AD HOC COMMITTEE ON POLICE REFORM REPORT relative to alternative models and methods that do not rely on armed law enforcement to achieve transportation policy objectives.

Recommendation for Council action, as initiated by Motion (Harris-Dawson - Bonin - Price - Wesson - Ryu):

1. DIRECT the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), with assistance of the City Administrative Officer (CAO), Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA), Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), and the City Attorney, to develop and issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking a consultant to conduct a study on the feasibility of utilizing civilian enforcement of traffic laws for motorists, cyclists, and other forms of transportation occurring within the City of Los Angeles.

2. DIRECT that City departments consider the following in the development of the RFP detailed above in Recommendation No. 1:
   a. A review of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, the California Vehicle Code, and other relevant traffic laws for any outdated enforcement sections that could be decriminalized or removed.
   b. A review of unarmed traffic enforcement techniques from around the United States as well as any international models.
   c. The size of the City of Los Angeles in population and square mileage. d. The diversity of the City, including but not limited to:
      i. Racial demographics.
      ii. The number of languages spoken.
      iii. The number of people living in poverty.
      iv. Any other factors that may be relevant to developing this type of program to meet the needs of City residents.

3. DIRECT the LADOT to create an advisory task force to make recommendations to the LADOT for traffic safety alternatives and convene community meetings to solicit feedback in regard to community needs.

4. DIRECT the LAPD to report in regard to the top five most cited traffic violations, as well as the number of vehicle stops and arrests for traffic enforcement/violations including data on the gender and ethnicity of those cited or arrested, broken down by bureau, traffic division, and station for 2018-19 and 2019-20.

Fiscal Impact Statement: Neither the CAO nor the CLA has completed a financial analysis of this report.
Community Impact Statement: Yes

For:
Arroyo Seco Neighborhood Council

**Summary:**

On October 23, 2020, your Committee considered a Motion (Harris-Dawson - Bonin - Price - Wesson - Ryu) relative to alternative models and methods that do not rely on armed law enforcement to achieve transportation policy objectives. According to the Motion, people of different races and ethnicities have different access to, experiences with, and feelings of safety with mobility in Los Angeles, especially in interactions with law enforcement. In the transportation industry, national experts are increasingly recognizing that policing of public spaces reduces mobility for some members of the public, particularly Black and Latino people. These barriers to mobility have cascading impacts on access to job and educational opportunities, healthcare, and parks and open space, all of which contribute to the wide disparities in income, health, and well-being experienced in Los Angeles. Low-income communities of color bear the brunt of traffic violence in Los Angeles due to decades of disinvestment in safe streets infrastructure and policies that prioritize through traffic over local residents’ mobility needs. In 2015, when the City endorsed the Vision Zero Initiative to end traffic fatalities through a combination of education, engineering, and enforcement strategies, mobility justice advocates immediately feared yet another campaign to over-police their communities and lack of follow-through on investment in tangible safety improvements. These consistent critiques, many from leaders based here in Los Angeles, have now grown into a broad consensus among transportation industry’ leaders that police involvement can actually undermine traffic safety goals and that a police-led response to what is fundamentally a disinvestment issue is harmful, costly, and counterproductive. After consideration and having provided an opportunity for public comment, the Committee moved to recommend approval of the Motion as amended and detailed in the above recommendations. This matter is now submitted to Council for its consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON POLICE REFORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WESSON:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KORETZ:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE:</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDILLO:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIS-DAWSON:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B: Task Force Roster

**TASK FORCE ROSTER**
City of Los Angeles Traffic Enforcement Alternatives Advisory Task Force

**Task Force Members**

1. Chauncee Smith (President)
2. Asiyahola Sankara (Vice President)
3. Benjamin Pezzillo
4. Candyce Kornblum
5. Elmer G Roldan
6. Jesus "Chuy" Garcia
7. Leslie Cooper Johnson
8. Lin Min Kong
9. Ma'ayan Dembo
10. Moises Gomez
11. Patricia Joyce Strong-Fargas
12. Rae Huang
13. Yolanda Davis-Overstreet
LADOT Traffic Enforcement Study
Community Advisory Task Force
Application

Application period closes Friday, December 10, 2021. Applications may be submitted online using the web form, via email to ladot-advisory-tf@lacity.org or in-person at LADOT HQ 10th Floor ATTN: Vision Zero/Traffic Enforcement Advisory Task Force, 100 S. Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012. Resumes can be emailed to ladot-advisory-tf@lacity.org but shall not replace an application. If assistance is needed in completing the application please contact: 213-972-4973. ***In accordance with Los Angeles City Ordinance 187134, candidates must meet the minimum requirement of being fully vaccinated against COVID-19 or receive an exemption and report their vaccination status prior to being hired by the hiring City department. The ordinance is available at https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2021/21-0921_ord_187134_8-24-21.pdf

* Required

1. Email *

2. Full Name *

3. Street Address *

4. City *
5. Zip Code *

6. Phone Number *

7. Do you have any relationships (professional, financial, organization affiliation, or otherwise) that may present a potential conflict of interest in working with the City or the Traffic Enforcement Study Advisory Task Force? *

8. Are you a current or former member of any other City committees? If yes, please describe: *

9. What mode of transportation do you use? *
10. How often do you travel in the City of Los Angeles? *

*Mark only one oval.*

- [ ] Once per week
- [ ] Twice per week
- [ ] Three times per week
- [ ] More than three times per week

11. Please identify your experience or areas of interest. Check all that apply. *

*Check all that apply.*

- [ ] Academia
- [ ] Equitable Transportation
- [ ] Judiciary/Law Enforcement
- [ ] Public Health
- [ ] Public Safety
- [ ] Racial Justice
- [ ] Social Services
- [ ] Other: ______________________________________

12. Describe the experience, knowledge, technical skills, and/or education, professional or otherwise which you possess regarding the area(s) selected above. *

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
13. Please state your reason(s) for applying to the LADOT Traffic Enforcement Study Advisory Task Force.*

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

14. What are your top three goals for your tenure on the Advisory Task Force if your application is accepted? *

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

15. Optional Resume

Files submitted:

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.
Meeting Dates

1. June 23, 2022
2. August 11, 2022
3. September 28, 2022
4. October 24, 2022
5. November 17, 2022
6. December 15, 2022
7. January 12, 2023
8. January 26, 2023
9. February 2, 2023
10. February 16, 2023
11. April 2023

Meeting Topics

The following is a summary of meeting topics. In some cases, these topics were covered or revisited over a series of meetings. Topics are listed in rough chronological order.¹

1. Task Force responsibilities and administrative requirements
2. Project context + Traffic Enforcement Study scope of work
3. Alignment on study’s problem statement
4. Review of and feedback on the following consultant team deliverables:
   a. Literature review findings and proposed case study approach

¹ All agendas, minutes, and reports for Brown Act meetings are here: https://ladot.lacity.org/about/advisory-committees
b. Proposed quantitative analysis approach and preliminary findings

c. Expert interview protocol and interviewee list

d. Legal interview protocol and interviewee list

e. Draft study findings and recommendations

5. Task force-led self-enforcing streets literature review

6. LAPD’s existing and new policies, including the March 2022 pretextual stops policy

7. Task force-led recommendations criteria

8. Discussions on study recommendations
The purpose of this memo is to provide task force members with research and key findings on self-enforcing street design as an alternative to armed law enforcement. The task force may recommend that LADOT include self-enforcing street design in the LADOT study.

RECOMMENDATION GOAL

This memo evaluates the effectiveness of using civilian engineering, planning, and design methods to compel individuals to obey traffic laws without the use of armed police. While the study researchers develop recommendations that will reduce police violence against individuals, we want to emphasize recommendations that would also result in a significant reduction in serious and fatal traffic crashes. It is not our desire to co-develop a study that focuses solely on whether the City of Los Angeles should civilize an inherently inequitable, ineffective, and predatory system of fines and fees. Traffic stops, whether conducted by police or unarmed civilians, are often harmful and may not prevent serious and fatal traffic accidents. This is why we hope to include in the study at least some recommendations that would reduce police violence and increase traffic safety if implemented.

This memo will briefly discuss whether City Council’s motion includes civilian-led traffic-calming strategies within the scope of its legislative purpose, which would enable the research team, the task force, and/or LADOT staff to dedicate a section (or subsection) to design and infrastructure changes. In addition, the memo will summarize the existing body of research contrasting these interventions with armed traffic policing. Again, the purpose of the proposed memo is to ensure that this recommendation, if adopted by the task force, is appropriately informed by research and key findings regarding feasible strategies to decouple law enforcement from traffic safety.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Is self-enforcing street design a method of civilian enforcement of traffic laws?
2. What research has already been done on self-enforcing design as a civilian-led enforcement model that does not rely on police to achieve transportation policy objectives?

SHORT ANSWER

1. Based on the text of motion and context in which it passed, it appears reasonably likely that City Council intended for LADOT to include civilian-led design and infrastructure methods within its definition of “civilian enforcement.”
2. There is a growing body of research on self-enforcing infrastructural solutions as a civilian-led alternative to armed law enforcement. Further analysis is needed to determine
obstacles to LADOT implementing self-enforcing street design as a nonpolice safety strategy, and ways to overcome them.

DISCUSSION

A. LA City Council Motion Definition of “Enforcement”

The motion is titled “A motion relative to alternative models and methods that do not rely on armed law enforcement to achieve transportation policy objectives” and directs LADOT to “conduct a study on the feasibility of utilizing civilian enforcement of traffic laws.”

Confusion about whether the scope of Council’s legislative purpose includes self-enforcing street design as a method of civilian enforcement can be resolved in the affirmative by reading the plain text of the motion and considering the context in which it passed.

Regarding that context, this motion was introduced in June 2020 during a city-wide and nation-wide popular uprising demanding that public officials reimagine public safety (hence the title of the motion) by shifting approaches from enforcement by punishment to enforcement by prevention. Transportation and mobility-focused community advocates across the country specifically called for divesting from police enforcement and reinvesting in self-enforcing streets in that context. Specifically, this motion came about in the context of PUSH-LA advocacy, which in its report on racially biased stops specifically called for "enhancing urban design to improve traffic safety" in the context of advocacy by Black Lives Matter-Los Angeles and People’s Budget-Los Angeles, who reported that the vast majority of Angelenos surveyed want to see greater investment in the built environment and divestment from police in the city budget.

