

**PUBLIC SAFETY
COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETING
APRIL 20, 2021
2:00 PM
VIDEOCONFERENCE**

Members Present:	Councilmember Melissa Cabello Havrda, <i>Chair, District 6</i> Councilmember Jada Andrews-Sullivan, <i>District 2</i> Councilmember Rebecca Viagran, <i>District 3</i> Councilmember Ana Sandoval, <i>District 7</i> Councilmember Clayton Perry, <i>District 10</i>
Members Absent:	None
Staff Present:	María Villagómez, <i>Deputy City Manager</i> ; Liz Provencio, <i>First Assistant City Attorney</i> ; William P. McManus, <i>Chief of Police</i> ; Jim Kopp, <i>Assistant City Attorney</i> ; Thomas Filopoulos, <i>Assistant City Attorney</i> ; Karen Falks, <i>Deputy Chief, SAPD</i> ; Michael Starnes, <i>Captain, SAPD</i> ; Hector Salas, <i>Captain, SAPD</i> ; Anthony Maziek, <i>Captain, SAPD</i> ; Robert Blanton, <i>Chief of Staff, SAPD</i> ; Richard Riley, <i>Assistant Police Director, SAPD</i> ; Laura Mayes, <i>Assistant Director, Government and Public Affairs</i> ; Berta Rodriguez, <i>Government and Public Affairs</i> ;
Others Present:	Rob Tillyer, PhD, <i>Professor and Associate Dean for Graduate Student Success, UTSA</i> ; Michael Smith JD, PhD, <i>Professor and Chair, Department of Criminal Justice</i> ; Chris Tatham, <i>CEO, ETC Institute</i>

Call to order

Chairwoman Cabello Havrda called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of minutes from the Public Safety Committee meeting on March 24, 2021

Councilmember Andrews-Sullivan moved to approve the minutes of the March 24, 2021 Public Safety Council Committee Meeting. Councilmember Sandoval seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment

Written Testimony

There were no written comments submitted.

Live Testimony

There were no citizens registered to speak.

Items for Consideration

2. Briefing and Possible Action on the results of the Police Services Scientific Survey conducted by ETC Institute. [Jeff Coyle, Assistant City Manager; Laura Mayes, Assistant Director, Government and Public Affairs]

Chris Tatham reported that the survey was conducted from February 15 – March 19, 2021 and an address-based on random samples selected from each of the City's 10 Council Districts. He stated that the survey was administered by mail, phone and online in English and Spanish and the goal was to obtain 100 surveys from each Council District. He noted that a total of 1,150 surveys were completed with at least 100 completed in each Council District. He indicated that the overall results had a precision of at least +/- 2.8% at the 95% level of confidence. He added that the ETC Institute administered the survey to a random sample of at least 100 residents in the Texas cities with populations above 500,000 of Dallas, Austin, Fort Worth, El Paso and Houston.

Mr. Tatham reviewed the physical and demographic distribution of the results of the survey. He stated that the first survey question was "overall, how satisfied were you with the work of SAPD?". He reported that the findings revealed that the percentage who were satisfied or very satisfied was 63% or more in all 10 Council Districts. He reviewed the percentages of residents who were satisfied or very satisfied with the work of the Police Department in the six largest cities in Texas.

Mr. Tatham reported that the second survey questions were "how safe do you feel in your neighborhood during the day" and "how safe do you feel in your neighborhood at night?". He stated that the findings revealed that most people in the City felt safe in their neighborhoods, both during the day and at night. He reviewed the results to the same survey questions in other Texas cities with the City of San Antonio receiving the highest percentage of residents who reported feeling very safe or safe in their neighborhood during the day and the City of San Antonio receiving the second highest percentage of residents who reported feeling very safe or safe in their neighborhood at night.

Mr. Tatham stated that the third major finding was that although most residents felt safe, there were some areas in the City where residents did not feel safe. He reported that more than 70% of the respondents reported feeling very safe or safe at night in Council Districts 8, 9, and 10 and fewer than 50% of the respondents reported feeling very safe or safe at night in Council Districts 3, and 4.

Mr. Tatham reported that the fourth survey question was "How do you think the visibility of Police in your neighborhood should change?". He noted that the findings revealed that 42% of respondents thought that the visibility of Police in neighborhoods should stay about the same and 45% of respondents thought that the visibility of Police in neighborhoods should be increased. He stated that residents who did not feel safe wanted the Police to be more visible in their neighborhoods. He reviewed the percentages of residents who thought that the visibility of Police in their neighborhood should be greatly increased or increased in the six largest cities in Texas.

Mr. Tatham stated that the fifth major finding was that the majority of residents were willing to have SAPD share some of its current responsibilities with other City agencies.

Mr. Tatham noted that a dashboard was created to have the data as transparent as possible. Government and Public Affairs Assistant Director Laura Mayes stated that during community meetings staff would present the data and get more qualitative data.

Chairwoman Cabello Havrda asked if feedback was received from the public following release of the study findings. Deputy City Manager Maria Villagomez stated that feedback was received in terms of what was more important in each district, and questions were received on why a scientific survey was utilized instead of a convenience survey.

