city is paying the police accountability commission, and the city is who is sued and pays out damages, then the city has a conflict of interest. This needs to be done by a third party advocacy group like the ACLU or something that has credibility, not the city protecting itself from lawsuits, and the police protecting themselves from not only lawsuits, but from having to follow the law at all, such as police fighting taking drug tests.
- This is an unnecessary CFC, and would be an expensive loss of City funds. The money can be better spent on housing the homeless. No volunteer Board, Committee, Task Force, Commission in the City of Santa Barbara should be paid to serve. This CFC (btw Police is not even in your name) should Report that an OPO is found to be redundant to PD internal affairs and to the duties and responsibilities chartered to the Fire and Police Commission. Thank you.
- Plus it will become a money pit and prevent the City from hiring and retaining effective police officers.

- Put money allocated to this commission to better use providing outreach programs to youth
- ballot measures to make the police directly accountable to voters would be even better
- This commission is unnecessary. Use resources to eradicate dangerous open-air meth markets instead.

Is it politically motivated?

- Santa Barbara does not need to spend money on another venue for activists to pursue their questionable goals.
- This would turn into another commission populated by people with an agenda, not with the best interest of the citizens in mind. And a waste of money.
- We don't need to waste tax funds for this "Woke" nonsense. We don't want an oversight commission, period. This idea is promoted by a minority of bullying activists. Leave it alone. Repair our roads instead.
- This proposal for the commission is purely political in nature and envisioned and to be populated by activists who failed in their dream to defund the police department.
- This has all the earmarks of an outsiders' politically driven agenda to diminish police effectiveness under the camouflage of some so-called "community oversight."
- Why really are you doing this! What an agenda former Mayor Murillo and associates have fomented! I can see shades of Black Lives Matter and beyond in this ill-conceived conception.
- It is politically motivated and is pandering to such a small percentage of people.
- We don't need this stupid civilian oversight board. It's two years since the BLM Craze, no one really wants this anymore
- It's a terrible idea, it will do nothing but attract 'defund the police' fanatics.
- This gives power to people who may have their own political agendas!

Yes, it's worth it

- We are in desperate need of a fair, neutral, and transparent oversight of police activity in this city. Otherwise, unchecked power always runs amok.
- This oversight process is critical to community trust and representation.
- I think it's an excellent idea as a way to hold officers accountable. And possibly increase and build relationships between the public and law enforcement
- I think this is an excellent step towards increasing transparency and accountability. It is human nature for people to focus on their own experiences, which means that law enforcement is naturally going to be biased toward their own perspective. I feel that it is vital for ordinary citizens to also have input so that the concerns and outcomes are more balanced with the entire community. Hopefully this will increase communication between citizens and law enforcement, so that each can understand the others' viewpoints.
- I believe having direct community non-law enforcement oversight would increase transparency and eliminate the abuse of process that has been extremely prevalent in Santa Barbara County.
- I think the creation of a Civilian Oversight Board is a progressive step toward developing trust and better collaboration between the SB Police Dept and community members.
- I trust the Santa Barbara Police Department but feel that any extra help whether it be civilian or other to help Santa Barbara become a safer place where everyone is working for a common goal A great idea. The goal being Harmony, and peace.