With that context, it appears reasonably likely that council did not grant LADOT discretion to exclude civilian-led design and infrastructure methods from its definition of “civilian enforcement” or its scope of work.

B. Literature/Case Study Review

| Dismantling Law Enforcement’s Role in Traffic Safety: A Roadmap for Massachusetts |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Date published**            | April 2022                      |
| **Main topic**                | This article proposes that traffic enforcement interventions should be moved upstream, focusing on infrastructure and design solutions that will measurably reduce serious and fatal crashes. |
| **Link**                      | https://assets.nationbuilder.com/livablestreetsalliance/pages/7390/attachments/original/1649863050/Dismantling_Law_Enforcements_Role_in_Traffic_Safety_report.pdf?1649863050 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>The paper, authored by LiveableStreets Alliance, offers “practical steps” transportation experts and elected officials can take to dismantle law enforcement’s role in traffic safety in Massachusetts. Some of the recommendations are specific to Massachusetts but most are applicable to other states and cities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Key statistics or talking points | ● The authors discuss the inequities and harms associated with traffic stops and note “the growing body of evidence that traffic stops do not deter crime and have a limited impact on dangerous driving.” (p. 9)  
● The report explains why infrastructure and design is the “first and best” strategy to encourage or force desired motorist behaviors and reduce the chance of serious and fatal crashes. (p. 11)  
   ○ “When streets are designed to protect vulnerable road users and prevent risky driving behavior, fatalities and serious injuries can be dramatically reduced and potentially eliminated, making police enforcement of traffic violations unnecessary.” (Id.)  
● Unarmed civilian traffic monitors and automated enforcement can be considered. However, the report recommends them as “stop-gap measures” that should be “phased out” as infrastructure and design improvements are made. (p. 12)  
   ○ “The goal is to build the infrastructure to effectuate safer streets and to employ community-driven measures of accountability, rather than rely on punitive measures that have failed to reduce traffic fatalities and cause untold harms.” (Id.) |
| Specific Proposals | ● Decision makers should ask the following questions to analyze the purpose and effectiveness of specific traffic safety measures: (p. 19)  
1. Could the safety outcomes of the violation be achieved through design or infrastructure changes? Policy changes? Increased education or outreach?  
2. What data and research are available around the purpose or outcomes of the violation, including the racial or economic disparate impact?  
3. Could enforcement of this violation be conducted without a police officer? |
| Misc. notes/comments | Throughout this white paper, the importance of preventative enforcement measures is emphasized. Although the report does not exclude the possibility of civilian monitoring of traffic stops, it argues that civilianization treats symptoms rather than root causes. Overall, the report supports the argument that self-enforcing design interventions should replace criminalizing police interactions. |

4. What would the impact on safety be if the violation were removed entirely?  
   
The report uses three examples to illustrate how this framework can be used. Below is an excerpt from “Example 3: Speeding.”
EXAMPLE 3: Speeding

Speeding increases crash likelihood because it takes longer for drivers to stop or slow down, and makes crashes more deadly because crash energy increases exponentially as speeds increase.\(^{51}\) Speeding endangers everyone on the street nearby, but particularly vulnerable road users because they are not protected by the structure of a vehicle. More than 26% of all fatalities from car crashes in 2019 occurred in speed-related crashes,\(^{52}\) demonstrating that a reduction in the number of drivers speeding will directly increase safety.

As noted on page 9 of the report, some research demonstrates that high visibility traffic enforcement campaigns do not meaningfully change drivers’ behavior or reduce speeds in the long term.

Design and infrastructure changes are the most effective and equitable way to decrease speeding. A myriad of proven traffic-calming strategies are available, including narrowing vehicle travel lanes, timing signals to encourage lower speeds, and adding pinch points, chicanes, speed humps, or raised crossings, among many other tactics.\(^{53}\) Many of these interventions can be installed quickly and with inexpensive materials like paint and cones.

Automated enforcement is another strategy that can increase safety until infrastructure can be installed, or on certain roads where traffic calming may not be feasible. *Please refer to Appendix A (page 45) for a more detailed analysis of automated enforcement.*

**OUTCOME:** In order to ensure the intended safety outcomes are met, design and infrastructure changes should be implemented to curtail dangerous driving behavior, and automated enforcement could be considered as a step toward removing direct police interactions in areas where immediate infrastructure improvements aren’t possible.

---

51. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Highway Loss Data Institute, “Speed.”
52. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, “Speed.”
53. NACTO Global Designing Cities Initiative, “Global Street Design Guide.”
EXAMPLE 3: Speeding

Does the law increase safety?

Speeding increases crash likelihood because it takes longer for drivers to stop or slow down, and makes crashes more deadly because crash energy increases exponentially as speeds increase.

Does the law disproportionally affect vulnerable populations?

Traffic stops disproportionately impact vulnerable populations, by way of police violence and punitive measures like fees.

OUTCOME: PURSUE ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES

Speeding endangers everyone on the street nearby, but particularly vulnerable road users because they are not protected by the structure of a vehicle.

Design and infrastructure changes are the most effective and equitable way to decrease speeding. Automated enforcement is another strategy that can increase safety until infrastructure can be installed, or on certain roads where traffic calming may not be feasible.

Would there be a negative impact if the law were removed?

Are there alternatives to police enforcement?
# The Case for Self-Enforcing Streets: How Reallocating a Portion of the NYPD Budget to the DOT Can Reduce the Harm of Racial Bias and Improve Safety for All New Yorkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>June 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main topic</strong></td>
<td>This paper by Transportation Alternatives seeks to demonstrate how New York City can reduce traffic violence and racial bias in police enforcement by prioritizing self-enforcing street design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5cab9d9b65a707a9b36f4b6c/t/5ece1235fe73d720da412589/1592529462229/CaseForSelfEnforcingStreets.pdf">https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5cab9d9b65a707a9b36f4b6c/t/5ece1235fe73d720da412589/1592529462229/CaseForSelfEnforcingStreets.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>This paper was released as part of a budget justice advocacy campaign by Transportation Alternatives “together with several elected officials and other legal and advocacy organizations.” (p. 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Key statistics or talking points** | - “By shifting resources to infrastructural solutions, which work 24/7, are free from implicit bias, and are unable to harass or cause violence, the City can lessen the need for armed police enforcement (e.g. all non-civilian members of the NYPD), reduce traffic injuries and fatalities, and save money.” (p. 2)  
- The authors put together a very helpful framework by comparing the efficacy of specific DOT-led design and infrastructure improvements to the efficacy of police officer-based enforcement:  
  - “For example, in 2017, there were 46,000 hit-and-run crashes in New York City. Yet police officers arrested just one percent of all hit-and-run drivers. In the past five years, hit-and-run crashes in New York City have increased by 26 percent. By comparison, DOT infrastructure projects designed to reduce these traffic crashes have proven effective and scalable. Changing traffic signals to ‘leading pedestrian intervals’ reduced the number of people killed or seriously injured by drivers failing to yield by over 50 percent. Protected bike lanes have produced as much as a 94 percent drop in cycling on the sidewalk. Automated speed cameras reduced the number of people killed or seriously injured by as much as 50 percent, and reduced speeding by over 60 percent. Furthermore, these interventions afford no privileges to police union ‘courtesy card’ holders, nor do...
they carry biases that may lead to police harassment or violence.”

- The authors consider the social costs of defunding transportation budgets in favor of police budgets:
  - “Consider just the NYPD fleet. Over a three-year period ending in 2018, the NYPD grew its fleet of squad cars and SUVs by over 1,300 vehicles. It is the largest vehicle fleet of any city agency, and there are plans to spend $80 million to upgrade the fleet in the next five years. As a point of comparison, Mayor de Blasio recently cut $7.9 million from a program that would build new bus lanes (which would serve, in large part, the essential workers who make up nearly half of bus riders). These cuts halve the pace of bus lane installation and risk worsening the commute of New York City health care workers who already have the longest commute of any group in the city. To restore budget cuts to bus lanes would cost, at most, half of what the city plans to spend on police vehicles this year alone.” (p. 5)

| Specific Proposals | “Transportation Alternatives recommends reallocating a portion of the NYPD budget to the design and construction of ‘self-enforcing’ streets. In addition to the redesign of streets to include self-enforcing elements such as protected crosswalks, protected bike lanes, protected bus lanes, narrowed roadways, bulb-outs, leading pedestrian intervals, and curb cuts, the redesign of curbs with loading zones should also be prioritized to lessen the need for parking enforcement.” (p. 13) |
|                     | Below is an excerpt from the analysis. |
2022 – New York City Department of Transportation

All Road Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Treatment</th>
<th>Injury Change</th>
<th>KSI Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Diets</td>
<td>-16.6%</td>
<td>-30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bike Lanes</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>-18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Islands</td>
<td>-15.1%</td>
<td>-35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb &amp; Sidewalk Extensions</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>-34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Calming</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs)</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
<td>-29.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Treatment</th>
<th>Ped Injury Change</th>
<th>Ped KSI Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Diets</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
<td>-31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Bike Lanes</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bike Lanes</td>
<td>-17.8%</td>
<td>-29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Islands</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
<td>-29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb &amp; Sidewalk Extensions</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
<td>-44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Calming</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
<td>-32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs)</td>
<td>-18.1%</td>
<td>-34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motor Vehicle Occupants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Treatment</th>
<th>MV Injury Change</th>
<th>MV KSI Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Diets</td>
<td>-19.3%</td>
<td>-33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Bike Lanes</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>-25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bike Lanes</td>
<td>-19.0%</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Islands</td>
<td>-18.1%</td>
<td>-52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb &amp; Sidewalk Extensions</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
<td>-24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Calming</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>50.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs)</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
<td>-28.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Motor Vehicle KSI at Turning Calming locations rose from an annual average of 7.3 KSI in the before period to 11 KSI in the after period. Due to this small sample size of severe injuries, it is likely that this large increase (50.7%) is not as accurate as other report findings.
### Redesigning Public Safety: Traffic Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>September 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main topic</strong></td>
<td>This report discusses how to redesign traffic safety by investing in evidence-based strategies that simultaneously reduce traffic violence and police violence. The recommendations center racial equity, public health, and community power rather than surveillance and punishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="https://policingequity.org/traffic-safety/60-cpe-white-paper-traffic-safety/file">https://policingequity.org/traffic-safety/60-cpe-white-paper-traffic-safety/file</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>This white paper is part of the Redesigning Public Safety Resource Series.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Key statistics or talking points** |   ● The recommendations in the report “aim to address the physical, psychological, and economic harms caused by unjust and burdensome enforcement, including the preventable debt, justice system entanglement, and trauma that too often flow from a single routine traffic stop.” (p. 3)  
    ● Disinvestment driven by systemic racism, including redlining, leads to “infrastructure failures” that increase crash risk in Black neighborhoods. The report recommends “a public health approach to traffic safety [that] focuses on creating environments that lead to safe driving.” (p. 6)  
    ○ “To do so, this approach aims to shift the focus of safety efforts from identifying and punishing individual reckless behaviors to establishing and enhancing the systems that determine traffic safety, including how cars and human-made surroundings are built.” (p. 6)  
    ● This report identifies Complete Streets and Vision Zero as two frameworks with a systemic approach to traffic safety “rather than regulating individual behavior alone.” However, the authors note that Vision Zero’s historic emphasis on increased traffic enforcement by police has been challenged by racial justice advocates. (p. 8)  
    ● The authors recommend cities and states limit the use of fines and fees and instead prioritize and fund programs to address road safety issues. (p. 11) |
| **Specific Proposals** | ● The proposals related to self-enforcing street design include: lowering speed limits, speed bumps, raised crosswalks, |
roundabouts, turning lanes, and increasing yellow light length.

