

San José Re-Imagining Public Safety Community Advisory Committee

Coalition Proposal

June 2021

The undersigned organizations offer a proposal for a community-led process that we believe can lead to meaningful recommendations for reform and alternatives to policing in our community. The proposed structure was derived from other local models, similar bodies in other Bay Area cities, and specific feedback from community organizations over the last month. This may be revised by the coalition as necessary.

The proposal recommends a refined purpose, structure and timeline, suggestions for voting and non-voting membership, a youth council, governance, and role of the City and consultants.

Background

The murder of Mr. George Floyd by Minneapolis Police Officer Derek Chauvin stirred a massive public uprising against the intolerable and persistent legacy of racist law enforcement misconduct in communities across this country, including our own. Last June, local leaders called on the City of San José to commit meaningful resources to establish an Office of Racial Equity and to direct that office to:

“Develop a process to redirect resources away from policing toward other community-based solutions. This effort needs to incorporate and center the voices of individuals traditionally left out of our decision making, in partnership with diverse community-based organizations that have long served and represented the voices of those community members harmed by systemic racism.”

–June 15, 2020, letter to the Mayor Liccardo and City Council entitled, ***This Budget Fails to Measure up to this Moment***, signed by over 75 community-based organizations.

The Council agreed to create the Office of Racial Equity and charged the administration with establishing a community process on the “future of policing,” to recommend new ways of addressing social issues, and “a process to review our use of force policies.”

This spring, the City Manager’s office launched a Reimagining Community Safety Advisory Group with a large and diverse group of stakeholders. Members were told they were selected, in part, because of their direct relationships with grassroots constituencies. Many of the participants expressed significant concerns with inadequate representation of youth and system impacted individuals, along with frustration with the pace, scope, and poor facilitation of the process. By the first week of May, over a third of the appointees resigned from the Advisory Group, calling for a community-led process.

This proposal represents an attempt to articulate such a process.

Purpose

The purpose of the Re-Imagining Public Safety Community Advisory Committee (RPSCAC) is to identify, research, develop, and advance:

- ***Alternatives to policing.*** Redirecting resources toward community-based programs and interventions that will significantly change, reduce, or eliminate the role of law enforcement in addressing social challenges. These involve both the creation of alternative emergency response systems and preventative approaches.

- ***Transformation of police policies and practices.*** The Council must develop a detailed understanding of current SJPD policies and institutional context to inform policy recommendations moving forward. The body will explore what police policies require immediate reform, including but not limited to crowd control techniques, use of force policies, training, hiring, oversight, and disciplinary practices.
- ***Increased police accountability and transparency to the public.***
- ***Implementation strategies*** to employ alternatives to policing, apply necessary policy reforms, and increase public accountability/transparency in San José.

Structure & Timeline

The RPSCAC and RPSCAC Youth Council will work for approximately six months to develop a report with a set of findings, policy recommendations, and strategies for implementation to the City Council. The final report will be presented to the Council by members of the Committee.

In the course of this work:

- RPSCAC meetings will be open to the public and include opportunity for public comment;
- RPSCAC will be empowered to invite individuals, organizations, and/or agencies to testify;

The RPSCAC and RPSCAC Youth Council will meet twice per month, on a day/time accessible to the community and the membership. Voting members may decide to change the frequency or length of meetings at any time, and may schedule committee meetings as necessary and appropriate.

Committees

The RPSCAC may choose to organize itself and some of its work using committees and engagement teams.

A recommended structure would be to organize committees around the purposes of the RPSCAC:

- Alternatives to Policing
- Transformation of Policing Policies and Practices
- Public Accountability and Transparency

The Role of each Committee would be to:

- Incorporate and center the voices of individuals traditionally left out of our decision-making processes, especially those that have been harmed by traditional policing practices.
- Identify, develop, and prioritize recommendations for action using a results-based accountability framework with a focus on eliminating racial disparities.
- Propose a narrative shift to community stakeholders and policymakers for how recommendations can achieve a new vision of public safety.

Engagement Teams

The RPSCAC may consider developing engagement teams of members designed to help develop and implement outreach strategies to engage specific constituent stakeholders (impacted populations, neighborhoods, etc.) in order to surface input in the process.

RPSCAC Membership

Guiding principles of the RPSCAC composition will be:

- To center the voices of systems impacted families and communities while uplifting their narrative experiences throughout the process.
- To engage diverse community constituencies disproportionately impacted by policing systems, identifying nominating organizations who have capacity and experience in representing these communities.
- To ground RPSCAC findings and recommendations in mutually observable evidence such as scholarship, data, and reporting.