- No matter how many commissions you make or establish, those pigs will continue to harass and disrupt our communities with their unwanted presence. Those pigs do not prevent crime, nor do they resolve it in any timely manner. They cause more civil unrest than if they did nothing at all! Those pigs should find a job worth honoring and stay FAR far away from the communities of color that they terrorize daily. I wish each and every pig stay away from any commission that is set up for the better of the public. They are all one in the same: physical manifestations of evil. Keep them away from our communities.
- In general I rarely believe increasing the level of bureaucracy improves government effectiveness, and that sentiment would probably prevail in this case. However, some form of civilian oversight could be helpful in counteracting the negative effects of police unions, police overreach, overuse of civil forfeiture, and other important issues.
- This is a good idea. I hope it helps
- personally, I have been satisfied with the SBPD. Additional oversight from a civilian team is, however, sensible
- Overall, I think community oversight of the police operations is a great concept.
- In the spirit of the racial justice movements of 2020 that brought thousands of Santa Barbarans into the street, we should be doing all we can to allow the communities that are most harmed by policing to finally have a meaningful voice in this conversation: Black and brown folks, those who've experienced being unhoused or have lived with substance-use challenges, LGBTQ+ folks, the disabled, the working class, etc. I want to see all of my neighbors thrive, and civilian oversight of SBPD is one step in that direction. SB is ready!
- Let's get this commission going!! It's so important!!
- Please do not delay in establishing this Civilian Oversight Board.
- It is long overdue, hope it will be created soon!
- This oversight is crucial for the integrity of our criminal justice system and those who are involved in it.
- I have significant trust in the integrity of the SB Police Department, but believe that the oversight proposals would help increase trust throughout the community.
- Also, I looked on the SB police website for how to report potential police misconduct, and I can't find anywhere to do that. So yes, we need this!
- I recently served on a jury in SB and was alarmed that the SB police department and the DA were basically bringing serious charges against a young Latino gentleman for the failings of a rookie SB cop. The jury found the defendant not guilty on all charges that really amounted to the City of SB looking to avoid a workman's comp claim against the city. It was despicable and makes me strongly favor this oversight process. We'd like to trust the cops, but we can't.
- This commission is critical to hold SBPD accountable
- Considero que las quejas deben dejarse de ser aceptadas directamente el Departamento de Policía y solo ser aceptadas por la Junta

Size and Composition of Board

Too big

- Oversight Board is too large - reduce to 7 members like other boards and commissions
- Eleven members of the civilian oversight is too many members. Perhaps at least two should be alternates that only listen.

- I feel a group of 11 on a Civilian Oversight Committee is a bit excessive given the size of our department and the size of our community. I read Los Angeles Sheriff had a commission group of 9; it therefore does not seem practical or necessary for our city and department to have a group of 11.
- An 11-member panel is way too many. I would think that 4 members including the director is enough.
- The proposed oversight committee is too big.
- Eleven members is overkill - that's more than the entire County of Los Angeles has overseeing thousands of officers.
- 11 members is excessive. 3, 4, or maybe a max of 5 is more reasonable.
- If a review board was to be implemented, 11 members is far too large for the small workload

Composition

- I think a police oversight commission should lean more heavily skewed to more minority members and other underserved communities since they are usually more adversely impacted by poor policing and poor police policies.
- Be sure the group would be from various sections of SB. Policing thoughts might be different depending on what part of the city we live in.
- I think this is a good idea. Don't get too hung up on making sure the diversity factor is 100%. Get the best people, and try to achieve a level of diversity.
- I believe if the committee is to proceed forward. It needs to be fair and be opened to anyone joining the board. Don't continue the separatism and separate people from joining the board.
- If cops/ex-cops want a seat, then one for a public defender/defense or civil rights attorney should also be made compulsory.
- Diversity/ representation is highly important when electing for board.
- It so important to have people on this review board that understand the law and evidence. This will be a total waste of time if these appointments are political.
- Any member on this panel should have to live within city limits, and thereby reap the benefits of this action.
- I oppose the idea of allowing convicted felons, those currently on probation, parole or PRCS, or those convicted of violent misdemeanor crimes from serving on this board, unless a significant amount of time (10 years) has elapse, with no new criminal behavior. If that standard is not upheld, I would not trust the review board to be able to objectively critique accusations of police misconduct. I want to know we are as fair and unbiased against policing as an institution as possible. Those disqualifying criteria I listed are glaring red flags for me.
- The commission should be composed of fair and honest people of good character and should not be influenced by politics.
- The question about "the members should represent the diversity of Santa Barbara": I don't believe Santa Barbara is very diverse, but I'd like a variety of people in police oversight roles from different races, ethnicities, incomes, and backgrounds. If this question is intended to suggest that the racial composition must be benchmarked to Santa Barbara's demographics, I do not support that.
- I selected unsure regarding the diversity question because the city of Santa Barbara is not very diverse. Perhaps the county. But primarily I think it should represent the diversity of folks who are most affected by police abuse.