### Self-Enforcing Roadways: A Guidance Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>January 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main topic</strong></td>
<td>This publication provides guidance for transportation professionals, departments of transportation, and researchers on how to produce self-enforcing roadways. The report defines self-enforcing roadways (or “self-explaining” roads) as roadways that are “planned and designed to encourage drivers to select operating speeds in harmony with the posted speed limit.” (p. i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>The report was sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration and written by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Specific Proposals

- Chapter 4 describes six self-enforcing road concepts and the processes needed to implement the concepts when designing or assessing two-lane rural highways:
  - (1) the speed feedback loop process, (2) the inferred design speed approach, (3) design consistency methods, (4) the application of existing geometric design criteria, (5) the combination of signs and pavement markings, and (6) the setting of rational speed limits.

#### Misc. notes/comments

- Because crashes in rural areas represent most total crashes due to speeding, the authors focus on methods to mitigate speeding on rural roadways. As a result, while the study is largely supportive of self-enforcing street design, it is less useful for transportation planners in urban areas. Additionally, the report does not analyze the role and responsibility of armed law enforcement.

### National Roadway Safety Strategy

<p>| Date published | January 2022 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main topic</th>
<th>U.S. DOT description of the “major actions” it will take as part of its Safe System Approach to improve roadway safety.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law passed by Congress in 2021 includes funding for street safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(geographic location, demographic profile, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Key statistics or talking points | ● Self-enforcing streets:  
  ○ “Roadway design and other infrastructure factors play a significant role in managing speeds and can deter excessive speeding behaviors from occurring in the first place. Design can help to make roads and streets ‘self-enforcing,’ offering drivers contextual encouragement – via lane width, intersection design, pedestrian and bicyclist infrastructure, and other features – to drive at safer speeds.” (p. 26) |
| Specific Proposals | ● In this strategy document, U.S. DOT identifies self-enforcing street design as a “key departmental action to enable safer speeds.”  
  ● The agency recommends FHWA revise its guidance and regulations to encourage “creating roadways that help to ‘self-enforce’ speed limits.” In addition, it recommends FHWA identify “noteworthy practices for re-engineering roads to slow down vehicles rather than relying primarily on enforcement to manage speeding.” (p. 28) |
| Misc. notes/comments | FHWA is supposed to complete the above revisions by 2024. |

**Investing in Evidence-Based Alternatives to Policing: Non-Police Responses to Traffic Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>August 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main topic</td>
<td>This short policy brief presents five ways states and cities can more equitably and safely enforce traffic laws without relying on police.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is a white paper by Vera Institute of Justice.

**Specific Proposals**

- Build non-police first responder teams whose mission is traffic and road safety, not criminal law enforcement.
- Implement voucher programs for minor traffic violations as an alternative to civil enforcement.
- **Improve transportation infrastructure and public transit networks.**
  - “Jurisdictions can reduce collisions by investing in transportation infrastructure—like implementing best practices in road and vehicle design and engineering. These investments should also be used to expand public transit systems that are a safer alternative to driving. As part of this process, jurisdictions should solicit diverse perspectives from residents and experts to inform road design and transportation rules to better address the underlying causes of traffic accidents.” (p. 2)
- Use automated traffic enforcement systems to promote safety and reduce disparities.

**Misc. notes/comments**

Mode shifting is one of the recommendations.

### Safety of Vulnerable Road Users (RS7)

**Date published**

1998

**Main topic**

This report by the OECD examines the safety of vulnerable road users in OECD Member countries.

**Link**


**Context**

“The study was started in 1995 by a Scientific Expert Group of the OECD Road Transport Research Programme. Based on a problem-oriented approach, the report sets the main safety problems faced by vulnerable road users taking full account of their social, regulatory and physical environments.” (p. 4)
| Key statistics or talking points | Describing developments in transportation planning theory during the 1970s and 1980s:  
|                               | ○ “Professionals became aware that publicity and police enforcement were not the key to inducing more adequate speed behaviour, and that physical design of the road environment could play a much more efficient role… The concepts of mixed traffic and traffic calming – obtained through physical self-enforcing speed reduction measures – spread and extended from the previous schemes in residential areas to the treatment of urban thoroughfares with heavy traffic.” p. 12. |
| Misc. notes/comments           | This OECD report does not offer concrete policies for civilian-led alternatives to armed traffic policing. But the language on self-enforcing streets, and the specific comparison to ineffective police enforcement, may be useful to quote. |

**Response and Recommendations to NICJR Report by the Reimagining Public Safety Task Force**

| Date published               | March 2022 |
| Key statistics or talking points | “Police maintain that the purpose behind traffic enforcement is to increase traffic safety and decrease crime. However, there is, at best, mixed evidence showing that traditional traffic enforcement by police in the US is effective in creating sustained increases in traffic safety. **Re-engineering roadway design and geometry to create self-enforcing streets, on the other hand, has consistently been shown to increase traffic safety and decrease severe and fatal collisions.** Data also show that traffic stops do little to prevent crime, and when stops are focused on safety violations only, crime does not increase. The Berkeley City Manager estimates that moving traffic enforcement and other transportation-related duties out of BPD would reduce BPD staffing by approximately 100 full time positions and reduce BPD’s budget by nearly $50 million. The reduced police staff time allocated to transportation-related work that is non-criminal in nature and better addressed by other city...
professionals like transportation planners and engineers will allow remaining BPD staff to focus on the prevention of and response to violent offenses that are of greatest importance to the community.” (p. 87)

| **Speeding in America: A Critique of, and Alternatives to, Officer-Initiated Enforcement** |
| Date published | November 2015 |
| Main topic | This study analyzes whether police-led speed limit enforcement deters speeding and if it does so “in a cost-efficient manner.” |
| Link | https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0734016815614057 |
| Key statistics or talking points | • “For example, constructing a speed bump entails an initial one-time cost that may result in a speed-reducing benefit indefinitely. By contrast, paying officers to enforce speed limits results in ongoing costs that do not necessarily, or typically, lead to consistent enforcement.” (p. 64)  
• “… ticketing carries with it potential harms that may offset putative benefits. For example, fines may have disproportionate effects both on lower income individuals and on upper income individuals. Across states, maximum speeding ticket fines range from US$50 in Tennessee to US$2,500 in Georgia and Virginia (NHTSA, 2013a, pp. vi–ix). Fines, as a percentage of income, will be higher for lower income individuals and may be especially burdensome for those who reside in or close to poverty. They also may not be able to afford to challenge their ticket. Transportation costs and missing part of a workday to attend a court proceeding, for example, would be cost-prohibitive or simply not feasible for many lower income individuals.” |
A note from . . .

CAPTAIN STEVEN A. RAMOS
Commanding Officer
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Division
(213) 792-9963

July 20, 2022

DIRECTOR LIZABETH RHODES
OFFICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL POLICING AND POLICY

SUBJECT: LA DOT EQUITABLE ENFORCEMENT LITERATURE & CASE STUDY REVIEW

On July 7, 2022, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Division (DEID) was tasked to review a
memorandum titled “LA DOT [Department of Transportation] Equitable Enforcement Literature
& Case Study Review”. The memorandum from Equitable Cities summarizes nationwide and
international case studies where action was taken to reduce the presence of armed police officers
conducting traffic enforcement. A review of the case studies was conducted to determine which
should be further evaluated by the City of Los Angeles Research and Consulting Team, assigned
to the Traffic Enforcement Alternatives Project. The case studies were divided into the
following five tiers:

- Tier 1: Government entity has transitioned powers of police enforcement to a DOT
  municipal unit.
- Tier 2: Government entity is in the process of transitioning powers of police enforcement
to DOT a municipal unit.
- Tier 3: Government entities have agreed to reduce traffic safety enforcement via other
  means.
- Tier 4: Government entities are exploring the above tiers but not have implemented any
  policies to date.
- Tier 5: Non-governmental entities have examined how to decriminalize mobility through
guidelines, reports, podcasts, etc.

We recommend the City of Los Angeles conduct further research of the following case studies:

New Zealand (Tier 1) - New Zealand used a country wide non-police government agency to
enforce traffic laws between 1936 and 1992, when it was dissolved due to costs. During that
time, the non-police agency was tasked with enforcing on non-moving and minor moving
violations. New Zealand Police continued to investigate traffic accidents that resulted in injuries
and enforce driving under the influence laws.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Tier 2) - Philadelphia is currently transitioning powers of traffic enforcement to a non-police municipal entity. In 2019, Philadelphia voters approved the creation of unarmed civilian public safety “officers” tasked with issuing citations for minor traffic violations, the officers would report to the Philadelphia Office of Transportation rather than the police department. Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, the program was delayed and has yet to be implemented. The City of Philadelphia also passed two related bills in November 2021. The first bill separated traffic violations into “primary” and “secondary” violations and prohibited police officers from conducting traffic stops for “secondary” violations. The second bill requires the police department to report information collected during vehicle stops to a public database which was to be updated on a monthly basis.

