

# NEST

---

## Neighborhood Engagement Strategy Talks

Sacramento, California

2018

### I. Intro

- The CRS legislative mandate
- What CRS does
- Who CRS works with

### II. Background

- Critical Incident
- CRS Services Requested

### III. Methodology

- How participants were selected
- Dialogue process design
- Final NEST questions used by CRS
- Additional questions asked participants about further perceptions of police and perceptions of racial tensions
- Concluding open ended questions

### IV. Summary of NEST Results

- Highest priorities as indicated by participants across all districts
- Community members' priorities fell generally into the following categories:
  - Outreach
  - Homelessness and Mental Illness
  - Tactics

### V. Next Steps

- Primary needs identified by CRS:
  - Understanding
  - Justice and accountability
  - Respect
  - Inclusion
- Items for consideration in next steps
  - Police presentations on topics identified by participants
  - Community Dialogues on Homelessness and Mental Illness
  - Community dialogues on race

### VI. Conclusion

Appendix 1: Polling Results

# **I. Introduction**

The Community Relations Service (CRS or the Agency) is the Department's "Peacemaker" for community conflicts and tensions arising from differences of race, color, national origin, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion and disability. CRS is not an investigatory or prosecutorial agency, and it does not have any law enforcement authority.

Rather, the Agency works with all parties, including State and local units of government, private and public organizations, civil rights groups, and local community leaders, to uncover the underlying interests of all of those involved in the conflict and facilitates the development of viable, mutual understandings and solutions to the community's challenges. In addition, CRS assists communities in developing local mechanisms and community capacity to prevent tension and violent hate crimes from occurring in the future. All CRS services are confidential, impartial, and are provided free of charge. CRS works in all 50 states and U.S. territories, and in communities large and small, rural, urban and suburban.

## **The CRS legislative mandate:**

### **1964 Civil Rights Act**

CRS was established by Title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C 2000g et seq.).

### **Matthew Shepard and the James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act**

In 2009, with the passage of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, CRS' mandate expanded to provide jurisdictional services to additional communities whose members have frequently been the victims of hate crimes, but were not protected under the 1964 Civil Rights Act (gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, and disability).

## **What CRS Does**

The Community Relations Service provides four services: Mediation, Facilitated Dialogue, Training and Consultation. These services help communities enhance their ability to alleviate tension, resolve disputes, and prevent future conflicts more effectively.

## **Facilitation**

The CRS convenes parties in dialogue to open lines of communication, identify issues, common concerns, increase collaboration, and develop solutions.

## **Consultation**

The CRS helps identify and deliver resources for communities by providing: technical assistance, best practices, and referrals that improve communities' capacity and ability to address underlying issues.

## **Training**

The CRS provides a formal curriculum of instructional programs that increase understanding and improve collaboration to resolve disputes and prevent future conflict.

## **Mediation**

The CRS serves as neutral third-party mediator to facilitate problem solving discussions and the development of documented agreements between parties in conflict.

## **Who CRS works with:**

- Civil rights groups
- Community groups
- Law enforcement
- Faith-based groups
- Federal, state, and local government
- Private and public organizations
- Tribal governments

## **II. Background**

### **Critical Incident**

On March 18, 2018, in Sacramento, California, law enforcement responded to protests following the fatal police shooting of an African American male, Stephon Clark. There were multiple weapon discharges by the Sacramento Police, and it was later found that the victim was unarmed. The incident resulted in rapid formation of crowds protesting the scene in several neighborhoods. A CRS team was dispatched and on the ground within 24 hours.

### **CRS Services Requested**

After the shooting of Stephon Clark and the demonstrations that followed, CRS was in contact with the Sacramento Police Department (SPD) and the City of Sacramento to offer jurisdictional services. CRS met with the Sacramento Police Department and also delivered a presentation to the Sacramento Public Safety Accountability Commission. CRS also met with various community leaders and community organizations.

CRS services were requested by the Sacramento Police Department and the City of Sacramento as an impartial agency that does not engage in the performance of investigative or prosecutorial functions.

## **III. Methodology**

The model that CRS proposed involved a focus group approach across all six police districts in the city with a primary focus on assessment of community concerns, perspectives, and priorities. The size of each focus group and instant polling technology that was used offered participants an ample opportunity to interact and provide input. The results of this process would be summarized and assessed to provide guidance on additional next steps.