- This office will serve an important function in our community and for the Police Department. For it to work effectively, it must be shielded from influence by the Police Department and its stakeholders. Likewise, it must be shielded from influence both those who do not support law enforcement.
- The members of both the Office of the Police Oversight, and the Civilian Oversight Board, should be chosen specifically to have no personal or professional bias in these matters! If there is even a hint of a "conflict of interest" in any police misconduct cases, this whole process will be a waste of taxpayer money.
- We want people of color in this civilians group and more on the police group too.
- Vetting of the members of the civilian oversight board should be conducted thoroughly to ensure the board is comprised of competent and unbiased members. The composition of the board should be based on competence, experience and integrity, not diversity.
- Participation should be based on the content of one's character, not the color of their skin or what genitalia they were born with. Color blind! End ALL racism!!!
- I worry that individuals with a political agenda will seek positions on the commission. This commission, if established, must be non-partisan. A Grand Jury is non-partisan and without political motivations.
- I think the chair of the committee should be selected by the committee and not appointed by the Council or the Chief of the PD, then it becomes political. I also think there should be at least 2 youth members from the high schools.
- Diversity should not just regard race, but class. A great majority should be renters, not business owners.
- My concern would be that choosing members for this board without any other agendas would be difficult especially in this political climate.
- This is a sensitive subject - but in looking at your DEI goals, I would think that such a committee would include people of ALL races/ethnicities - including citizens who are White/Caucasian. I would think that a goal of this kind of committee would be to represent the entire community - so, I would think that you would match our county (or city) demographics as it relates to gender, and also to the racial/ethnicity makeup of our county, by a percentage, and have a proportional representation on the committee that matches our county demographics.
- I believe the civilian review board should be representative of people most impacted by policing in SB.
- A non-elected oversight board has NO place in our city operations.
- The "diversity" question leaves me uncertain. I think the Board should mostly have underrepresented residents, including undocumented, Brown, Black, Queer, and Indigenous.
- There should be a requirement that 50% of the oversight boards be women.
- People who have been convicted of crimes should not be allowed on either committee.
- having an oversight committee can be beneficial if the makeup of the group is diverse and educated.
- I am not sure what you mean by "diversity" or the methods in which you would ensure "diversity." I have a HUGE problem if you are selecting people based on them being Black, White, Hispanic, Asian, Indian, Native American, gay, straight, lesbian, transgender, etc., to fill vacancies on the board. Considering these factors in selecting a vacancy is ILLEGAL and DISGUSTING. Gender, race, sexual orientation, etc. is no factor in Police oversight and

accountability. It is black and white, right or wrong; regardless of who is evaluating police conduct.

- People with no law enforcement backgrounds do not have the training, education, or experience to provide educated policy change suggestions or suggestions regarding police policies. Pass a background, attend a police academy, pass training and maybe then someone will have enough experience to form an educated opinion on police practices.

Law Enforcement on the Board

Yes

- I think that there should be only one seat on the board for individuals with previous law enforcement experience.
- I don't think it would be bad to have one or two people on the board who were experienced in the field but surely they should not dominate it.
- I don't believe the exclusion of folks with prior police experience supports (or leads to) the creation of new forms of working together. Maybe there could be a limit on the number of members who have prior law enforcement experience-no more than one or two people serving at a time.
- I think having ONE person (out of 11) with some level of law enforcement experience/background or a relative of someone in law enforcement, while certainly not necessary, would not be a bad thing. Pushing too strongly against this I feel undermines the credibility of the commission and its stated goals.
- I believe there should be a mix of members with law enforcement experience to be able to offer a police perspective. There are many things an officer has knowledge of that a private citizen does not and this will alter the way an officer responds to an incident versus a private citizen. That perspective is important to note and is equally important to be heard. If the point of the commission is to ensure officers are acting in accordance with the law, then there should be persons on the board with the knowledge of how an officer should be/would be applying it. Individuals with no hands-on experience will obviously be lacking in this area.
- There should be a law enforcement person to add their experience & perspective.
- This group needs to be representative both of the Police Department and of the community and its diversity in order to be transparent and fair. If the Police side is left out the understanding and comprehensiveness will be missed.
- Unless you have law enforcement experience with extensive knowledge of police tactics and laws, you will have no credibility with police officers.
- Restricting people with law enforcement experience from participating means you would not be having a forum actually open to diverse opinions
- The commission needs individuals with policing experience. Untrained/inexperienced civilians lack basic knowledge of policing standards, complexities, issues, training. Those individuals should/must have orientation/training to serve. Otherwise, the commission could become mere host to biased grievances
- As the sibling of a police officer (another city), I think the seats should be earmarked for existing or retired law enforcement and public members, i.e. 5 law enforcement, 5 civilian, as an example. There should be a limit for legal, parole, etc. This board should have legitimate civilian participants.