Fayetteville, North Carolina (Tier 3) - In 2013, the Fayetteville Police Chief shifted traffic enforcement away from non-moving violations and encouraged officers to focus on moving violations of immediate concern to public safety. The number of investigative stops for non-moving violations decreased for the next four years, as did the number of Black drivers stopped and searched. Additional research showed the change in focus of traffic violations reduced the overall fatalities overall due to officers' attention being focused on moving violations.

These three case studies DEID selected align with the studies the research team determined had the greatest potential for meeting the stated goal to “reduce the presence of armed police officers performing traffic enforcement.” Each case study should be further evaluated for the following factors and how they would be addressed in the City of Los Angeles:

- Cost of implementation;
- Potential legal implications (i.e. who is permitted to conduct a traffic stop in the state of California);
- Necessary training and equipment to support implementation;
- Memorandum of Agreement between different entities (i.e. will the Los Angeles Police Department need to assist in any complaints or use of force investigations if they occur);
- Labor/union considerations;
- If there is a change on how traffic violations are enforced, what impacts will it have on traffic collisions resulting in injuries and fatalities; and,
- Any observed impact on crime rates.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Respectfully,

Steve
Data Fields and Treatment

This appendix outlines the fields within the RIPA dataset used for this study and any categorization or treatments used before analyzing the data.

### Perceived Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern or South Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perceived Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender man/boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender woman/girl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reason for Stop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable suspicion that person was engaged in criminal activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known to be on parole, probation, PRCS, mandatory supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation to determine if person is truant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensual encounter resulting in search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine if student violated school policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible conduct warranting discipline under education code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Traffic violation type

While the data include categories of “moving”, “equipment”, and “non-moving violation”, LAPD advised the research team not to use these categories because they may not be consistent across officers and reasons for the stop. Instead, we coded the traffic violation type based on the type of CJIS offense code and categorized these into these traffic violation type categories. Because of the volume of different CJIS offense codes within the data, and the need to do this rematching process, the research team only categorized traffic violation type for the top 20 CJIS codes. These top 20 reasons represent 77.1% of stops analyzed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mv CJIS</th>
<th>CJIS Description</th>
<th>Plain Description</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Violation Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54098</td>
<td>FAIL STOP LINE/ETC AT RED</td>
<td>Red light violation</td>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>21453(A) VC FAIL STOP LINE/ETC AT RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54106</td>
<td>UNSAFE SPEED:PREVAIL COND</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>22350 VC UNSAFE SPEED:PREVAIL COND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54115</td>
<td>UNSAF TURN &amp;/OR NO SIGNAL</td>
<td>Unsafe turn or no signal used</td>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>22107 VC UNSAF TURN &amp;/OR NO SIGNAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54167</td>
<td>FAIL STOP VEH:XWALK/ETC</td>
<td>Failure to stop for crosswalk</td>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>22450(A) VC FAIL STOP VEH:XWALK/ETC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54178</td>
<td>UNSAFE LANE CHANGE/ETC</td>
<td>Unsafe lane change</td>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>21658(A) VC UNSAFE LANE CHANGE/ETC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54185</td>
<td>FAIL TO OBEY TURN SIGNS</td>
<td>Failure to obey turn signs</td>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>22101(D) VC FAIL TO OBEY TURN SIGNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54186</td>
<td>ILEGAL UTURN:BUS DIST/ETC</td>
<td>Illegal u-turn</td>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>22102 VC ILEGAL UTURN:BUS DIST/ETC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54011</td>
<td>SEATBELT VIOLATION</td>
<td>Seat belt violation</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>27315 VC SEATBELT VIOLATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54109</td>
<td>FAIL MAINT VEH LITE EQUIP</td>
<td>Light equipment violation</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>24252(A) VC FAIL MAINT VEH LITE EQUIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54141</td>
<td>BIKE HEADLIGHT/ETC VIOL</td>
<td>Bike headlight violation</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>21201(D) VC BIKE HEADLIGHT/ETC VIOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54191</td>
<td>DRIVE WITHOUT LIGHTS:DARK</td>
<td>Driving without lights at night</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>24250 VC DRIVE WITHOUT LIGHTS:DARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54571</td>
<td>OPR VEH:WINDOW OBSTRUCTED</td>
<td>Window obstruction</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>26708(A)(1) VC OPR VEH:WINDOW OBSTRUCTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54644</td>
<td>DISPLAY LIC PLATES WRONG</td>
<td>Display license plate wrong</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>5200(A) VC DISPLAY LIC PLATES WRONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54099</td>
<td>NO REG:VEH/TRAILER/ETC</td>
<td>No registration</td>
<td>Non-moving</td>
<td>4000(A) VC NO REG:VEH/TRAILER/ETC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54107</td>
<td>DRIVE W/O LICENSE</td>
<td>Driving without a license</td>
<td>Non-moving</td>
<td>12500(A) VC DRIVE W/O LICENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54168</td>
<td>EXPIRED TABS/FAIL DISPLAY</td>
<td>Expired tabs/failed to display</td>
<td>Non-moving</td>
<td>5204(A) VC EXPIRED TABS/FAIL DISPLAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54537</td>
<td>PARK UNLAW:DOUBLE PARKING</td>
<td>Double parking</td>
<td>Non-moving</td>
<td>22500(H) VC PARK UNLAW:DOUBLE PARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54566</td>
<td>USE CELLPH W/DRIV W/O HFD</td>
<td>Hand held device violation</td>
<td>Non-moving</td>
<td>23123(A) VC USE CELLPH W/DRIV W/O HFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54655</td>
<td>NO HND HLD DEVICE W/DRIVE</td>
<td>Hand held device violation</td>
<td>Non-moving</td>
<td>23123.5 VC NO HND HLD DEVICE W/DRIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54657</td>
<td>NO REG:VEH/TRAILER/ETC</td>
<td>No registration</td>
<td>Non-moving</td>
<td>4000(A)(1) VC NO REG:VEH/TRAILER/ETC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions Taken**
The first column includes all potential actions taken during the stop. These data were used in three ways. First, we counted the number of actions that occurred during each stop because each stop could have multiple responses within the ‘action’ field. Second, we created a new field for any actions that we categorized as including use of force. Finally, we created another field if a firearm was pointed at a person, discharged or used during the stop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Categorized as Use of Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baton or other impact weapon used</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine bit or held person</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical spray used (e.g., pepper spray, mace or other chemicals)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic control device used</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm discharged or used</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm pointed at person</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact projectile discharged or used (e.g., blunt impact projectile, rubber bullets or bean bags)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other physical or vehicle contact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person removed from vehicle by physical contact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked for consent to search person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked for consent to search property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine removed from vehicle or used to search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside detention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field sobriety test conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcuffed or flex cuffed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol car detention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person photographed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person removed from vehicle by order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search of person was conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search of property was conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results of the Stop**

No action
Warning (verbal or written)
Citation for infraction
In-field cite and release
Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant
Custodial arrest without warrant
Field interview card completed
Noncriminal transport or caretaking transport
Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor
Psychiatric hold
Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Referral to school administrator
Referral to school counselor or other support staff
Focus Group Protocol

Ideas for overall flow:

1. Personal experiences with police stops
2. Experiences they’ve heard from others about police stops
3. Traffic safety concerns they want to see addressed in their neighborhoods
4. Traffic safety improvements they like
5. Address what we know - Black and Latino people are disproportionately stopped by police in traffic stops and are also the victims of traffic violence. Discuss ideas how to address both of these issues
6. Consider rapid fire of some suggestions for improvements
7. Magic wand/overall recommendations
8. Final thoughts

A. Introduction

Good [morning/afternoon] and welcome. Thank you for taking the time to talk with us today.

My name is Tamika Butler and I will be serving as the facilitator for today’s interview/focus group. I am an independent consultant that the Los Angeles Department of Transportation has hired to guide the group through a series of questions to support its work related to reimagining policing and traffic enforcement in the city of Los Angeles. Our team is charged with collecting and analyzing data about police stops in Los Angeles and other places. These focus groups are intended to gather information about how people have experienced police stops. Your contributions during this focus group will help this research team and a community advisory task force develop recommendations related to how or if traffic enforcement in Los Angeles may be conducted in the future.

As the Facilitator, my job is to make sure everyone has an opportunity to share their experiences and ideas and to keep track of the time.

I’m here with my team member(s) XXXXX who will be taking notes from today’s conversation. As the notetaker, XXXX will help to make sure we capture the important insights that you provide in response to our questions.

While we will keep your individual responses private, to support the development of a Summary, we will be recording today’s interview/focus group. Only members of the consultant team will have access to the notes.

This is the first/second/third/last of four focus groups. Separately, we’ll be conducting interviews with experts from across the country who have been part of reimagining policing in their local communities. When we are done, we will take all of the responses from the interviews and the focus groups, thematically cluster the responses we received, and provide a summary report with what we heard over the course of this study. We will then work with the City of LA Traffic Alternatives Advisory Task Force to develop recommendations for future traffic enforcement in Los Angeles. Your individual responses will not be connected back to you.
This focus group will be about 90 minutes of active discussion with around 8 questions. To thank you for your time and energy, each of you will receive a cash-equivalent $50 gift card at the end of our time together.

B. Purpose of the Interview/Focus Group Conversation

Our purpose in meeting with all of you today is to learn your thoughts, feelings, and experiences related to public safety, policing, and transportation in Los Angeles. Your insights will shape our recommendations to the LA Department of Transportation and LA City Council for traffic enforcement alternatives.

There are no wrong answers to the questions we ask. Please feel free to share your point of view even if you think it might differ from what other people might say.

C. Are There Any Questions?

You can ask questions for clarifications on anything I’ve said so far, or questions. Any questions?

D. Introduction of Participant

Please share with us the following:
- Name
- Your favorite place to go in your neighborhood

E. Focus Group Questions

1. **Personal Experiences with Police Stops**
   a. Let’s dive right into what we want to discuss today, tell us about your experiences with traffic stops by the LAPD. You can share whether this is something that happens a lot or less or more now than in other points in your life, what happened when you were stopped during and after (warning, ticket, etc) and tell us a little bit about how you felt during and after?
   i. **Facilitation Probes:**
   1. Does this happen more in certain neighborhoods than others?

2. **Experiences You’ve Heard from Others About Police Stops**
   a. Tell us about what you’ve heard about others’ experiences with traffic stops by the LAPD.
   i. **Facilitation Probes:**
   1. Are there certain groups of people you hear more stories about?
      More neighborhoods where you hear about stops?