Below is a suggested list of nominating community-based organizations.

[Note: The organizations listed are possible examples. Ultimately their capacity will need to be confirmed, and the coalition may choose to alter this list. These are suggestions for key populations to be represented.]

These organizations are recommended based on their connection to key resident constituencies. Organizations are encouraged to nominate representatives with lived experience, and to consider someone other than their highest-ranking executive leadership. Nominees do not necessarily have to be members of their nominating organization. All nominees must have the capacity to fulfill the obligations of the role and be empowered to meaningfully represent their designated resident constituencies.

Members (Voting) – Community-Based Organization Nominees (27)

<u>Nominating Organization</u>	<u>Representation</u>
1) SV DeBug	System impacted individuals who experienced arrest/incarceration
2) SV DeBug	System impacted families who lost loved ones to SJPD encounters
3) Race Equity & Community Safety Cmt.	System impacted change advocates
4) San José Neighborhoods Commission	Broad representation of SJ neighborhoods, resident orgs
5) San José Neighborhoods Commission	Neighborhood Association representative
6) Destination:Home	Current and formerly unhoused residents
7) Interfaith Leaders Collaborative	Faith communities
8) People Acting in Community Together	Faith communities
9) NAACP SJ/SV	AfAm/Black community and multi-racial coalition
10) Black Leadership Kitchen Cabinet	AfAm/Black community
11) African American CSA	AfAm/Black youth attending public school with SROs
12) SOMOS Mayfair	East San José community
13) Latinos United for New America	Latinx communities
14) La Raza Roundtable	Latinx communities
15) National Compadres Network	Latinx communities, youth intervention
16) Amigos de Guadalupe	Undocumented communities
17) Asian Law Alliance	AAPI communities
18) LEAD Filipino	Filipinx community
19) Vietnamese American Roundtable	Vietnamese American Community
20) Indian Health Center of SCV	Indigenous/Native Communities
21) LGBTQ Youth Space	LGBTQIA youth/community
22) Behavioral Health Contractors' Association	Residents impacted by mental health/addiction challenges
23) Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence	Women's rights leadership/DV and SV survivors
24) Parents Helping Parents	Differently-abled residents
25) Sacred Heart Community Service	Low-income residents
26) Bill Wilson Center	Unhoused & system involved youth
27) HERO Tent	Youth/young adult civil and human rights activists

Expectations of Nominees for Membership:

- They have the capacity to facilitate engagement of their designated community constituents in the process.
- They are empowered to reasonably represent the interests of their designated community constituency.
- They are familiar and in agreement with the purposes of the RPSCAC above.
- They have familiarity with the fundamental reasons and motivations of the movement against racist police violence.
- They can attend the scheduled meetings in addition to committee meetings or work on assigned / volunteered tasks.

Advisory Members (Non-Voting) – Relevant Experts and Public Agencies (8)

<u>Nominating Organization</u>	<u>Role / Representation</u>
1) SJP	Officer/representative, SJP
2) Independent Police Auditor, CSJ	Legal expert, IPA CSJ
3) Public Defender Office, CSC	Legal expert, PD CSC
4) Probation Department, CSC	Applied professional, PD Juvenile Justice CSC
5) Office of the District Attorney, CSC	Legal expert, DA CSC
6) Human Rights Institute, SJSU	Academic expert: policing/human rights/civil rights, Member
7) Dept. of Family & Children’s Services, CSC	Family and child social services expert, DFCS CSC
8) Office of LGBTQ Affairs, CSC	LGBTQ relations expert, Member

Expectations of Nominees for Advisory Membership:

- They can reasonably represent their respective agencies and professions.
- They are familiar with and respect the purposes of the RPSCAC.
- They understand their role is to advise and serve at the behest of the voting members—to answer questions, take on assigned tasks, and inform (not make) the decisions of the RPSCAC.
- They have some familiarity with the fundamental reasons and motivations of the movement against racist police violence.
- They can attend the scheduled meetings in addition to potential committee meetings or work on assigned/volunteered tasks.

TOTAL Members = 35 (27 voting + 8 advisory)

RPSCAC Youth Council Membership

The RPSCAC Youth Council will be an arm of the RPSCAC organized entirely by youth residents. The Youth Council is meant to provide a relatively autonomous space for youth to discuss and formulate their own recommendations relative to the RPSCAC purposes and findings.

The Youth Council will meet on a separate, parallel track and put forward their own recommendations in a distinct section of the Final Report. While their recommendations will be in conversation with the broader recommendations of the RPSCAC, they will not require approval of the RPSCAC to be included.