- Excluding current and former law enforcement as well as their family members from participating on the commission is just another move meant to demonize law enforcement and will not result in a balanced and unbiased commission. Even the City's Rental Housing Mediation Board is comprised of both tenants and landlords. If transparency of this commission is a consideration, then this commission should also reflect ALL members of the community. You have encouraged young people between the ages of 18 and 24 with "lived experience" either being homeless or being arrested or convicted of crimes to apply. You should also include the "lived experience" of someone with a law enforcement background being valued as well. Anything less will be skewed towards being anti-police, decisions will not be unbalanced, and will further lead to further recruitment and retention challenges within our department.
- I think members of law enforcement should be somehow apart of the process or commission to get their perspective from a public safety standpoint as well. Maybe a designated liaison.
- I believe there should be a police presence on the committee to allow for clarification regarding police procedures.
- For this to be a fair, impartial, and neutral civilian oversight board, an element of retired law enforcement must be included.
- Just having served in law enforcement should not preclude someone from service, they may have left for reasons that would be valuable background.
- Do Hospital Medical Review Boards exclude other surgeons from reviewing a questionable medical procedure that was performed that resulted in death or other significant loss.
- Of course law enforcement & their families should be eligible, otherwise you are excluding a sizable portion of the population that you are proposing to represent. Also, the message is that you simply want to eliminate anyone who may have favorable views toward law enforcement. You should be looking for people who are willing to be fair, not just people who are pre-disposed against law enforcement.
- I believe that in order to have representation from every part of the community, there needs to be a representative from law enforcement serving on the committee. Someone who understands the workings of law enforcement and how it intertwines with the community - be that current law enforcement, former law enforcement, etc. If we are allowing criminals with history of parole/probation to be represented/on the committee, why is the opposite not allowed to be represented as well? How can someone who does not understand the workings of law enforcement be allowed to determine the actions the police department must follow? I also think it should be mandatory for all members of the committee to participate in a ride along (at least once, if not more) to fully understand what a police officer goes through on his/her shift and the dangers he/she willingly puts themselves in in order to protect the community. If they are not willing to fully understood what officers go through every day, they should not be allowed to serve on the committee.
- This can never truly be an inclusive board without representation from law enforcement on it. They'll provide context explain things to other board members.
- I don't understand why this committee would not want someone who has served in law enforcement! By not having someone on the committee it hurts its credibility in my eyes! I have never served nor do I have family member who has served, but a committee of community members to evaluate complaints should have individuals with a certain set of training (law, psychologists, etc etc). In order for people in the community to take them seriously!

Yes but need more clarity/guidelines

- This survey does not define "law enforcement". As a retired judge in civil matters only I ENFORCED STATUTES and WEIGHED EVIDENCE as prescribed by law on a daily basis.
- The question about whether former LE personnel should be able to serve is a complicated one. I think there could be value if done well. If done well, it would increase the legitimacy of the body to some members of the community and bring a valuable perspective. But it would have to be someone who is community-oriented, reform-minded, and has an equity lens. There should be very clear and rigorous criteria for former LE personnel.
- I believe that if the individuals who are going to be chosen to serve on the committee don't have any law enforcement background, they should go on several ride alongs with the PD and have an understanding of the laws officers are required to follow. An analogy would be: If I was on a medical review board and had zero medical background, how would I make sound recommendations? I would not be qualified or be in a position to be giving any advice on a topic I know nothing about. The issue with such a board would be to have individuals who are already biased against police and have zero knowledge about the profession.
- Law enforcement personnel should be allowed, but only those who did/do not work in SB County law enforcement employment
- I think people with law enforcement experience should be allowed to participate in the civilian review board, however only after they are retired or not related to anyone current working with the city.
- I think it could serve the community well, in theory, to have a former law enforcement officer on the civilian oversight committee so they could potentially offer some insight regarding the ins and outs of a police department. However, it's worrisome because it could be hard to tell if that former law enforcement officer has good intentions or if they would "poison the well".
- I think that there should be a police officer on the board in 3-6 month rotations. They can bring the SBPD perspective & procedure but in 3-6 month rotations they would not be able to have more influence than warranted.
- I think it may be important to have someone with police experience on the commission - to understand that perspective and be able to address the constraints that affect officers in given situations. This would need to be a very special person - someone who could remain neutral and just state perspective and constraints without having an undue influence over the rest of the group. So they definitely should not be the Director.
- I would like to hear the arguments for and against including previous law enforcement persons to participate. I think having a very limited number included could be beneficial.
- I also believe that like school boards there should be participants who are former educators as long as they do not have numerous complaints and have been out of policing for a while. Unlike Education police forces do not have the same scrutiny and tend to recruit those more prone to escalate situations rather than deescalate.
- I am unsure if members of law enforcement should be allowed to serve on the board as I think they could bring a different perspective and insight. However I do not think they should be able to hinder or undermine mission of the board etc.
- I strongly believe that it would be a serious mistake to not allow persons with prior law enforcement background to be on the commission, but the number of commissioners with that background should be limited in number.