3. **Traffic Concerns in Your Neighborhood**
   a. Where do you live and what are some of the most common traffic and safety concerns you and your neighbors have?
   i. **Facilitation Probes:**
   1. Do you have ideas on how to address these concerns?
4. **Things You Like**
   a. What is going well with transportation safety in Los Angeles? What should be lifted up and expanded upon?

5. **Suggestions for Improvement (consider asking for rapid fire responses)**
   a. What does “reimagining public safety” mean to you?
      i. *What would have to happen for this to be possible?*
      ii. *What would it look like in your neighborhood?*

6. **Racial Disparities**
   a. We know that Black and Latino people are disproportionately stopped by police in traffic stops and are also disproportionately the victims of traffic violence. What ideas do you have to address both of these issues?
   b. How can trust be improved when it comes to traffic enforcement in Los Angeles?
      i. *If you could only prioritize one area/thing to build more trust, what would that be?*
      ii. *Would having LADOT charged with this enforcement improve trust?*

7. **Magic Wand/Wrap-up**
   a. If you were writing this report, what types of things would you suggest to address traffic safety besides police stops?
      i. *Facilitation Probe: What are your thoughts for sustaining the work after the consultant team is gone?*
      ii. *What important steps should the city take to move towards this idea?*

**If time permits:**
- What would you like to see change about traffic enforcement in LA based on your participation in this project?
- Is there anything else you would like to share that I haven’t asked you about?
Appendix I: Focus Group Summary Presentation

Focus Groups’ Report

Los Angeles Department of Transportation
December 1, 2022

tamika l. butler consulting
Data Collection
Focus Groups:

Space for screened community members to share their views about how people have experienced police stops and how or if traffic enforcement in Los Angeles should be conducted in the future.

- Round 1: ~70 emails sent
- Initial Google RSVP Form had over 600 responses
- Follow up survey via SurveyMonkey with over 150 responses
  - Mostly BOTS or scammers!
  - Only 23 were actual people
- Follow-up email to confirm times with the 23 human respondents with IP addresses in LA
  - 15 out of 23 responded with a preference to meet virtually, with no one asking to meet in person
- Debrief between focus groups
Focus Groups:

Space for screened community members to share their views about how people have experienced police stops and how or if traffic enforcement in Los Angeles should be conducted in the future.

- Round 2: ~20 emails sent
  - Share to CPAB members and through Task Force networks
- Initial Google RSVP Form had over 200 responses
  - Mostly BOTS or scammers!
- Follow up calls to ~15 respondents
  - Confirmed 2 as LA residents
- ~10 emails sent to no-show respondents from Round 1
- Open participation to Task Force members
Format

● 90 mins
● Camera on at the beginning
● Chat and oral responses
● Short presentation
● Discussion
  ○ Breakout rooms staff by Nelson/Nygaard and Equitable Cities
● Notes
  ○ Recorded
  ○ Transcript

Traffic Enforcement Alternatives
Focus Group #1
Monday, November 7, 2022
1:00 – 2:30 p.m.

today's agenda

1. welcome & ground rules
2. introductions
3. project overview
4. discussion
5. closing & next steps
Communities Represented

Individual LA Resident

- Resident in Echo Park
- Residents (2) in Mar Vista
- Resident in Beverly Grove
- Resident in Elysian Valley

Representative of LA Organization

- Hollywood United Neighborhood Council
- ACLU SoCal
- LA Bike
- LA Metro - Office of Equity and Race
- Mission CPAB member
- North Hollywood CPAB member
- Residents (2) in Playa Vista

Residents (2) in Mar Vista

Resident in Elysian Valley
Questions Asked

● Question 1: What are your experiences with traffic stops by the LAPD? You can share whether this is something that happens a lot or less or more now than in other points in your life, what happened when you were stopped during and after (warning, ticket, etc) and tell us a little bit about how you felt during and after?

● Question 2: Tell us about what you’ve heard about others’ experiences with traffic stops by the LAPD.

● Question 3: Where do you live and what are some of the most common traffic and safety concerns you and your neighbors have?

● Question 4: What is going well with transportation safety in Los Angeles? What should be lifted up and expanded upon?
Questions Asked

- **Question 5:** What does “traffic enforcement alternatives” mean to you?

- **Question 6:** We know that Black and Latino people are disproportionately stopped by police in traffic stops and are also disproportionately the victims of traffic violence. What ideas do you have to address both of these issues?

- **Question 7:** How can trust be improved when it comes to traffic enforcement in Los Angeles?

- **Question 8:** If you were writing this report, what types of things would you suggest to address traffic safety besides police stops?
Raw Notes
Live Notes

What does “traffic enforcement alternatives” mean to you?

- Reactionary & tied to defund the police movement
- There needs to be discipline because that’s the only form of accountability that has shown results.
- Ciclovia as community engagement
- Traffic enforcement alternative is not good. Looking like people are blaming their faults on the police
- Driving is a privilege not a right.
- Not every pull over is a ticket?
- Education: cars are just as dangerous as guns
- Improvement or creation of public spaces
- Traffic Enforcement alternatives is a nightmare from some city official?
- You can discuss and explain the reason you pulled them over
- DMV needs to step the law when you renew your license
- There needs to be a give and take on both sides.
Post Session

Tell us about what you’ve heard about others’ experiences with traffic stops by the LAPD.

Within the bike community, it’s not infrequent hearing people interacting with law enforcement following collisions (e.g., cop didn’t take input before determining fault, bias against people not in car, dismissed for reporting hit and run if no vehicle information is gathered). General sense PD is not there to help people not in cars at all. People not in cars are not treated the same way as those who drive.

Ex. Bike repair ban by City Council - people cited by new leg. Seems to be used against community members to clear out homeless encampments and confiscate their belongings. Lack of interest in doing things that benefit community and literal interpretation of legislation and impact of actions. Not addressing intended purpose of dealing with chop shops.

Hear people don’t want to bike because they don’t want to be seen by LAPD (look for excuse to stop them). Terrible place to start from.

In certain neighborhoods, where people have been stopped by LAPD, experiences of tailgating being followed even for non-moving violations (e.g., tinted windows). Interactions are intrusive. Passengers interrogated, car or person is searched, people physically grabbed/pulled out of car. Humiliating experience.

Results in tickets and people feeling they can’t live their lives. Being held up on way to pick up kids. Causing fear and trauma.

Hear from South LA from Black and brown folks...

Feeling of being stalked. Ex. young Black man with backpack coming on buses and trains with law enforcement presence. Will get approached/asked to see bag without probable cause. Hear this from people in high school/teenagers.

Key points: Negative bias towards people not in cars; people avoid biking and walking to not interact with PD; surveillance/being stalked in neighborhood/transit
Overview + Emerging Themes
Themes

Question 1: Your Experiences
Question 2: Others’ Experiences
Question 3: Neighborhood Concerns
Question 4: Going Well
Question 5: “Traffic Enforcement Alternatives”
Question 6: Disproportionate Stops
Question 7: Improve Trust
Question 8: Report Suggestions
Question 1: Your Experience
Focus Group Insights: *Fear & Anxiety*

Many participants articulated a belief that **both drivers and police officers have heightened emotions** during stops:

- **Most participants stopped when younger and while driving**
- **Less able to speak to their own stops by hear about a lot of stops**
- **Seems like officers are reluctant to stop people due to fear of escalation**
- **Some spoke of being empathetic and trying to see it from officer POV**
- **People get nervous, defensive, and/or anxious when stopped**
- **Try to avoid interactions**
- **Found police polite and respectful**
- **Awareness of and palpable feeling of power imbalance/authority**
- **Don’t feel safe, respected or protected by LAPD**
Question 2: Others’ Experience

HAVE YOU HEARD ABOUT THIS?
Focus Group Insights: *Stops Depend on Behaviors and Characteristics*

Participants have heard about stops being both good and bad. **Some blame the people being stopped and others blame police officers:**

- **Desire to see more stops**
- **Stops cause trauma and fear**
- **People avoid biking and walking to not interact with police**
- **Feelings of being surveilled/being stalked in neighborhood or in transit**
- **Bias against people not in cars and young people**
- **Opinion that when stopped drivers should be honest and respectful and stop will be okay**
- **People feel profiled based on mode of transportation, condition of vehicle, neighborhood, etc.**

Usually the "good" or "bad" experience depends on the behavior that leads to the interaction.
Question 3: Neighborhood Concerns

ITS A BEITIFUL DAY IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD... 😂
Focus Group Insights: *Infrastructure and Policy, not Enforcement*

Many participants *defined speeding as the top problem, but said more than police enforcement is needed* to combat it:

- **Speeding, street races, and street takeovers are increasing**
- **Infrastructure** (roads, paint, signs, lighting, etc.) are old and need consistent maintenance
- **Stop signs don’t work** consider lowering speeds, roundabouts, and other changes
- **Some believe more police walking the street and engaging in community policing would help**
- **Unhoused people present safety concerns, but they need mental health services, not police**
- **Even more substandard conditions and lack of infrastructure for non-car modes of transportation**
- **People think conditions got worse during pandemic (more app drivers, more aggression, more speeding, etc.)**
- **Seems to be a lack of enforcement (lights, stop signs, crosswalks, etc.)**
- **Driving near schools feels terrifying**

Lack of connectivity (between modes and communities) and conflict between modes built into infrastructure
Question 4: Going Well
Focus Group Insights: *Engaging People Works*

People expressed that sessions like this one are **elevating the topic and providing the opportunity for thoughtful, consistent, and intentional** community engagement:

- **Besides engagement, infrastructure improvements are key**
- **Areas with more bike paths and trees**
- **Models that do not rely on armed officers on transit (e.g., Metro Ambassadors)**
- **Traffic calming measures that have worked in parts of LA**
- **Kudos to transportation advocates engaging in policy and showing up at government meetings**
- **Better bus service (reliable and free) and bike lanes will mean fewer people driving**
- **Shift from using law enforcement (armed officers) dealing with traffic stops. Perception that it’s a waste of time and resources.**
Question 5: Traffic Enforcement Alternatives
Focus Group Insights: *Creative Potential or Scary Alternative*