Councilmember Viagran asked of the definition of why individuals felt safe or unsafe and asked if there was an area for individuals to discuss that. Mr. Tatham stated that an appendix was prepared and included open ended questions and answers and was organized by Council District.

Councilmember Andrews-Sullivan expressed concern that the data did not reflect the sentiments in the community. Ms. Mayes noted that quality of life issues were reported in the answers to the open ended questions. Councilmember Andrews-Sullivan asked what officer category did individuals want to see more of. Ms. Villagomez stated that individuals wanted to see more Police Officers on the street and more community engagement between Police Officers and the neighborhoods.

Councilmember Sandoval asked for the percentage of individuals who had interfaced with SAPD. Ms. Villagomez stated that 44% of the individuals had interacted with SAPD; 54% had not; and 2% did not remember. Councilmember Sandoval asked of concerns raised regarding interaction with SAPD. Ms. Mayes stated that the top three concerns were loss of trust, previous experiences and response times.

Councilmember Viagran asked if there was an open ended question which asked why individuals felt safe. Ms. Villagomez stated that there was not but the question could be asked when interacting with residents in the next couple of months.

Councilmember Perry asked if a selection for “leave as is: was added to the survey in response regarding duties and responsibilities of the Police. Ms. Villagomez replied that it was not.

No action was required for Item 2.

3. Briefing and possible action on results of a review of Police calls for service. [Dr. Michael Smith and Dr. Rod Tillyer, Professors of Criminology and Criminal Justice in the College for Health, Community and Policy at UTSA]

Professor Rob Tillyer reported that the City had been engaged in a discussion of reviewing Police services since the summer of 2020. He stated that the project goal was to provide an empirical analysis of SAPD’s response to calls for service (both emergency and non-emergency) to assist City leadership and other stakeholders in deciding which, if any, calls could be assigned to non-Police personnel or to a co-response by Police and other service providers.

Professor Tillyer stated that they worked collaboratively with SAPD to access calls for service data and to understand the dispatch process and protocols. He noted that they had several meetings with SAPD, visited the Call Center and were provided access to all training materials for call takers and dispatchers. He indicated that data was provided from several internal SAPD data repositories and combined into a single dataset for analysis.

Professor Tillyer noted that the data represented calls for service incidents received by SAPD between January 2018 and October 2020. He stated that over four million records were identified with 3,090,823 unique incidents analyzed.

Professor Tillyer reported that all incidents were categorized in three ways: 1) Call type; 2) Priority category; and 3) Response code. He reviewed the resources required to address the incidents: 1) Number of Police units dispatched; 2) Response time; and 3) Time on scene. He stated that the definitions for incident disposition included: 1) Cleared – a written report was taken by SAPD Officers; and 2) No official report was made.

Professor Tillyer reviewed the calls for service by year, by day of the week, by hour of day and by priority category. He reported that the results included:

- Distribution across Council Districts and SAPD organizational units
 - Council Districts 1, 2, and 5 represented the majority of requests with relative equal distribution across SAPD organizational units.
- Call type and priority categories
 - Priority 4 and 7 incidents were most common; priority 1 incidents represented less than 0.5%.
- Police resources applied in response (i.e., units dispatched, effort time and dispositions)
 - Slightly more than 50% of all incidents received a single unit response.
 - SAPD spent 40 minutes on scene, on average.
 - 80% of all incidents were resolved without an official written report.
- Special focus was placed on priority 4-7 (Response Code 1) incidents to evaluate Police resources applied to these situations.
- These were prioritized due to the possibility that some may have been good candidates for a non-Police response.
- Using this lens, a sub-set of call types were identified by the City Manager's Office, SAPD and the research team.
- Four indicators were reported for selected call types within this sub-set of calls:
 - Number of incidents
 - % of 1-unit dispatches
 - Time on scene
 - % cleared

Professor Michael Smith reported selected results of the study and provided the following conclusions to the analysis:

- Takeaways:
 - Certain call types (e.g. barking dog, loud music) rarely resulted in an official report being taken, were often dispatched to a single Officer, and were handled relatively quickly.
 - The call types may be amenable to a response by non-sworn Police.
 - Current categorization of call types and priority categories should be reviewed to ensure accuracy and logical consistency.
- Considerations/limitations
 - Current data was based on what occurred when an Officer was dispatched; it was not clear what would have happened if the incident received a different response.
 - Transfer of response to another City unit/department would require resources, training and oversight to maintain responsiveness to resident needs.

Chairwoman Cabello Havrda asked if the survey findings matched the results of the sample survey. Professor Smith stated that this was an inductively conducted study which was not theory driven. He noted

that they started with the empirical question of what was the distribution and array of calls for service received by SAPD.

Councilmember Sandoval requested a glossary of what the priorities (1-7) meant and what was included in them. Professor Smith stated that an appendix in the report listed the priority categories and the types of calls that fall into each of those categories and the response codes associated with them.

Councilmember Andrews-Sullivan asked if staff had looked at how the data from this review overlapped with the Police survey that was just completed. Ms. Villagomez stated that staff would review once the community engagement process was completed. She added that the recommended goals would be brought before the Committee in June or August 2021.