- I think that maybe one seat should be reserved for someone with law enforcement background. But majority should be non-law enforcement members.
- If police representation is allowed on the commission, it should be limited to one current or former law enforcement officer.
- Individuals with prior police experience are a potentially invaluable asset to both proposed organizations, but they need to be carefully screened and peer reviewed to avoid damage to the legitimacy of the respective oversight organizations
- Though I see value in involving members who were previously or currently in law enforcement, I think it's hard to unlearn a lot of what they've learned (explicitly and implicitly) through their time on the job, and it might be better to have a clean break with no law enforcement representatives on the committees. But, I also believe in being reasonable, so I think there should be conversation with law enforcement as a part of the process, even if they aren't directly on the committee.
- I agree that one, but no more, former police officer (out of office for at least five years) should be able to serve on the community commission.

No

- Any involvement from law enforcement in this commission would greatly jeopardize the efficacy of this commission. There would be potential to intimidate other commission members, simply by presence of law enforcement.
- I think the commission should have advisors with law enforcement experience, maybe even paid advisors, but that officers/former officers and their families should not serve on the commission itself.
- There is a documented, studied culture which occurs within law enforcement that invokes an us vs. them approach to civilians. We don't need a devil's advocate for law enforcement on the committee board, we need citizens who are committed to more transparency within the department.
- No police officer or employee should serve on this committee or it defeats Transparency and is the fox in the henhouse.
- We should not let former law enforcers be on the committee. It would be another way for them to hide their actions (SBPD)
- Allowing former or current law enforcement to serve in police oversight roles is an absolutely unbelievable concept. That's a clear conflict of interest, and if that were to be permitted, occur, and be discovered by media, oversight roles for policing would lose all legitimacy. I strongly recommend against allowing individuals with prior law enforcement experience to serve.
- We really should not be letting anyone with history of or family history of police work have oversight over how conduct of members of the police force is reviewed and disciplined. We should have our police focus on crimes not committed by the police and use this community board to check police action when it endangers the public.
- The power dynamic that current/former/relatives of law enforcement would introduce would seriously compromise accountability, transparency, and the PERCEPTION of these within the community, and undermine all of your hard work.
- Also, the Office of Police Oversight should not have any current or previous law enforcement employees. It takes 6 months, sometimes less, to become a police officer, and it should take significantly less time to learn the processes involved in oversight. Therefore, law enforcement experience is not particularly valuable.

- While I appreciate that a person with law enforcement experience could bring good insight into this work, the overwhelming culture of most police departments is to protect their own members above all else, treating officers as members of a special fraternity that "regular citizens" will never understand. Until this broader police culture changes, I would be hesitant to include former law enforcement on an oversight board because their prior training and experiences would reflect the dominant culture of policing and police training.