### **How participants were selected**

The Neighborhood Engagement Strategy Talks (NEST) were intended to assemble a diverse group of people from around the city to improve police-community relations, neighborhood by neighborhood. An open call for applications to participate in NEST drew interest from across the city. The application process was accessible online, via the Sacramento Police Department website which was linked to the City of Sacramento website. The online

application requested basic biographical information such as name, address, and contact information, as well as a brief statement of interest. The only requirement was that the applicant be a resident in the police district for which they applied. In order to get a broad cross-section of each district, applicants were also asked to self-identify as a faith representative, business leader, social service provider, youth representative, or community member at large. Efforts were made by CRS to ensure that each district had representation from each of the self-identified groups.

To keep the discussions productive, the size of each group was capped at 20. CRS worked with the city to form six NEST groups – one for each of the six Sacramento police districts. Throughout June and July of 2018, CRS engaged the city’s neighborhoods in NEST dialogues in each police district. Each NEST dialogue involved faith representatives, business leaders, social service providers, and residents from the police district. All efforts were made to include interested participants who met the minimum qualification of being a resident of their particular police district. The talks also included representatives from city and state government agencies who were non-participant observers to the process to ensure that residents’ feedback would be passed on to policymakers.

## **Dialogue Process Design**

As the nature of NEST focused on assessment of community perspectives, CRS sent invitation emails to the participants with a date and location to each dialogue to be conducted within each police district. Participants without access to email were called via phone and/or sent a letter format of the original email. Participants were asked to answer two basic questions ahead of the dialogue: 1) What is working well with the police department? 2) What is not working so well? Participants were instructed to email or call CRS with their response. This allowed participants to elaborate on their responses.

CRS conducted follow interviews during the weeks and days before the dialogue to obtain answers to the questions sent in advance. The purpose of the questions and follow-up was to both fine-tune the dialogue prompts that would be asked during the group session, and to allow those participants to prioritize among the answers given by their fellow participants during the live joint session. As CRS fine-tuned questions and answers that would be shown during each dialogue, it separated issues between those where the police department was seen by the dialogue participants as having primary responsibility or involvement, and those issues where the police department was not a primary party.

For example, many participants mentioned that among the biggest problems for the police department was the issue of dealing with homelessness and mental health. At the same time, those participants recognized that the police department was not the responsible entity for fixing the problem. Other examples include concerns over rising housing costs.

CRS responded by creating separate questions. One question focused on issues in the community that impact relationships with police (mental health, homelessness, poverty, gentrification, drug use, racial bias within the community, etc.) and other questions focused

solely on perceptions of the police department in regards to their role as law enforcement officers (response times, perceptions of police outreach, concerns and questions over training, perceptions and questions over tactics, perceptions of police use of force, staffing, etc.). A large number of participants identified training and policies as a concern.

Participant answers were clarified, assessed, and combined where redundant. The resulting questions and answers were what was ultimately shown in the NEST dialogues for the participants to answer using electronic polling technology. Upon answering and seeing the results, participants were given a chance to elaborate on answers and to have more in-depth discussions on the results.

## **Final NEST Questions Used by CRS**

- 1) What is something you believe the SPD is doing well or seems to be working?
- 2) What is the most pressing concern *in the community* within your district that impacts policing?
- 3) What is the most pressing *concern with police* in your district requiring attention?
- 4) If police training is a priority, what topics should be prioritized?
- 5) If police policies are a priority, which ones are critical for the police to review?

## **Additional questions asked participants about further perceptions of police and perceptions of racial tensions**

During follow-up phone calls with participants before the NEST sessions, it was clear that depending on how each question was interpreted, elements directly related to racial tensions may or may not have been mentioned. However, in follow-up phone calls when asked how race impacted their answers, many of the participants provided very detailed responses. Thus, to assure that participants would directly address the jurisdictional conflicts CRS asked additional questions focused on perceptions of race relations.

CRS researched existing surveys that were focused on police perceptions and race. CRS looked for questions that raised some of the same issues brought up in the follow-up phone calls with participants. For example, CRS selected questions related to the size of departments, questions about how officers are perceived, as well as questions about systemic problems, and questions about demonstrators and perceptions of the motivations of protesters.

In discussions with the participants, CRS also established that the community participants were interested in how the results of the national survey reference would compare with views of the local participants. Participant felt that knowing and comparing these results might promote additional discussion on each topic.