**Understanding of the phrase varies widely**—some understand it as policy and protocol changes while others hear it simply as police-centered improvements. There is a *universally strong reaction to the phrase*, but different people have very different feelings and thoughts when they hear it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shifting traffic enforcement to DOTs or Public Works Departments</td>
<td>Equitable use of camera-based technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove law enforcement pensions if proven record of police misconduct</td>
<td>Progressive fines based on infractions and income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better coordinated traffic lights and infrastructure</td>
<td>There needs to be a give and take on both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnings or community service instead of tickets</td>
<td>People are trying to blame their faults on police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift framing from punishment to prevention, more public education and PR</td>
<td>Reactionary and effort to ‘defund the police’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 6: Disproportionate Stops
Focus Group Insights: People Stopped Need to Take Accountability

Many participants got stuck on the fact that this might not be true or that people of color are bringing it on themselves. Other acknowledged it was true, but were unsure what to do about it:

- Need clearer data to show if this is true
- Bring back driver’s education in high schools
- Education between LAPD and citizens (e.g., citizen/community academy)
- Better maintenance of traffic infrastructure
- More community engagement
- Encourage people to have different vehicles using stats of what colors, types, get pulled over most
- Not sure if it is appropriate to talk about race in traffic stops
- Researchers should learn how to explain research in a way that is relevant to community
Question 7: Improve Trust
Focus Group Insights: *Larger Systemic Issue*

People think that engagement will help, but fear that this is too large of a systemic issue:

- **Officers should engage with and learn from community**
- **Data should be shared transparently with public in easily accessible way**
- **Shift money from officers to resources in areas of historical disinvestment**
- **Require police officers to live in neighborhoods where they’re assigned**
- **Need to address larger systemic issues (e.g., moving officers to different groups following misconduct)**
- **Change one-sided media narrative—LAPD comms and union have strong relations with media**
- **Two-way education or conversations needed between police and community.**
- **More officers on foot walking the community.**
Question 8: Report Suggestions
Focus Group Insights: More Interaction with Community

Many of the ideas suggested for other questions apply here, namely community engagement, community policing, and education rather than enforcement:

- **Better coordinated traffic flow**
- **Use technology to tow any vehicle without insurance**
- **Building relationship outside of stops**
- **Ensure there are opportunities for positive interactions with police**
- **People have to have understanding that police are just doing their job**
- **LA is large, so having smaller districts/areas covered by police would allow for more community policing**
- **Better infrastructure and maintenance of that infrastructure**
- **Create opportunities for DOT engineers and patrol officers to get together and talk about how design can be used instead of enforcement**
Other Emerging Themes

#MrsMaisel

ANYTHING ELSE?
Community engagement, use of technology, infrastructure investments and personal and department accountability were themes throughout all questions:

- Need to invest in infrastructure
- Services for unhoused populations and providing mental health services will help those not driving
- City needs to pay attention to quality of life issues generally (e.g., noise, litter, street takeovers)
- City can better use technology for enforcement
- Elected officials need to hear directly from communities on this
- Police need to be in community and interacting with people outside of traffic stops
- People need to take personal accountability when they break the law
- If there is transition to new department, needs to be adequate time and process
- City needs to invest more in getting people out of cars
Anything I missed
Focus Group Insights: ???

Anything else?
Next Steps
What’s Next?

- **Two more focus groups**
  - Relying on this group
  - Only virtual

- **Add these insights to final report**
  - This is an internal (*research team*) facing document, but major insights or themes could be incorporated into the final report as appropriate
thank you

@TamikaButler
www.TamikaButler.com
tamika@tamikabutler.com

@CitiesEquitable
www.EquitableCities.com
carmen@equitablecities.com
Appendix J: Expert Interview Protocol

Expert Interview Protocol and Interviewee List

Interview Protocol and Questions

Introduction [15 min]
Hi [Interviewee’s Name]. My name is [Interviewer’s Name] I am a [Role] from Nelson\Nygaard working with several other consulting firms and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation, or LADOT, on the LADOT Alternatives to Traffic Enforcement Project. LADOT is a municipal agency that oversees transportation planning, design, construction, maintenance, and operations within the city of Los Angeles. In 2022, the Los Angeles City Council directed LADOT to conduct a study and develop strategies for reevaluating how to best structure and fund efforts to provide public safety in an effective, equitable manner within the public right-of-way. This call to action is in response to broad public support for creating alternatives to armed law enforcement response in a variety of situations.

The LADOT Alternatives to Traffic Enforcement Project seeks to:
• Examine alternative traffic law enforcement techniques in the United States and globally;
• Compare the traffic safety outcomes with other entities that have implemented civilian traffic enforcement strategies; and
• Present alternatives to traditional traffic law enforcement, including methods that are consistent with unarmed enforcement opportunities.

As part of this project, we are interviewing a diverse group of subject matter experts to learn more about alternative traffic law enforcement techniques applied in different contexts, the steps taken to implement such techniques, and any lessons learned following implementation.

I am here with [Co-Interviewer’s Name] who will also be listening, learning, and taking notes during this discussion. Thanks again for participating in this initial data gathering effort to inform our work.

This conversation will take up to 60 minutes. I will ask a series of questions about your organization’s awareness of alternative traffic law enforcement techniques within your local context, how it relates to your work, and any challenges and lessons learned resulting from this work.

Before we begin, [Co-Interviewer’s Name] will highlight a few guidelines for today’s session.

• **There are no right or wrong answers.** We know that everyone’s experiences are different, and everyone has an opinion or perspective that is different than what someone else says. Please share what you think or have observed or experienced!

• **There are no “gold stars” or competition.** This initiative is about learning, growing, and sharing lessons learned to inform what LADOT and the City of Los Angeles is doing. We understand that everyone’s stage of development in this work will be different. It is hard not to compare and even more difficult to have the discipline to pause and reflect on our own learnings.
• **Personal stories and experiences will be kept confidential. Lessons learned will be shared for LADOT and their partners’ growth and learning.** We will summarize what is said but will not be sharing identifiable information or attributing anything that is said to/about an individual.

• Finally, please let us know if you cannot hear me or if anything we say is unclear or confusing.

How do these guidelines sound to you? Do you have any questions before we begin?

**Questions [35 minutes]**

In thinking about the changes your organization made or are thinking of doing as it relates to change the enforcement of traffic violations:

• How would you and/or your department define traffic safety? Have any of the changes you’ve made shifted that definition for you?
• How did you engage with the community or community partners if at all to design, shape, implement, and track the outcomes of these changes?
• What were some of the legal implications for implementing these changes?
  ○ Follow-up: Did this result in transitioning responsibilities from one group to another to conduct enforcement? If so, did this impact any public-facing reporting protocols?
• What was the cost of implementing these changes? What factors were accounted for in calculating these costs (internal and external costs? Positive and negative?)
• How did these changes impact internal training protocols and procurement of equipment?
• What was the process or mechanism used for transitioning responsibilities to partner entities? How did you delineate roles and responsibilities following this change (e.g., was there a Memorandum of Agreement)? Who oversees and/or tracks changes and how is it reported?
• Were there any concerns among alternative enforcement staff about their safety? Were those safety concerns similar to those voiced by police officers when conducting traffic enforcement activities?
• What impact did these changes have on existing labor or union agreements?
• Was there any impact on traffic collisions, specifically those resulting injuries and fatalities?
• Did you notice a change in the number of traffic stops that did NOT escalate due to the presence of an alternative enforcement officer instead of a police officer?
• Were there any observed impacts on crime rates or frequency of violations resulting from these changes? Were there any mechanisms to track changes in rates across various populations?
• How did members of the community, public oversight committees, or community partners respond to these changes? Were there any observed impacts to the relationship between your department and the broader community?
• Have there been any recent discussions internally or externally within your jurisdiction to expand on the changes you’ve already implemented?
Closing [10 min]

Is there anything else you would like to share to help build understanding around what you/your organization did for alternatives to traffic enforcement?

Again, thank you for taking the time to participate in this interview today. If you have any questions regarding this session, please reach out to me. For questions about the overall project, please contact Richard France of Estolano Advisors.
### Full List of Recommended Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Potential Contact</th>
<th>Title/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Hon Chris Hipkins</td>
<td>New Zealand Police Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Stu Kearns</td>
<td>Former Traffic Officer, Traffic Safety Service, Ministry of Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Michael Wood</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Michael Carroll</td>
<td>Deputy Managing Director for the Office of Transportation, Infrastructure, Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Kurt August</td>
<td>Director of the Office of Criminal Justice, CJPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Martese Coker-Clark</td>
<td>Chief of Staff, CJPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Danielle Outlaw</td>
<td>Police Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>Farid Javandel</td>
<td>Berkeley Transportation Division Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>Jennifer Louis</td>
<td>Interim Berkeley Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>Rigel Robinson</td>
<td>City Council Member, D7, City of Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, CA / Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Dave Campbell</td>
<td>Former Director of East Bay Advocacy, Bike East Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville, NC</td>
<td>Harold E. Medlock, Jr</td>
<td>Chief of Police, Fayetteville Police Department (2013-2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville, NC</td>
<td>Mike Dolan Fliss</td>
<td>Public Health Data Scientist, UNC Injury Prevention Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville, NC</td>
<td>Frank Baumgartner</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor of Political Science, UNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville, NC</td>
<td>Kelsey Shoub</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Public Policy, University of Massachusetts (formerly USC, UNC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Ryan Russo</td>
<td>Former Director, Oakland Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Takeaways
Expert Interviews - Traffic Enforcement Alternatives
Nelson\Nygaard
Where we are

- Reached out to all recommended police departments and task force recommendations
- Conducted three interviews:
  - UNC as a mini-focus group (3 people)
  - Berkeley City Councilmember
  - Former OakDOT director
Takeaways from UNC Interview

- Recommend looking at traffic safety through an expanded vision zero framework
  - Expand vision zero definition to include public health and use of force (no violence or fatalities due to police), including fatalities AFTER stops
  - Collect better data around real reasons for stops and consequences
- Think about the total cost in long term—determine the real value (vs perceived value) of major arrests from traffic stops, vs. cost to public health, mental health, trust, etc.
- Need to be more holistic—include land use, infrastructure, density of related concerns (such as number of alcohol establishments), social factors that affect crime
- Need leadership and institutionalized change
  - Resistance from internal and external forces
  - Non-institutionalized change disappears when leadership changes
- Need real accountability and benchmarking
Takeaways from City of Berkeley