Compensation

- Are other commissioners and committee members compensated? If so, then I think the police oversight commission should be no different. If not, I'm not clear why they're special? ... It would be good if you guys could clarify that for the public and for members of the community, because right now the compensation piece as presented makes it already look suspicious.
- Regarding a stipend, I could be incorrect, but I believe grand jury members are volunteers. I feel that the oversight members should be volunteers as well and regard this position as a civic duty for the sake of the community because they wish to serve.
- Since this is a new commission it may be that the stipend should be increased if it turns out there is a ton of work to do?
- If members have to pay parking fees, these and a trip gas allowance absolutely should be reimbursed! Other stipends should not be paid.
- I hope there will be rules of conduct about not accepting money or gifts for civilian oversight members. While they should be fairly compensated for the work they do, it seems like corruption is possible and the board will just become another puppet of SPBD and powerful interests, rather than truly representing the views of the community.
- Regarding "stipends", absolutely no-unless, the city is prepared to offer the same for all members of all city committees and boards.
- \$100 stipend per meeting is OK, but no extra for child care, parking, etc. Other Commissions do not get the extra money. How about Zoom meetings so the committee doesn't have to leave their home or park their car.
- I have no problem with an oversight committee at \$50.00 per meeting period.
- I do not totally disagree with the idea of monthly reimbursement but I think it should depend on the individual's situation -- not money for everyone. Most volunteer positions do not come with money attached.
- Meeting compensations will be only for fully Brown-Act complaint meetings where a quorum is in attendance.
- The stipend you proposed is insufficient to allow for lower income people to serve in police oversight roles. Providing a low stipend ensures that exclusively wealthy individuals will serve in this role. I believe that the stipend should be increased to allow for people of all incomes to serve.
- I think it is a good idea to allow some compensation for the oversight committee in order to take down barriers to those who are most policed.
- I think that commissioners should be paid but just not so much per meeting. Childcare prices look fine.
- Giving board members a stipend helps insure there will be more community buy and diversity as many people cannot afford to serve on a board unpaid, especially if they have children.

- Next, anyone serious about serving -- as in civic duty -- will not require compensation. \$400.00 a month is excessive, especially given that the City is experiencing a serious shortfall in its budget.
- Cut the stipend in half. \$50 per meeting is plenty!
- I believe members should not be paid but should be reimbursed for expenses related to doing the job
- Stipends to pay for parking, childcare, etc. may be appropriate, but a general stipend does not seem appropriate.
- Here is why I think that service on such a commission should be mostly uncompensated: It should be run on the same principle as an HOA Board of Directors, where the participants are also the stakeholders. Service should be entirely voluntary, while overhead costs are compensated.
- They should be offered a higher stipend for their work.
- As far as payments, either a per meeting stipend OR expenses, not both.
- proposed amount of stipend is being too generous. it will dull the intent of what the commission is about.
- This sounds like an interesting program but I would recommend having members be on a payroll so they could participate on a consistent basis rather than solely per-meeting.
- Stipends should be offered to commissioners, but not automatically paid out. Maximum monthly stipends should not exceed \$200 per month.
- I do not think committee members should receive \$\$ just for attending meetings, but should receive \$\$ for child care, parking.
- Stipends should be in line with regular City commissioners.
- Re the stipend proposal: Only expenses incurred such as babysitting. Money should not be an incentive to serve on this commission. It should be more like being on a Grand Jury (though I don't actually know if and how those members get paid but assumed they don't).
- I think the oversight commissioners should be compensated at a higher rate than was listed in the survey. Otherwise, it won't be enough to attract a diverse pool of applicants.
- A would agree with expenses being reimbursed for the people who serve on this board. That would make access equitable. But I don't think we need to pay them.
- there should be no compensation as this will lead to members serving for an income source and not a public service. We don't need another committee of self-empowered members that just want their voices heard.
- I truly feel to be a board member, it should be a voluntary position without pay. Too many people get on boards to get paid and then we see politics get involved. This should be a non-partisan position to help our police serve the community better.

Other Roles for the COB/What Power do They Have?

- I am hopeful yet it seems like the civilian oversight committee will have very little teeth.
- It seems like the agencies that you suggest creating are toothless. None of them have the authority to discipline or remove officers, or to force changes on the department. What use is yet another government agency if it has no power? Do you really think that the police department would willingly adopt a recommendation made by such a board if said recommendation actually changed anything? This is theater. Give the board TEETH, and scare the cops into compliance. They do the same thing to us