CRS identified five questions used by the Pew Research Center's surveys on police and public views on policing.<sup>i</sup>

The questions used/referenced from the Pew Research Center were:

- 1) Would you prefer a smaller, larger, or same size police presence in your police district?
- 2) Do you see police as enforcers, protectors, or both equally?
- 3) Deadly encounters between police and African Americans in [Sacramento] are: isolated incidents; or signs of a broader problem?
- 4) Anti-police bias is a primary motive in recent protests: a great deal; some; not very much; or not at all?
- 5) Protests are motivated by a genuine desire to hold police accountable: a great deal; some; not much; not at all?

Question one was selected because police staffing levels repeatedly came up as a concern among some of the participants across different policing districts. Staffing levels came up with some correlation with discussion on issues of homelessness and the impact of homelessness on “petty” crime. In these cases police were seen by some participants as putting less priority on these issues due to perceived limited staffing levels so they could focus more on higher priority problems. This question was also selected as a method to assess and discuss if there was a difference of opinion depending on race, personal, and historic experience interacting with police. For example, some participants indirectly expressed or inferred the idea of diminishing returns and that more resources were needed to address root causes rather than symptoms.

Questions two was selected to continue encouraging a discussion where perspectives, experience, race relations, and the historic relationship between police and communities of color could be discussed.

Question three was selected to bring to the forefront a direct discussion on police treatment of African Americans. The question would allow participants to not only discuss historical relationships, but also discuss how institutional structures impact departments today, even for those officers with the best intentions. It would also allow participants to discuss these views as they pertain to their own Police Department.

Question four was selected as a follow-up to the discussion on historical impact of policing on perceptions of African Americans, as it asked participants to discuss whether they thought local protests in Sacramento were more of a consequence of anti-police bias. Participants could then discuss whether or not this may have been the effect of longstanding anti-police bias and why or why not.

Question five was selected as it provides insight into perceptions of the cause and motivation of protests.

## Concluding Open Ended Questions

Questions for the NEST sessions concluded with open ended questions meant to capture needs and concerns of those the participants identified as missing, as well as asking participants what they thought would be concerns that all participants across all districts could agree on as a high concern and priority. Lastly, input on the process was requested and next steps were described to the extent possible given the continuation in process design being based on the results of the assessment of this process.

## IV. Summary of NEST Results

Upon completion of the NEST sessions across the six police districts there were topics that stood out across all districts for CRS. Those results will be highlighted below. A full summary and complete results of polling by district can be found in Appendix 1.

### Highest priorities as indicated by participants across all districts

1) What is something you believe the SPD is doing well or seems to be working?

**Outreach**

2) What is the most pressing concern *in the community* within your district that impacts policing?

**Homelessness and Mental Illness**

3) What is the most pressing *concern with police* in your district requiring attention?

**Tactics**

4) If police training is a priority, what topics should be prioritized?

**Tactics**

5) If police policies are a priority, which ones are critical for the police to review?

**Tactics**

## **Community members' priorities fell generally into the following categories:**

### **Outreach**

Outreach referred to public events with higher visibility and presence (such as coffee with a cop or uniformed presence at community events such as block parties or neighborhood association meetings), as well as more informal attempts to connect with and build relationships with community members in non-emergency environments. These efforts were widely seen as successful and visible by many of the community members present.

### **Homelessness and Mental Illness**

These issues were perceived in all six Districts as a critical issue impacting “petty” crime such as bike theft, car break-ins, package theft, and minor vandalism. Community members expressed a frustration with law enforcement’s limited capacity to assist in all instances while being conscious that it was a bigger community issue beyond law enforcement. Community members also expressed frustration that due to the non-emergency nature of some of the “petty” crime, that community members perceived law enforcement as putting a lower priority on these issues resulting in longer response times. There was a recognition across all six Districts that resources would be better allocated to more serious crime.

### **Tactics**

Tactics referred to a perception that officers needed to improve their tactical planning so as not to place themselves in a position where they would then have to use deadly force. There was also a sentiment that officers could benefit from better and more frequent training to support the implementation of better tactical planning. Training was also mentioned as a priority, as participants admitted to limited knowledge of how police were trained to respond to situations where use of force may be necessary. Additionally, the topic of “tactics” included training related to use of less lethal tools to engage contacts and training in cultural competence and unconscious bias to impact the perception of threat on officers. Some participants also suggested that training on “verbal engagement and de-escalation” be considered mandatory. Lastly, participants expressed that negative customer service experiences with people of color could possibly lead to a greater chance of escalation and the need to use force (in these discussions cultural competence and unconscious bias was used by participants to express how the lack can impact customer service and increase the chances of escalation).