All voting members of the Youth Council must be residents of San José, under the age of 21 at the point of nomination. Below is a suggested list of nominating organizations.

Youth Council Members – Youth Organization Nominees (12)

<u>Nominating Organization</u>	<u>Representation</u>
1) SV DeBug	Youth residents who experienced arrest/detention
2) City of San Jose Youth Commission	Youth residents
3) African American CSA	AfAm/Black youth attending public school with SROs
4) HERO Tent	Youth/young adult civil and human rights activists
5) LGBTQ Youth Space	LGBTQIA+ youth
6) Bill Wilson Center	Homeless/system impacted youth
7) NAACP	Multi-racial youth organizing for civil rights protection
8) LEAD Filipino	Filipinx youth
9) Fresh Lifelines for Youth	Multi-racial system impacted youth
10) Young Women’s Freedom Center	Young women
11) San Jose Unified Equity Coalition & San Jose Strong	Multi-racial youth
12) APALI Youth Leadership Academy	AAPI youth

Expectations of Nominees for Youth Council Membership:

- They are empowered to reasonably represent the interests of their designated community constituency.
- They are familiar and in agreement with the purposes of the RPSCAC above.
- They have some familiarity with the fundamental reasons and motivations of the movement against racist police violence.
- They can attend the scheduled meetings in addition to potential committee meetings or work on assigned/volunteered tasks.

TOTAL Youth Council Members = 12

Governance

Voting

While the goal will be to reach unanimous consensus on decisions whenever possible, all decisions by the RPSCAC and RPSCAC Youth Council can be made by a *majority vote* of the voting members. They may decide to follow the principles of [Robert’s Rules of Order](#), and require a *minimum quorum of 2/3rds voting members* to make a decision.

Steering Committee

The voting RPSCAC and RPSCAC Youth Council members may decide to elect a Steering Committee from among their ranks. Steering Committee may be responsible for:

- Developing meeting agendas.
- Ensuring proper facilitation of meetings.
- Ensuring communication between committees.
- Incorporating member feedback on expectations, process, and decision-making.
- Represent the group when necessary.
- Work with City staff, consultants and counsel to facilitate the drafting of the Final Report.

The Steering Committee membership will not have additional powers of any significance.

Role of City: Budget, Staff, and Consultants

The City should provide staff, consultant support, and retain counsel for the RPSCAC and RPSCAC Youth Council.

Meeting Support:

Staff and consultants will support the Steering Committee in providing preparatory materials for Advisory Council members and the public, including:

- Agendas and background summaries on upcoming meeting topics and explanations of the process for discussion, which may include the use of guiding questions.
- Minutes/Notes from previous meetings that are accessible to their constituents.
- Materials which are provided at least a week in advance of meetings.
- Other logistical support as needed.

Stakeholder Engagement:

Staff and/or consultants will support RPSCAC and RPSCAC Youth Council members in conducting outreach to resident stakeholders by providing:

- Clear expectations, direction, and support in soliciting feedback from their constituents to inform the process.
- Support in collecting and presentation of data on the needs and priorities of community stakeholders.
- Providing language interpretation as needed.
- Other logistical support for outreach activities as needed.

Recommendations/Final Report:

City staff, counsel, and consultants will support the RPSCAC and RPSCAC Youth Council in research and development of specific proposals for consideration and adoption in the Final Report including:

- Review and present current City policies and practices.
- Research support for alternatives to policing models for discussion.
- Presentation of data and findings.
- Technical assistance in developing proposals for consideration.
- Drafting final report and presentation in formats accessible to the community.
- Communication with City Departments and City Council.

The City Manager's office should assist the RPSCAC in the selection process for consultants and counsel. The voting RPSCAC will then vote to select the consultants and counsel in coordination with the appropriate hiring agency. Either the City or one of the RPSCAC member organizations may serve as the fiscal agent for consultants and counsel.

All recommendations from consultants are subject to review and approval by the RPSCAC membership.

Follow-Up

A process should be established by RPSCAC members in conversation with consultants to monitor the implementation of recommendations by the City. This would include publicly tracking the recommendations adopted, partially adopted, or rejected by City Council, and relevant City agencies. This may also include setting appropriate expectations and/or timelines for implementation.

