



Additional Documents Distributed for the City Council Meetings of February 26, 2024

Item No.	Agenda Item Description	Distributor	Document
02.	RECEIVE AND DISCUSS THE SOUTH PASADENA POLICE DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT	Anne Bagasao	Email to Council

**THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

From: [Elizabeth Anne Bagasao](#)
To: [City Council Public Comment](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Special Joint Session with PSC
Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 11:32:33 AM
Attachments: [2-26 public comment.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear City Clerk:

Attached please find a public comment for the abovementioned meeting, Agenda Item No. 2 for February 26, 2024

Always,

Anne Bagasao

February 26, 2024

Anne Bagasao

To: Mayor Zneimer, Mayor Pro-Tem Donovan, Councilmembers and Public Safety Commissioners:

In July of 2022, I was asked to serve on the committee to review responses to the Public Safety Review RFP.

Because our city is now facing a \$3.7million deficit, I am compelled to answer to the Council, the Finance Commission and the public as to why I stand by my opinion that Raftelis was the most qualified and capable to carry out the specifics of the RFP. I believed at the time that it would be money well spent as this assessment, particularly coming out of the Summer of Our Discontent, was imperative for the healing, health and future progress of our community.

To be perfectly clear, based on the Raftelis proposal, agency qualifications and sample work, I stand by my belief that Raftelis was the best choice to conduct the assessment.

However, after the review of the report, I am disappointed but not surprised at the lack of depth particularly with regard to community input from social justice activists and recommendations on racial equity and DEIB.

The number one Area of Focus in the RFP reads,

*“To advise on an assessment of efficient Police Department services, delivery, and approaches from **a lens of racial equity**, and in consideration of community frameworks, advise regarding assessment of law enforcement services, delivery, and approaches.”*

Rafetlis’ sample work demonstrated a breadth of understanding in this area, so I expected more.

This report is a strategic plan to increase our public safety personnel without much evidence to back up the need. If the data in the report were to support public safety goals including best practices to achieve gender, economic and racial equity, that would be great. I would want the City to add the personnel and whatever else the department needs to reach all of the goals. **This report, however, does not go far enough to justify what is outlined here nor does it address the above point in the Area of Focus.**

I am concerned that the final report took much longer than intended. It’s nearly two years in the making from the time the RFP was released until now.

When I inquired of the Assistant City Manager as to delay, she provided the following explanation:

“They were ready to deliver it Fall 2023, and for various agenda forecasting and scheduling reasons, pushed into the new year.”

That would mean a five-month delay because of “forecasting and scheduling reasons”. What pray tell would those “forecasting” reasons be? Budget reports on city expenses perhaps?

With regard to the additional cost, it was cited that the consultants needed to do additional community engagements. City management foolishly scheduled an important community forum for renters on the same day and time as the first community meeting. Those of us who should have been able to attend both meetings had to choose between the two. Again, if this is the case, it's not Rafetelis' fault and thus the need to increase the contract period and compensations was a direct result of was bad planning by City management.

I would also like to add, that public outreach on this assessment and report was poor and lacking. South Pasadena Tenants Union was not included in the community group interviews. When we asked if the consultant planned to interview our community group, it was added last minute. Additionally, while City Management claims to have done public promotion of tonight meetings in social media, City Scoop, etc, the announcement was not posted to the City's social media until Thursday, February 22 as well it did not appear on City Scoop until February 22. No link to the report was provided in any public announcements other than on the city website as part of the agenda packet.

How can the city claim to do sufficient community outreach and claim to have sufficient public participation when they don't make the information available to all of the public? This seems to be an ongoing challenge for City Hall and I implore the Mayor to give direction to the City Manager to make immediate improvement on communication for all future public meetings.

Not having the benefit of being a public safety commissioner, I am prohibited from asking questions, in the meeting tonight.

Perhaps the Council or one of the commissioners can use their privilege to ask the consultant the following.

- In your words, tell us why you were delayed?
- Who provided you with the list of community groups and individuals who were interviewed and at what phase of this process, and was South Pasadena Tenants Union included on the original list?
- Did you receive all the data, financials, personnel and other information you requested from the city to do a thorough and detailed review in a timely manner to stay within the original contract period?
- Is this report 100% in alignment with the RFP and your scope of work?
- Were you made aware of some requested conditions in the legal claim made by BLM leadership that, were not part of the settlement but, may have served to enhance the scope of work?

Sincerely,



Anne Bagasao

**THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**