## V. Next Steps

Based on the results of participant polling and follow-up on the questions where participants had an opportunity to discuss topics further, CRS identified various needs and themes that could offer public officials and law enforcement with guidance on topics to prioritize moving forward.

### Primary Needs identified by CRS

#### Understanding:

Participants expressed a need to understand how their police department operates. For example, participants asked how the Sacramento Police Department trains their officers in:

- Tactical planning;
- Use of less lethal tools;
- De-escalation;
- Cultural competence;
- Unconscious Bias.

The following may be additional questions and topics for the police department to explore with the community to assist them with understanding how their police department operates:

- How is tactical planning, use of less lethal tools, de-escalation, cultural competence, and unconscious bias training captured or incentivized in performance evaluations?
- What kind of support and training exists for first line supervisors to be able to impact and correct behavior in the above topics (tactical planning, use of less lethal tools, de-escalation, cultural competence, and unconscious bias training)?
- How do first line supervisors currently correct behavior with their subordinates (in so far as tactical planning, use of less lethal tools, de-escalation, cultural competence, and unconscious bias)?
- How many officers have been trained in these and other topics?
- What is the current demographic composition of the department and how does it represent the diversity of the city?
- What are current policies and strategies to increase diversity and inclusion within the police department?

Some participants also expressed a need for dialogue regarding the community's perception of "historic racism," "institutional discrimination," and the "perceptions of disparate impact on people of color" from both law enforcement and their neighbors. Other participants also expressed need for police to acknowledge:

- The role and impact of slavery and racism on institutions, and their long lasting impact today which includes how even well-meaning individuals can perpetuate racial tensions.

## **Justice and Accountability**

Participants expressed a need to understand how their department is held accountable. Questions raised by participants on this topic included:

- What is the current internal process for accountability?
- What kind of discipline data exists that can be shared with the public to show the number of officers disciplined and fired in the past and for what behaviors?

Other questions that could be discussed by the police department to help the community understand how their police department strives towards providing justice and accountability:

- How do you assure a fair and impartial process with safeguards against conflicts of interest (such as officers investigating their colleagues, or any other conflicts of interest)?
- What are the current challenges in internal accountability, and how are they being addressed?
- What kind of post-critical incident protocols exist to ensure the integrity of an investigation?
- Are there any issues with those protocols and have they been addressed?
- What kind of internal data is currently being captured on race, to both show who is being promoted or disciplined inside the department?
- What kind of external data is currently being captured on race to show who is being detained or arrested and for what behavior?
- How is this data being analyzed and used to improve the department?
- What are current data capture challenges and how are they being addressed?
- Who is managing the data, analyzing it, and what happens to the data or the results?
- Does the department utilize Early Intervention Systems (EIS)? "An Early Intervention System (EIS) is a computerized database of individual officer performance indicators that supervisors use to identify officers who may be engaging in improper or illegal conduct, such as excessive or unnecessary uses of force or abusive behavior toward community members. As the name implies, an EIS also can alert supervisors to early signs that an officer may be under stress and at risk for engaging in improper behavior, or that officers may need additional training to improve their performance."<sup>ii</sup>

## Respect

Participants also communicated the need for mutual respect while acknowledging the challenge to give respect when the perception can exist that it is not provided by officers. Some participants described it as poor customer service, others, as a poor attitude that included a certain tone, and others described it as an engagement that would not explain why they had been engaged by police.

## Inclusion

In all police districts, participants articulated an enthusiasm or responsibility for civic engagement. Many of the participants also expressed ideas and priorities for the police department to consider as they responded to the questions asked by CRS. Many of the participants also acknowledged the absence of representatives from many other groups they could identify as significant in their district and discussed the importance of future engagement and inclusion of these and all groups that represent each district.

## Items for consideration in Next Steps

- 1) **Police presentations on topics identified by participants** throughout the city, with feedback leading back towards a working group that can review how any recommendations or issues highlighted could be addressed, changed, and, or improved. See topic list below.
- 2) **Community dialogues on homelessness and mental illness** by district with a local community working group tasked with reporting back to the city and implementing local recommendations.
- 3) **Community dialogues on race** to allow local residents an opportunity to discuss issues of race, privilege, and institutional disparate impact, with a working group tasked with reporting back to the city and implementing local recommendations.