Councilmember Viagran asked if calls made to substations were included. Professor Smith stated that they were not included.

Chairwoman Cabello Havrda asked what the original research question was. Professor Smith stated that the original research question was if there were potential call types that we could help the City identify as amenable or appropriate for a non-sworn Police response. She asked what the recommendations were that were extracted from the data to put into practical use. Ms. Villagomez stated that this would be discussed in June 2021.

No action was required for Item 3.

- 4. Briefing and possible action on amending the “Park Safety Zone” ordinance that prohibit all registered sex offenders from a) entering any City park (with certain limited exceptions), b) loitering within 300 feet of a City park, or c) establishing a residence within 1,000 feet of a City park to include areas close to schools.** [Maria Villagomez, Deputy City Manager; William P. McManus, Chief of Police]

Chief of Police William McManus reported that the current Park Safety Zone Ordinance was approved by the City Council in December 2013. He noted that violation of the Ordinance was a Class C Misdemeanor for a person required to register as a sex offender to have a temporary or permanent residence within 1,000 feet of a park, or to enter or come within 300 feet of a City park. He indicated that the residence and park restriction did not include most of the Riverwalk on the street level and there were exceptions for those attending official meetings and voting. He stated that affirmative defenses included that the person lived at the location prior to enactment and the Chief of Police could grant an exemption.

Chief McManus stated that the SAPD Sex Offender Registration Detail (SORD) was responsible for the registration of persons subject to Texas Code of Criminal Procedure Chapter 62: Sex Offender Registration Program and for enforcing registration requirements. He noted that two Officers were responsible for the registration of offenders, updating the Department of Public Safety (DPS) website and providing notifications to school district administrators. He indicated that three Detectives were responsible for monitoring registrants through home visits to ensure compliance and filing cases against registrants who failed to comply with Chapter 62 requirements. He reported that the SORD monitored approximately 2,900 registered sex offenders.

Chief McManus reported that on March 29, 2021, SAPD in coordination with Education Service Center Region 20, hosted a meeting with area school districts to discuss:

- Sex offender registration requirements
- SORD role and responsibilities
- School outreach and coordination
- Data and information sharing
- Existing Ordinance and possible amendments

Chief McManus stated that the potential Ordinance amendment would expand the residency restriction for registered sex offenders to include schools. He noted that the City may not limit places where sex offenders could live as to effectively prohibit offenders from living within the City limits.

Chief McManus reported that the next steps included:

- SAPD would seek input from the Committee
- Continued coordination with schools
- Review other similar Ordinances in Texas and understand enforcement
- Bring a recommended draft Ordinance to the Committee for further discussion and possible action

Chief McManus noted that the amendment to the current Ordinance would provide another tool for law enforcement.

Chairwoman Cabello Havrda stated that she would like to see an innovated way to enforce restrictions.

Councilmember Viagran asked if the proposed amendment to the Ordinance would encompass public schools or all schools. Chief McManus stated that all schools would be included. Councilmember Viagran stated that the City needed to make sure that when parents were leaving their children at school, that they could feel a sense of peace knowing the sex offenders were prohibited from the area and surrounding area.

Councilmember Andrews-Sullivan asked how many registry violations had currently occurred in the City. Chief McManus stated that he could provide the data for 2020. Councilmember Andrews-Sullivan requested that the data be provided to all members of the Committee.

Councilmember Sandoval asked if any permanent exemptions had been made. Chief McManus stated that he had only issued temporary exemptions. Captain Anthony Maziek stated that there were two juvenile offenders who lived with their parents and they were given permanent exemptions. Councilmember Sandoval requested a map of potential restricted areas with a higher resolution. Chief McManus stated that he would provide that.

Chairwoman Cabello Havrda requested that more engagement be held with the school districts. Ms. Villagomez stated that staff would continue their work and come back to the Committee with a proposed Ordinance.

No action was required for Item 4.

5. Briefing and possible action on a San Antonio Police Department grant application to the Texas Department of Transportation for the Click It or Ticket Selective Traffic Enforcement Program in the amount of \$35,000. [Maria Villagomez, Deputy City Manager; William P. McManus, Chief of Police]

Chief McManus stated that the goals of the Click It or Ticket Program included:

- Increase enforcement of traffic safety related regulations
- Reduce fatal and serious injury crashes
- Increase occupant restraint usage in all passenger vehicles and trucks
- Increase public education and information campaigns

Chief McManus reported that the Click It or Ticket (CIOT) Wave 2 was the second CIOT Grant the department applied for this fiscal year. He noted that the grant solicitation was released on March 29, 2021 and the application deadline was April 21, 2021. He stated that the amount of funding for the grant was \$35,000 with no cash match required. He indicated that the funds would be used for seatbelt and child safety seat enforcement.

Councilmember Andrews-Sullivan moved to recommend and forward the item to the City Council for consideration on May 13, 2021. Councilmember Viagran seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of items for future meetings

There were no items considered for future meetings.

Adjourn

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 pm.

Melissa Cabello Havrda, Chair

Respectfully Submitted

Denice F. Trevino, Office of the City Clerk