- Currently addressing pretext stops through ongoing work with Police Dept, BerkDOT, and Berkeley Community members
- State law has been an obstacle in allowing unarmed traffic enforcement
- City wanted to move parking enforcement out of Police Department into BerkDOT but blocked by the SEIU which represents parking enforcement officers
  - Parking enforcement wanted the connectivity to PD; easier to call for back-up enforcement if assistance is needed
  - Officers valued the uniform which gave them a sense of authority and trust in the community
- Need to connect Police Dept and DOT in their work around traffic safety: connect the philosophy of street safety (Vision Zero) with the practice
Takeaways from Oakland Dept of Transportation

- Oakland Department of Transportation (OakDOT) oversees parking enforcement, crossing guards, and abandoned vehicle towing
  - These services were previously managed by the Oakland Police Department
  - Parking enforcement under OakDOT has a stronger focus on safety (e.g., cars parked in red zones near crosswalks which decreases pedestrian visibility) rather than revenue generation

- City Council wanted to pilot automated speed enforcement with cameras:
  - Proposed state legislation emphasized that cameras would capture photos of rear license plates instead of windshields or drivers' faces and ticketed drivers could reduce fines if unable to pay
  - Community engagement revealed lack of support particularly from communities of color who thought cameras would result in less police patrol and more unsafe driving
  - Lacked support from advocacy groups, labor unions, and police advocates in state legislature
Objectives

The legal scholar interviews for LADOT’s Alternatives to Traffic Enforcement Study aimed to identify and evaluate legal requirements and implications of the study’s proposed recommendations. Those legal requirements and implications included the following:

- limitations under California law, including statutes that arguably limit traffic enforcement to sworn officers and statutes that impose penalties for moving violations based on the severity of the infraction;
- City of Los Angeles Municipal Code provisions that impose penalties for moving violations based on the severity of the infraction;
- state and local requirements regarding public sector collective bargaining, labor law, and regulations; and
- LADOT’s legal structure and authority under the City of Los Angeles’ Administrative Code.

Interviews also explored any state and local legislative changes that could be necessary to implement the recommendations.

Structure

The interviews proceeded iteratively, with the first set of interviews identifying legal issues that need research (including from the categories listed above), and additional legal scholars to consult. The interview questions evolved as the Task Force modified its recommendations and initial interviews were performed. As such, the legal interviewers drafted tailored questions for each interviewee and are considering follow-up interviews with some based on the iterative research findings and Task Force recommendations.

Each interview was about 45 minutes. In the first 5 minutes, the interviewers introduced themselves and the LADOT study. In the next 25 minutes, the interviewers asked tailored questions to each interviewee based on their relevant expertise. In the remaining 15 minutes, the interviewers asked follow-up questions and the interviewees had a chance to provide additional suggestions and ideas.
Timeline and Logistics

The interviews took place by Zoom. The first round of interviews occurred during the week of January 30, 2023 and the second round occurred during the weeks of February 6 and 13. Julian Gross and Shajuti Hossain conducted the interviews and a notetaker was present. Julian and Shajuti will synthesize notes from each interview to highlight key takeaways and next steps.

Interviewee Names and Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Organization</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jon Holtzman</td>
<td>Managing Partner/Renne Public Law Group</td>
<td>Collective bargaining, labor law, civil service rules in California; contracts between public entities in California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Michel and Jessica Breslin</td>
<td>Senior Attorney/Attorney / ChangeLabs Solutions</td>
<td>Drafted legal memo on California law's limitations on civilianizing traffic enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anand Subramanian</td>
<td>Senior Director/People Pathway at The San Francisco Foundation</td>
<td>Public safety/criminal justice reform efforts in California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Ochoa</td>
<td>Director of Police Practices/ACLU of Southern California</td>
<td>City of LA's police practices; state law on collection of police stop data; Co-Chair of California Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla Myers</td>
<td>Legal Aid Foundation of LA</td>
<td>LA traffic enforcement fees/fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najeeb Khoury</td>
<td>ED of LA Employee Relations Board</td>
<td>LA labor relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TASK FORCE CRITERIA

(confirmed during 1/26 Task Force meeting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Fit/Feasibility</th>
<th>Movement Alignment</th>
<th>Racial Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., does this recommendation have a positive impact on populations most affected by policing?)</td>
<td>(i.e., can the City of Los Angeles realistically carry out this recommendation?)</td>
<td>(i.e., does this align with the recommendations for nonpolice traffic safety alternatives put forward by LA groups advocating for social, racial, and economic justice?)</td>
<td>(i.e., does this recommendation reduce racial disparities in outcomes?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix N: Task Force Recommendations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritized Recommendations (across all groups)</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Final/Consolidated Version for Review</th>
<th>Areas for Further Task Force Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invest more in roadway improvements</td>
<td>G1, G2, G3</td>
<td>Structural Changes (City Agencies)</td>
<td>Increase and prioritize self-enforcing infrastructure investments (without increasing surveillance) in high-injury network corridors, low-income communities, and communities of color.</td>
<td>The group may want to revisit the phrase “without increasing surveillance” since this only came up during one of the working sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More safety infrastructure: Speed limit signs, reflectors, traffic signal synchronization</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Structural Changes (City Agencies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enforcing streets as a means of prevention</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Structural Changes (City Agencies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize investments in self-enforcing infrastructure (without increasing surveillance) in high-injury network corridors, low-income communities, and communities of color</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Structural Changes (City Agencies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop these interactions altogether (stop the stops)</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Reducing Disparities and Stopping</td>
<td>Stop the stops, i.e. stop interactions between enforcement entities and drivers altogether</td>
<td>Review alongside the following recommendation: Use unarmed civilians for enforcement rather than police (not necessarily through a new department).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate enforcement and/or criminalize these activities.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Reducing Disparities and Stopping</td>
<td>Eliminate enforcement of low-level traffic violations by police.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate enforcement of low-level violations by the police</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Reducing Disparities and Stopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review local enforcement ordinances and determine efficacy</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Reducing Disparities and Stopping</td>
<td>Review local traffic enforcement ordinances to determine their efficacy at improving safety outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify alternative approaches to fees</td>
<td>G1, G2, G3</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td>Identify alternative approaches to fees for moving and non-moving violations (e.g. repair vouchers) that foster increased safety.</td>
<td>The group may want to revisit whether to call out the creation of a new department in this recommendation or leave it out since this approach differed by group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use unarmed civilians for enforcement (not necessarily through a new department)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td>Use unarmed civilians rather than police for traffic enforcement.</td>
<td>Review alongside the following recommendation: Stop these interactions altogether (stop the stops).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More civilian enforcement (as opposed to police enforcement)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a new department for civilian enforcement.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer enforcement of non-moving violations to parking attendants.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build non-police first responder teams (including medical professionals) whose mission is traffic and road safety, not criminal law enforcement.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td>Build non-police first responder teams whose mission is traffic and road safety, not criminal law enforcement. These should be care-centered first responders, including mobile behavioral health crisis response teams comprised of medical professionals and behavioral health providers.</td>
<td>Review alongside the following recommendation: Increase funding for and availability of mental health professionals who partner with LAPD to respond to emergency calls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the Mayor’s proposed Office of Community Safety as a potential home for a proactive repair voucher program</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td>Consider the Mayor’s proposed Office of Community Safety as a potential home for a proactive repair voucher program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the use of lethal and less-lethal weapons during traffic stops.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td>Eliminate the use of lethal and less-lethal weapons during traffic stops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold officers accountable for excessive use of force</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td>Hold officers accountable for excessive use of force.</td>
<td>Review alongside the following recommendation: Build non-police first responder teams whose mission is traffic and road safety, not criminal law enforcement. These should be care-centered first responders, including mobile behavioral health crisis response teams comprised of medical professionals and behavioral health providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase funding/availability of mental health professionals partnering with LAPD to respond to calls</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td>Increase funding for and availability of mental health professionals who partner with LAPD to respond to emergency calls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate training funds toward Vision Zero rather than LAPD.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Improvements to Experience &amp; Outcomes</td>
<td>Provide funding for traffic safety training for Vision Zero staff, rather than LAPD, to avoid allocating additional funds to LAPD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help people meet their basic needs</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Holistic Approach</td>
<td>Help people meet their basic needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift modes (active transportation, public transit) and make them competitive with cars.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Holistic Approach</td>
<td>Implement policies and conduct additional research to encourage travel mode-shifts away from cars and to make other modes (active transportation, public transit) more competitive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that there is community buy-in for any report recommendations</td>
<td>G1, G3</td>
<td>Project Next Steps</td>
<td>Provide more opportunities for authentic, robust community engagement and listening sessions and ensure that there is community buy-in for this report’s recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community listening sessions</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Project Next Steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: At the start of each working session, the Consultant team presented key takeaways from research conducted to date and a set of preliminary recommendations. The slide deck can be found here: [http://bit.ly/3K8uN5D](http://bit.ly/3K8uN5D)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Recommendations (across all groups)</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Prioritized Recommendation</th>
<th>Group(s) that Prioritized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Align other policies (i.e. related to housing, commute patterns) with traffic safety goals.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual vehicle inspections to reduce equipment-related stops.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact anonymous feedback from citizens after traffic stops.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a new department for civilian enforcement.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate motorists about the risks of driving to encourage behavior change.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate enforcement and/or criminalize these activities.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the use of tribal and less-lethal weapons during traffic stops.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that there is community buy-in for any report recommendations.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1, G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow through on existing infrastructure plans, such as the Mobility Plan.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help people meet their basic needs to alleviate need for enforcement.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold officers accountable for excessive use of force, how they engage citizens, and how they use bodycams.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify alternative approaches to fees for moving and non-moving violations that foster increased safety (e.g. repair vouchers).</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1, G2, G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase/improve officer training (i.e. related to implicit bias, interactions with communities, and impact of stops) and require test.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest more in roadway improvements.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1, G2, G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby the state to reduce the speed that cars can physically drive.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent City Council members from blocking traffic safety improvements.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information on what to expect during a traffic stop in the DMV handbook.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review local enforcement ordinances and determine efficacy for improving safety outcomes.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline the process for implementing safety improvements by consolidating City departments.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer enforcement of non-moving violations to parking attendants.</td>
<td>1/26 mtg</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add dedicated infrastructure to protect non-driving road users and promote other transportation modes.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address officer misconduct that results in changed behavior or fewer interactions with communities.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviate procedures/behaviors/infrastructures that contribute to traffic danger.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to fines.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera speed enforcement in high density areas + school zones (AB43).</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community listening sessions.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for officers to engage with and learn from communities.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further advance policy changes to target highest risk moving violations.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing funding/availability of mental health professionals partnering with LAPD to respond to calls.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More civilian enforcement (as opposed to police enforcement).</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More crossing guards in more places.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More safety infrastructure: Speed limit signs, reflectors, traffic signal synchronization.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide extensive police training on de-escalation, discriminatory bias, fragile masculinity and systemic understanding of traffic safety issues.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsider the allocation of stops from call for service approach towards high-injury network corridors.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce time needed for infrastructure approval/implementation.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly convene community meetings to dialogue about the effects of police stops.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enforcing streets as a means of prevention.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party evaluation on effectiveness of future policy changes regarding police stops and provide ongoing monitoring/reporting to the community.</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use unarmed civilians for enforcement (not necessarily through a new department).</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss reform police enforcement approach (including tactics) in low-income communities and communities of color.</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate enforcement of “low-level” violations by police (e.g. Philadelphia example).</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the procedures/training approach in communities of color that results in fatal outcomes.</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s proposed Office of Community Safety as a home for a proactive Repair vouchers program.</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize investments in self-enforcing infrastructure (who increasing surveillance) in high-injury corridors/communities or color/low-income comm.</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop police from citing non-moving violations (i.e. parking violations).</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop these interactions altogether (“Stop the Stops”).</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transform institutions (rather than working in them) to history continues to show that these systems don’t accomplish purported purposes equitably.</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the County to create a county-wide, separate line to send notice to EMTs and social workers first.</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate training funds toward Vision Zero rather than LAPD.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build non-police first responder teams (including medical professionals) whose mission is traffic and road safety, not criminal law enforcement.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the window of time to apply for a ticket diversion/forbearance program.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research policy needed to enable car technology to limit the speed that cars can drive.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift modes (active transportation, public transit) and make them competitive with cars.</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultant Team Draft Recommendations