## Police presentations on topics identified by participants

- Presentations would be conducted throughout the city at the District level.
- Each presentation would focus on one topic related to, and or impacting tactics as prioritized or highlighted by participants throughout the districts. (See topics below under goal of presentations).

- The Sacramento Police Department could assign a working group to review and or consider community feedback from each topic presentation, and to later after all presentations are conducted issue a summary of how feedback was considered and update community members as to what the department has done in each topic in so far as changes, updates, or improvements.

- **Goal of presentations:**

To educate the community to improve understanding of elements impacting policing, while at the same time providing an inclusive opportunity for community feedback on specific police policies and practices such as in the following topics:

- **tactical preparation and training of officers**
  - Use-of-force.
  - Less lethal tools.
  - De-escalation, communication, and procedural justice.
  - Planning and strategizing (increasing safety, space, and time).
  - Performance evaluations.
  - First line supervisor support.
- **Status of addressing cultural competence of officers and status of addressing unconscious bias of officers**
  - To address the perception of a threat.
- **Investigatory accountability systems**
  - post-critical incident protocols required by officers involved in the incident, as well as required by other officers present and supervisors.
    - (i.e. separation of officers in an officer-involved-shooting so that they cannot talk to one another and be interviewed later)
    - (i.e. not muting cameras after a critical incident, except under certain conditions)
  - Describing the investigatory process.
  - Describing the circumstances under which a neighboring agency conducts an investigation and describing how that works.
  - Describing the circumstances under which the state or federal government investigate or review a case and describing how that works.
- **Diversity and inclusion in the department**
  - Describing the demographic composition of the department.
  - Describing any internal inclusion policies and practices.
  - Describing current policies and strategies to increase diversity in the recruitment process.

## **Community Dialogues on Homelessness and Mental Illness**

- By district with local residents.
- With city and county subject matter experts on homelessness and mental illness from government and the nonprofit sector.
- Would include police representation.
- Each with its own community working group tasked with reporting back to the city and implementing local recommendations and coordinating local efforts.
- Each can discuss what is being done to address these issues at the district, city, and county levels, and give members of the community an opportunity to discuss what they can do to help with the problem.
- Law enforcement can also share their challenges and work with each group to support them and offer expertise in the topic.
- Working groups can report back to city officials on their recommendations and planned actions.
- Working groups can meet again as needed with open doors to the public to strategize and coordinate efforts recommended by the district residents.
- Each working group can organize local events or coordinate resident efforts and establish better communication on the topic across each district, as well as become a local asset.
- Each working group can be selected through a combination of appointments by the city council, law enforcement, and through a random drawing of local residents and leaders who self-selectively express interest in serving on the group. Alternatively, each working group can be spearheaded by one or two individuals identified by the city to help coordinate and maintain the working group alive and functioning, while its membership remain open and available to all residents in the district who attend the meetings.
- Would require pre-planning with city and county subject matter experts in homelessness and mental health.

## **Community dialogues on race**

- By district to allow local residents an opportunity for an intimate discussion.
- Would allow residents and neighbors to understand each other's perspectives.
- Would offer an opportunity to discuss issues of race, privilege, and institutional disparate impact on communities of color which would include how police impact such communities.
- Can request that participants identify recommendations, to address some of these issues, including solutions that they have the power to implement as a local community.
- Would include a working group to help coordinate and implement the recommendations.
- Would include law enforcement, first line officers if possible, to provide exposure to community leaders and residents, as well as exposure and participation in the discussion.
- Could also include police training and police policy managers to expose them to the input so as to help the department determine how some community feedback can translate into recommendations for review, change, and improvement.
- Can include a short presentation on unconscious bias.
- Can include additional anonymous polling questions to set the stage and survey the participants on their views on issues of race, discrimination, privilege, and impact on local communities of color.
- Can include breakout groups to maximize participation.
- Breakout groups can be facilitated using local impartial volunteer facilitators.

## VI. Conclusion

In conclusion, CRS suggests that the three items proposed above as next steps be considered by local officials and law enforcement: 1) police presentations; 2) dialogues and working groups on homelessness and mental illness; and 3) community/resident dialogues and working groups on race. CRS can work with public officials to further discuss these items for consideration and fine tune these options as necessary, and or work with officials to build additional options to continue working with the Sacramento community.