See, for example, the following tracking strategy employed by the SCC Blue Ribbon Commission on jails:

<https://www.sccgov.org/sites/jr/summarized-recommendations/Pages/completed.aspx>

Abode Services	Loaves & Fishes
African American Community Service Agency	NAACP San Jose/Silicon Valley
Alum Rock Counseling Center	National Compadres Network
Amigos de Guadalupe Center for Justice & Empowerment	Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence
Asian Americans for Community Involvement	Office of the Public Defender, County of Santa Clara
Asian Law Alliance	MACLA/Movimiento de Arte y Cultura Latino Americana
Behavioral Health Contractors' Association (BHCA)	Metropolitan Education District
Bill Wilson Center	Momentum for Health
Black Leadership Kitchen Cabinet	PACT (People Acting in Community Together)
Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County	Parents Helping Parents
Carry the Vision	Peninsula Family Service
Center for Employment Training	Project HIRED
Center for Excellence in Nonprofits	Recovery Café San Jose
Child Advocates of Silicon Valley	San Jose Conservation Corps
City Year	San Jose Parks Foundation
Community Health Partnership	San Jose Taiko
Community Solutions	Sí Se Puede Collective
Council on American-Islamic Relations	SJSU Human Rights Institute
Destination: Home	SOMOS Mayfair
Educare California at Silicon Valley	Sacred Heart Community Service
Family Supportive Housing, Inc.	Santa Clara County La Raza Lawyers Association
Fresh Lifelines for Youth (FLY)	Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
Grail Family Services	Silicon Valley Council of Nonprofits
Green Foothills	South Bay Community Land Trust
Guadalupe River Park Conservancy	St. Joseph's Family Center
The Health Trust	SV@Home
HomeFirst Services	Ujima Adult and Family Services
International Children Assistance Network	Unity Care
Jewish Family Services	Uplift Family Services
Justice At Last	Veggielution
Latina Coalition	Vietnamese American Roundtable (VAR)
Latinos United for a New America/LUNA	West Valley Community Services
Law Foundation of Silicon Valley	Working Partnerships USA
LEAD Filipino	Youth Community Service
LifeMoves	

From: [Tiffany Maciel](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Agendadesk](#)
Cc: [Perez, Raul](#); [Liccardo, Sam](#); [Rios, Angel](#); [Parra-Garcia, Sabrina](#); [Maciel, Zulma](#); [Cici Vu](#);
Subject: tem 4.3, Police Reforms Work Plan: Reimagining Community Safety Status Report.
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 2:23:20 PM

[External Email]

For reference: Item 4.3, [Police Reforms Work Plan: Reimagining Community Safety Status Report](#).

City Clerk
Office of the City Clerk | City of San José 200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor San Jose,
CA 95113
June 21, 2021

Dear Honorable Mayor Liccardo and Members of Council-

“The greatest moment for social justice our country has ever known is the Civil Rights Movement and it was totally rooted in a love ethic.” ~bell hooks

1. ***“Almost half of the people who die at the hands of police have some form of a disability”*** Perry, David M, and Lawrence Carter-Long. n.d. *“THE RUDERMAN WHITE PAPER ON MEDIA COVERAGE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT USE OF FORCE AND DISABILITY.”*
2. In the United States, roughly 54,000 youth reside in juvenile corrections facilities on any given day. Though precise figures are difficult to come by, it is estimated that the percentage of incarcerated youth with disabilities typically range from 30 percent to 60 percent, with some estimates as high as 85 percent. [Office of Special Education](#).
3. While over the past 10 years there has been a decline in juvenile crime, youth with disabilities are being incarcerated at rates of more than four times higher than youth without disabilities. The National Coalition for Juvenile Justice has called the current levels of incarcerated youth with disabilities in the U.S. “an epidemic”. [October 2020 HSC Juvenile Justice Involved Youth with Disabilities](#).

The vibrant families of San Jose lead complex lives. Therefore, government must reflect this, by re-imagining, creating, and sustaining programs that respond to the multi-issue challenges faced by at-risk youth and adults with disabilities. For too long disability has been an afterthought when discussing community

care, program reform, and law enforcement. By leaving issues of disability out of data collection, youth programming, and community outreach, a valuable opportunity -that is needed- is missed to strengthen our network, improve outcomes, and build a safer and more inclusive San Jose. One organization aimed at representing “differently -abled” residents cannot possibly be considered equitable representation of the diverse and complex circumstances in which disabled residents live. Many members of the disabled community identify as Disabled, not “differently abled” or “special needs”. There is nothing special or different about wanting to feel safe in our community.

For these reasons, it is essential that as we re-imagine community safety services and programs for at-risk youth, they are informed about the disabled youth most at risk of involvement with juvenile justice, many of whom are not even recognized as disabled.

Respectfully, Tiffany Maciel, Parent, Advocate, member of original re-Imagining Community Safety Advisory Group, lifetime resident of SJ District 3

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.