Methodology

Equitable Cities developed an initial set of draft recommendations based on the findings from the qualitative focus groups. Takeaways from each analysis were aligned with the other to find similarities that would structure a draft recommendation. Other recommendations were developed based on additional findings from either the focus groups or the RIPA data analysis.

Table 1: Focus Group and Quantitative Analysis Takeaway Overlap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Groups</th>
<th>Quantitative Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drivers and police officers have heightened emotions during stops and imbalance of power</td>
<td>A number of actions can happen during the stops and after leading to financial or emotional consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic enforcement is observed to be almost non-existent in some areas of LA compared to others.</td>
<td>Stops are heavily concentrated in South LA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding is a top problem and enforcement does not resolve the issue.</td>
<td>Less than one in five traffic stops is for speeding and most speeding stops do not result in citations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions during stops differ depending on the neighborhood and perceived class or race of the driver.</td>
<td>Racial disparities are present across entire analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers and police officers have heightened emotions during stops and imbalance of power</td>
<td>A number of actions can happen during the stops and after leading to financial or emotional consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic enforcement is observed to be almost non-existent in some areas of LA compared to others.</td>
<td>Stops are heavily concentrated in South LA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equitable Cities presented draft recommendations to the Task Force over a series of formal Task Force meetings and below-quorum, small group recommendations workshops in January and February 2023. Equitable Cities utilized the feedback from Task Force members to revise, refine, or deprioritize initial draft recommendations.

Feedback from Task Force members emphasized the need to disinvest in additional police training or police-focused programs. Members expressed the preference to focus on enhancing and investing in programs to support ongoing community work, or in projects that are community-focused. Additionally, Task Force members stated the need to emphasize or include non-police methods of improving traffic safety. Based on the full set of feedback from Task Force members, Equitable Cities developed the full set of proposed recommendations shown below.
Table 2: Revised Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Enforcement vs. safety vs. financial effects of enforcement</th>
<th>Potential impact (low, medium, high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize investment of self-enforcing infrastructure on high-injury network corridors.</td>
<td>Structural changes (city agencies)</td>
<td>Enforcement and safety</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further advance LAPD procedural policy changes to target highest risk moving violations (speeding). Akin to procedure changes for pre-textual stops.</td>
<td>Structural changes (city agencies)</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use unarmed personnel to conduct moving violation stops for reducing stop actions and use of force; determine if there are unarmed field officers at LAPD or consider expanding role of traffic control officers who currently control intersections and conduct parking enforcement and are unarmed; build upon new models like LA Metro ambassadors.</td>
<td>Reducing disparities and stops</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase funding and use of mobile care response units to assist with crisis situations. Have a separate phone line that sends notice to EMTs and social workers first.</td>
<td>Reducing disparities and stops</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to add dedicated infrastructure to protect non-driving road users and promote other transportation modes.</td>
<td>Reducing disparities and stops</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create or increase accessibility to ticket diversion programs, modify to a progressive fine structure based on infractions and income (keeping in mind administrative burdens on people), consider increasing time to contest.</td>
<td>Improvements to experience and outcomes</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPD create a program where people receive vouchers to fix equipment issues rather than issuing tickets (<a href="https://example.com">LightsOn! program</a>) or use “fix-it ticket” approach.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage community partners to hold vehicle repair events (akin to smog test and repair events).</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training to community members on basic emergency response and care using the CERT LA model of community emergency response.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a third party evaluate effectiveness of future policy changes regarding police stops.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use technology to consistently enforce speeding and unsafe behavior; includes things that are currently legal in CA (red light cameras), explore legislative changes for currently not-legal state regulations (speeding cameras) and work with state to explore car technology options like speed governor's in vehicles, even as there are federal implications (i.e., need for waiver).</td>
<td>Reducing disparities and stops</td>
<td>Enforcement and safety</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address officer misconduct that results in changed behavior or fewer interactions with communities.</td>
<td>Improvements to experience and outcomes</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly convene community meetings to dialogue about the effects of police stops and gather input about how to improve approaches.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create two-way dialogue or training opportunities between LAPD and Vision Zero staff and engineers</td>
<td>Structural changes (city agencies)</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance standard driver awareness of the rights of people walking and cycling; rights to ride on streets and sidewalks, road positioning etc.</td>
<td>Reducing disparities and stops</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police training on de-escalation, discriminatory bias, fragile masculinity and systemic understanding of traffic safety issues.</td>
<td>Improvements to experience and outcomes</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for officers to engage with and learn from communities where stops occur frequently through relationship building outside of traffic stops.</td>
<td>Improvements to experience and outcomes</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Los Angeles Department of Transportation  
From: Sahar Shirazi, Carolyn Chu, Nelson\Nygaard  
Date: March 9, 2023  
Subject: Outreach and Engagement Scope of Work

The purpose of continued outreach and engagement scope of work is to ensure community members have ample opportunity to provide input on traffic enforcement alternatives and proposed solutions to address traffic violence in Los Angeles. The Traffic Enforcement Study includes a recommendation focused on continued engagement and coordination with community members. This recommendation calls for additional focus groups and listening sessions, broad outreach through public surveys and community-based organization engagement, and the continuation of the Task Force. This memo builds on those recommendations to support the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) in their continued efforts to eliminate traffic violence and fatalities.

LADOT can leverage community connections and resources gathered during the Traffic Enforcement Study, such as existing relationships with current Task Force members and the existing expert interview protocol. Those relationships and resources provide a strong baseline for continued and enhanced engagement with communities, including those most impacted by traffic enforcement. Recommended methods to inform and engage with community are below.

**PHASE I: INFORM**

**Work with existing Task Force members to share information and solicit feedback**

- Work with Task Force members to create outreach materials that are accessible and user-friendly
- Distribute information about the Traffic Enforcement Study and solicit feedback via multiple methods
  - Include option to sign up for future engagement

Appendix P: Summary of Outreach Next Steps
Create channel for ongoing, citywide distribution of information, including City’s responses to collected feedback

- Include images, data, and graphics
- Translate to multiple languages based on City demographics
- Share project updates, impacts, and research throughout research and implementation phases
- Build and maintain trust and accountability with community

PHASE II: ENGAGE, LISTEN, LEARN

Host focus groups to actively seek feedback and engage with community members and community-based organizations.

- Recruit community members from neighborhoods that face legacies of disinvestment; engage community-based organizations that represent these communities
- Remove barriers to participation in focus groups by:
  - Providing food, childcare, and language interpretation
  - Hosting at locations that are transit accessible and/or have plenty of parking
- Compensate focus group participants for their time (e.g. via gift cards)
- Offer at least two meeting dates at different times of day to accommodate participants’ schedules
- Value community members’ perspectives and respect their expertise

Provide support for community-based organizations to host focus groups and listening sessions

- Allow community groups to serve as the event hosts
- Compensate community-based organizations for this work and allow them to handle all logistics and organizing
- Contract with consultants to provide support as needed.
- Use train-the-trainer model to have consultants train organizations on how to facilitate the focus groups and offer additional project context to maintain consistency across focus groups
- Increase funding/resources to support specific focus groups for non-English speakers
Create series of town hall meetings with representation from various City of LA departments and County partners focused on addressing traffic enforcement alternatives.

- Gather input and respond to community questions and concerns

Conduct interviews with diverse set of policy and implementation experts.

- Interviews should be with experts who bring diverse experiences, including police officers, city officials, academics, advocates, policy analysts, and community members.
- Schedule ample time and appropriately allocate budget to identify and contact a robust list of potential interviewees.

PHASE III: MAINTAIN TRUST AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Continue to engage the existing Task Force for project continuity and continued engagement with community partners.

- Strengthen existing relationships with key stakeholders who have already invested their expertise and time as community consultants
- Ask existing members if expanding or alternating membership can help reduce burnout and fatigue or contribute to Task Force dynamics
- Create a clear scope of work for Task Force members and be transparent about how their feedback will be incorporated into LADOT policies and practices

Regularly convene community meetings to dialogue about the effects of police stops and implemented actions and gather input about how to improve approaches.

- Engage community partners to hold vehicle repair events (akin to smog test and repair events).
Appendix Q: Task Force Resource Library

Task Force Resource Library

The following resource library consists of articles, video clips, books, and other publications shared by Task Force members throughout the project period.

Resources