CRS would like to thank all public officials from the City of Sacramento, Sacramento Police Department, and community participants for their work on this process.

---

<sup>i</sup> Pew Research Center, Police Views, Public Views by Rich Morin, Kim Parker, Renee Stepler, and Andrew Mercer. January 11, 2017.

<sup>ii</sup> Police-Community Relations Toolkit: Guide to Critical Issues in Policing. U.S. Department of Justice, Community Relations Service. <https://www.justice.gov/crs/file836416/download>

## Appendix 1

District and Date	1) What is something you believe the SPD is doing right or seems to be working?	2) What is the most pressing concern in the community in your district requiring critical attention?	3) What is the most pressing concern with the SPD requiring critical attention?	4) If training is a priority, what kind should be prioritized?	5) If policies are a priority, what would be a critical priority for the police to review?	6) Would you prefer a smaller, larger, or same size police presence in your police district?	7) Do you see police as enforcers, protectors, or both equally?	8) Deadly Black-Police encounters in Sacramento are: Isolated Incidents; or Signs of a Broader Problem.	9) Anti-police bias is a primary motive in recent protests: a great deal; some; not very much; or not at all.	10) Protests are motivated by a genuine desire to hold police accountable: a great deal; some; not much; not at all.
1 (7/11)	<b>Outreach 50%</b> ; Police presence 20%; Active Intervention and Activities to reduce crime 20%; Transparency 10%	<b>Homelessness and Mental Illness 40%</b> ; Less serious "petty" crime 30%; Bias in the Community 20%; More serious crime 10%	<b>Tactics 27%</b> ; <b>Understaffed 27%</b> ; Response Times 18%; Lack of diversity 9%; Transparency 9%; data collection 9%	<b>Tactics 40%</b> ; Customer Service 30%; Community policing/engagement 20%; Implicit bias and cultural competency 10%	<b>Use of force, de-escalation and non-lethal tactics 50%</b> ; procedures for dealing with mentally ill/disabilities communities 20%; data transparency 10%; body cam usage 10%; community policing, engagement, and building relationships and collaborations	<b>Larger 75%</b> ; No Change 25%	<b>Both 88%</b> ; Enforcers 13%	<b>Signs of a Broader Problem 88%</b> ; Isolated Incidents 13%	<b>Some 63%</b> ; a great deal 25%; not very much 13%	<b>a great deal 63%</b> ; some 38%
2 (7/12)	<b>Outreach 33%</b> ; <b>Communication Style 33%</b> ; Transparency efforts 17%; Active Interventions and activities to reduce crime 17%	<b>Homelessness and Mental Illness 67%</b> ; Less serious "petty" crime 17%; Bias in the community 17%	<b>All of the above 50%</b> (lack of diversity; transparency; <b>tactics</b> ; <b>understaffed</b> ; <b>other</b> ); transparency 17%; tactics 17%; understaffed 17%	<b>Dealing with the mentally ill/ disabilities community 50%</b> ; community policing/engagement, customer service 25%; tactics and strategy, de-escalation and non-lethal tools, implicit bias reduction, and cultural competency/ sensitivity 25%	<b>procedures for dealing with the mentally ill/ disabilities community 50%</b> ; use of force, de escalation, and non-lethal tactics 25%; community policing/ engagement, and building relationships and collaborations 25%	<b>Larger 75%</b> ; Smaller 25%	<b>Enforcers 50%</b> ; Protectors 25%; Both 25%	<b>Signs of a Broader Problem 75%</b> ; Isolated Incidents 25%	<b>Some 50%</b> ; not very much 25%; not at all 25%	<b>a great deal 75%</b> ; Not at all 25%
3 (6/14)	<b>Transparency Efforts 60%</b> ; Outreach 40%	[***This question was not asked***]	Mental health and self-care of officers 50%; Tactics (use of force, de-escalation, less lethal tools, communication, and developing strategy) 50% <b>MISSING %S</b>	<b>Community Engagement 20%</b> ; <b>Patience Tolerance 20%</b> ; <b>Dealing with the Mentally Ill/ Disabilities community 20%</b> ; <b>Tactics to Avoid Killing as Many People 20%</b> ; <b>Implicit Bias 20%</b>	[***This question was not asked***]	<b>No Change in Size 60%</b> ; Larger 40%	<b>Both 60%</b> ; Enforcers 40%	<b>Signs of a Broader Problem 60%</b> ; Isolated 40%	<b>Some 60%</b> ; a great deal 20%; Not Very Much 20%	<b>a great deal 100%</b>