- How much power exactly will they have over SBPD's policies and procedures? If this board carries out an investigation and finds that misconduct occurred, will they have the power to charge that officer with a crime, or will it just be a recommendation that the DA can override?
- My complaint is that the entire proposal only give the committees the ability to make recommendations, which can be ignored or buried. I want them to have the power to require subpoenas, initiate independent investigations, etc., regardless of what the police force rules internally.
- A board that can "recommend" changes or "suggest" policies is not sufficient. Every law enforcement agency should be completely and totally subordinate to civilian government in every detail of its operation. In other words, a police oversight board should have total power to directly alter police department policy whenever the board deems that appropriate, and to enforce its decisions by imposing penalties on officers up to and including firing them if they do not comply with the policies decided by the civilian board (and/or by the city council). Every action taken by every police officer should be performed in a manner 100% in accordance with policies set by civilian agencies and/or legislative bodies. Police officers should not consider it part of their job or purview to decide anything about how they enforce the law; they should consider their job as solely to carry out decisions made by civilian government.
- Board should have subpoena power and should review all complaints.
- both the civilian review board and the office of police oversight should have subpoena power and the ability to fire any officer, up to and including the police chief.
- The oversight committees should also play a part in reviewing the annual police force budget.
- I would agree that if formed they should be able to take complaints directly, the scope on anonymity is concerning in the language. Would people be able to hammer away complaints just through some online form without meeting someone?
- Civilian oversight data should be publicly available (not, obviously personal information pertaining to complaints), but the type, number, etc. of complaints.
- The Oversight Board ought to publish their minutes for transparency and report regularly on the number of complaints, as well as the resolution of these complaints, while holding confidential specific individual's names when necessary.
- All meetings shall be accessible to members and public via live (in-room or with "Zoom") and recorded meetings provided by "Channel 18 TV" as well as "Streaming".
- Can the oversight board partner with other agencies to make sure other non-critical safety-needs are met? (Ex: homelessness/fires/encampment biohazard)
- It may help if a complaint tracker was available to the public to follow progress on complaints in "real time". It would also be good to post data on the different categories of complaints received and what steps are being taken to remedy these trends. Data should be presented to the public in a graphic summary format with more detailed back up information also available. We really need more ways to demonstrate government agencies following through and getting things done in a timely manner. The commissions seem like a wonderful opportunity to serve as a model of good governance aided by an effective communication system.
- Also, unclear if the Office of Police Oversight is with the PD Dept itself, or under City Hall, or some independent standalone. Knowledge of that might've affected my response.

- The interface between the Police Oversight and Civilian Oversight entities is a key component of the planning and addressing how conflicts/ differences between the two are addressed and facilitated should be a consideration in the early planning. Providing mediation support or other facilitated assistance when needed may be helpful to both entities, particularly in the early days of sorting out how best to implement the new structures and responsibilities.
- It would be helpful to clarify who the oversight office reports to as that would affect trust and transparency.
- The 2 new entities - civilian and city staff seem redundant and at odds. Has the city considered a mix of the 2, meaning one new entity comprised of both staff and civilian members?
- Just a few thoughts: 1) have a website, regularly updated, with summarized weekly data to increased transparency. Data and information should be what the people want, so up to further discussion. 3) create an active message board. found them helpful with other topics. There could be an active regulated/monitored message board that's made public and community members can share and post concerns in real time.
- I do not understand why there are two committees--overkill.
- It is unclear to me what the structure is between the citizen oversight commission and the police oversight body - is there a plan for regular communication or a mechanism for how information is routed?
- While I agree that sharing the outcomes of complaints is important for transparency, I strongly recommend that the citizens involved both in filing complaints and on the committee votes be kept anonymous. I would not be against keeping the police officers names who have been reported anonymous from public view, as long as clear action was taken based on the outcome of the decisions made by these committees.
- Will there be a mediation component to restore peace on the community between the public and SBPD?
- The oversight dept should immediately conduct an inventory of existing police activities in the community from traffic cop to investigators. Assess which functions are appropriate to the police department and reorganize as necessary.

General Thanks

- Good luck and thank you for everyone's work on this important task which may have seemed thankless and difficult.
- Thank you for your work!
- Thank you for all of your hard work.
- This is a great and much needed idea. Every town should have this.
- Thank you for your service. Now let's make our SBPD even better.
- Thank you for all of the hard work that you're doing to improve the safety for all members of our community. I hope that the City Council will listen to your recommendations and the concerns of the community by funding and establishing this oversight board and office.
- Thank you for this survey.
- I appreciate your outreach concerning these matters
- Thanks for doing this outreach and all your work on this effort - it'll be a great asset for the community.

- Thank you for your diligent work and recognition of the power imbalances & lack of accountability in our current system!
- Thank you for your work and effort!
- Thank you all for your work! I know this has been a challenging process.
- Thank you for your work to increase trust, transparency and accountability.
- Thanks for putting the work into the creation of the institutions, programs and this survey.
- Thank you for reaching out with the survey. We hope that the gathered data is incorporated into decision making.
- Thank you for reaching out regarding this important community issue.