## Appendix 1

4 (6/27)	<p><b>Outreach efforts to educate and connect with the community as well as solicit feedback (non-emergency activities to build relationships and get input, and problem solve) 56%</b>; Transparency efforts 33%; Communication style, empathy, and procedural justice by officers 11%.</p>	<p><b>Homelessness and mental illness 78%</b>; Less serious "petty" crime (illegal fireworks, bicycle theft, and other stolen property under \$1000, and minor property damage) 22%</p>	<p><b>Tactics (use of force, de-escalation, less lethal tools, communication, and developing strategy) 60%</b>; Lack of diversity 10%; Data collection 10%; Mental health and self care of officers 10%; competing interests (questionable loyalty, sense of entitlement, allegiance to themselves and the union, instead of allegiance to the community as a "guardian") 10%</p>	<p><b>Tactics, de-escalation, non-lethal tools 44%</b>; implicit bias, and cultural competency 33%; community engagement (non-emergency situations) 11%; Dealing with the mentally ill/ disabilities community 11%</p>	<p><b>De-escalation and non-lethal tactics 44%</b>; Body cam usage 33%; procedures for engaging the mentally ill/ disabilities community 11%; post-critical incident protocols 11%</p>	<p><b>Larger 70%</b>; No Change in Size 30%</p>	<p><b>Both Equally 40%</b>; Enforcers 30%; Protectors 30%</p>	<p><b>Signs of a Broader Problem 89%</b>; Isolated Incidents 11%</p>	<p><b>Some 78%</b>; A great deal 11%; Not very much 11%</p>	<p><b>A great deal 67%</b>; Some 22%; Not Much 11%</p>
5 (6/28)	<p><b>Outreach Efforts to Educate and connect with the Community 45%</b>; Transparency Efforts 35%; Police Presence to Deter Crime 12%; Active Interventions and Activities to Reduce Crime 8%</p>	<p><b>Homelessness and Mental Illness 50%</b>; More serious crime (assaults, prostitution, drugs, homicide, gangs, organized crime) 25%; protests and civil disobedience that disrupt the normal flow of life for residents 25%</p>	<p>Mental health and self care of officers 50%; <b>Tactics (use of force, de-escalation, less lethal tools, communication, and developing strategy) 50%</b></p>	<p><b>Tactics, de-escalation, non-lethal tools 50%</b>; Dealing with the mentally ill/ disabilities community 25%; implicit bias, and cultural competency 25%</p>	<p><b>De-escalation, and non-lethal tactics 75%</b>; Body cam usage 25%</p>	<p><b>Larger 75%</b>; No change in size 25%</p>	<p>Both 100%</p>	<p>Isolated Incidents 50%; <b>Signs of a Broader Problem 50%</b></p>	<p><b>A Great Deal 75%</b>; Some 25%</p>	<p>Some 100%</p>
6 (6/20)	<p><b>Outreach Efforts to Educate and connect with the Community 47%</b>; Transparency Efforts 29%; Police Presence to Deter Crime 18%; Active Interventions and Activities to Reduce Crime 6%</p>	<p>N/A (not asked)</p>	<p><b>Training of Officers 33%</b>; Police Response Times 22%; Police Policies 17%; Lack of Diversity Within the Police 11%; Crime 6%; Transparency of the Police 6%; Data Collection 6%</p>	<p><b>Tactics and Policies to Avoid Lethal Use of Force 45%</b>; Community Engagement 35%; Dealing with the Mentally Ill/ Disabilities Community</p>	<p><b>De-Escalation and Non-Lethal Tactics 76%</b>; Sharing Information about Police Activities in a Timely Way 24%</p>	<p><b>Larger 78%</b>; Smaller 17%; No Change 6%</p>	<p><b>Both 56%</b>; Enforcers 33%; Protectors 11%</p>	<p><b>Signs of a Broader Problem 76%</b>; Isolated Incidents 24%</p>	<p><b>A Great Deal 38%</b>; <b>Some 38%</b>; Not Very Much 19%; Not at All 6%</p>	<p><b>A Great Deal 73%</b>; Some 13%; Not Much 13%</p>