I. MINUTES
   1. Approval of Directors’ minutes from May 7, 2018

II. ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

III. CITY CLERK

IV. MAYOR’S OFFICE

V. DIRECTORS CORRESPONDENCE
   PLANNING
   1. Administrative Approvals from May 1, 2018 through May 7, 2018
   2. Action dated May 9, 2018
   3. Final Action dated May 9, 2018

VI. BOARDS/COMMITTEES/COMMISSION REPORTS
   1. MAC - Shobe (05.08.18)
   2. BOH - Shobe (05.08.18)
   3. PAC - Lamm, Shobe, Raybould (05.11.18)
   4. PBC - Raybould, Camp (05.08.18)

VII. CONSTITUENT CORRESPONDENCE
   1. Proposed JPA, opposition - Clarice Bailey
   2. Cardboard Ban in the Landfill - John Love
      Staff response provided by Angie Birkett, City Council Office
   3. Proposed Porter Ridge Krueger project, opposition - Mike Fine
   4. Proposed Porter Ridge Krueger project, opposition - Sarah Duer
   5. Proposed JPA, opposition - David Oenbring
   6. Proposed Porter Ridge Krueger project, opposition - Doug & Marsha Gerlach
   7. Proposed MOU, opposition - Rose Godinez
   8. Proposed Porter Ridge Krueger project, opposition - Dr. Julie Skrabal
   9. Proposed JPA, opposition - David Field
   10. Proposed JPA, opposition - Carol Miller
   11. Proposed JPA, opposition - Dave Bauer
   12. Proposed JPA, opposition - Deb Portz

VIII. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS
      See invitation list.

IX. ADJOURNMENT
Memorandum

Date:   May 7, 2018
To:     City Clerk
From:   Amy Huffman, Planning Dept.
Re:     Administrative Approvals
cc:     Planning Commission
         Geri Rorabaugh, Planning Dept.

This is a list of the administrative approvals by the Planning Director from May 1, 2018 through May 7, 2018:

Administrative Amendment No. 18018, to Special Permit No. 1464, Folsom Ridge, approved by the Planning Director on May 2, 2018, to amend the site plan to show a new clubhouse and maintenance building, generally located at S. Folsom Street and Folsom Lane.
**ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION**

NOTICE: The Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, May 9, 2018, at 1:00 p.m. in Hearing Room 112 on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St., Lincoln, Nebraska. For more information, call the Planning Department, (402) 441-7491.

**PLEASE NOTE:** The Planning Commission action is final action on any item with a notation of “FINAL ACTION”. Any aggrieved person may appeal Final Action of the Planning Commission to the City Council or County Board by filing a Notice of Appeal with the City Clerk or County Clerk within 14 days following the action of the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission action on all other items is a recommendation to the City Council or County Board.

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2018

[All Commissioners present; Commissioner Finnegan left at 2:52 p.m.; Commissioner Hove left at 3:33 p.m.]

Approval of minutes of the regular meeting held April 25, 2018. **APPROVED: 9-0.**

1. CONSENT AGENDA
   (Public Hearing and Administrative Action):

   ANNEXATION AND RELATED CHANGE OF ZONE:

   1.1a Annexation No. 18002, to annex approximately 33.56 acres, more or less, on property generally located at NW 48th Street and West Holdrege Street.
   Staff recommendation: Approval
   Staff Planner: Rachel Jones, 402-441-7603, rjones@lincoln.ne.gov
   This application was removed from the Consent Agenda and had separate public hearing. Planning Commission recommendation: APPROVAL; 9-0. Public hearing before the City Council is tentatively scheduled for Monday, June 4, 2018, 3:00 p.m.
1.1b Change of Zone No. 07063C, from AG (Agricultural District) to R-3 (Residential District) PUD (Planned Unit Development), on approximately 42.05 acres, more or less, on property generally located at NW 48th Street and West Holdrege Street.

**Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval**

Staff Planner: Rachel Jones, 402-441-7603, rjones@lincoln.ne.gov

This application was removed from the Consent Agenda and had separate public hearing. Planning Commission recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated May 1, 2018; 9-0. Public hearing before the City Council is tentatively scheduled for Monday, June 4, 2018, 3:00 p.m.

**SPECIAL PERMITS:**

1.2 Special Permit No. 1989C, to amend Special Permit 1989B for Planned Service Commercial to expand the boundary, and a waiver to reduce an internal setback to 0 feet, on property generally located at South 27th Street and Kendra Lane.

**Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval**

Staff Planner: Dessie Redmond, 402-441-6373, dredmond@lincoln.ne.gov

This application was removed from the Consent Agenda and had separate public hearing. Planning Commission recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated May 1, 2018; 9-0. Public hearing before the City Council is tentatively scheduled for Monday, June 4, 2018, 3:00 p.m.

1.3 Special Permit No. 1906B, to extend the allowed height for a personal wireless facility (cell tower), on property generally located at 2601 North 70th Street.

**FINAL ACTION**

**Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval**

Staff Planner: Brian Will, 402-441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov

Planning Commission ‘final action’: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated March 22, 2018: 9-0. Resolution No. PC-01601

2. **REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL:**

2.1 Text Amendment No. 18006, to amend Sections 27.06.180 and 27.62.150 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to allow outdoor vehicle storage as a conditional use in the I-1 (Industrial District), and repealing said sections as hitherto existing.

**Staff recommendation: Approval**

Staff Planner: Rachel Jones, 402-441-7603, rjones@lincoln.ne.gov

Planning Commission granted the applicant’s request for a 2-week deferral, with PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION is scheduled for May 23, 2018.

3. **ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA:** See Items 1.1a, 1.1b, and 1.2.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION:**

**CHANGE OF ZONE:**

4.1 Change of Zone No. 18010, from B-1 (Local Business) and R-2 (Residential) to B-3 (Commercial), on property generally located at 11751 "A" and 1425 South 118th Streets, and from B-1 to R-2, on property generally located at 11818 "A" Street.

**Staff recommendation:** Conditional Approval

**Staff Planner:** Tom Cajka, 402-441-5662, tcajka@lincoln.ne.gov

**Planning Commission recommendation:** CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated April 26, 2018; 9-0. Public hearing before the City Council on this application and the associated zoning agreement is tentatively scheduled for Monday, June 4, 2018, 3:00 p.m.

**PERMITS:**

4.2a Special Permit No. 1629H, to allow a waiver to parking requirements, on property generally located at S. 27th Street and Pine Lake Road.

**Staff recommendation:** Conditional Approval

**Staff Planner:** Dessie Redmond, 402-441-6373, dredmond@lincoln.ne.gov

**Planning Commission recommendation:** CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the REVISED staff report dated May 1, 2018; 6-1 (Joy dissenting; Finnegan and Hove absent). Public hearing before the City Council is pending at this time per applicant’s request.

4.2b Use Permit No. 100C, to replace three office/medical lots with two mixed use buildings, including waivers for parking, building height, uses within a rear yard setback, minimum lot area, and lighting, on property generally located at South 27th Street and Pine Lake Road.

**Staff recommendation:** Conditional Approval

**Staff Planner:** Dessie Redmond, 402-441-6373, dredmond@lincoln.ne.gov

**Planning Commission recommendation:** DENIAL, as set forth in the REVISED staff report dated May 1, 2018; 6-1 (Harris dissenting; Finnegan and Hove absent). Public hearing before the City Council is pending at this time per applicant’s request.

**AT THIS TIME, ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK ON AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA, MAY DO SO**

* * * * * * * * * *

Adjournment: 4:13 p.m.

**PENDING LIST:** None
TO: Mayor Chris Beutler
   Lincoln City Council

FROM: Geri Rorabaugh, Planning

DATE: May 9, 2018

RE: Notice of final action by Planning Commission: May 9, 2018

Please be advised that on May 9, 2018, the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission adopted the following resolution:

Resolution No. PC-01601, approving SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 1906B, to extend the allowed height for a personal wireless facility (cell tower), on property legally described as Lot 5, Harland Taylor 2nd Addition, located in the NE 1/4 of Section 16-10-7, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, generally located at 2601 North 70th Street.

The Planning Commission action on these applications is final, unless appealed to the City Council by filing a notice of appeal with the City Clerk within 14 days of the action by the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission Resolution may be accessed on the internet at www.lincoln.ne.gov (Keyword = PATS). Use the “Search Selection" screen and search by application number (i.e. SP1906B). The Resolution and Planning Department staff report are in the "Related Documents” under the application number.
Upon reading, and hearing, pro's and con's for the JPA, my husband and I are again saying please vote NO for setting up a JPA. There was an article in yesterday's paper by Nancy Hicks and Margaret Reist addressing both sides: AGAINST: "The city has "promised" to reduce the city levy by a half-cent in the next two-year budget, BUT, there is no GUARANTEE after the first year." And, "The school board members have said they will TRY to reduce their levy by half-cent. BUT, there is no GUARANTEE after next year". FOR: Good reasons were given BUT, it stated "School resource officers CAN receive up to 30 percent of the JPA revenue, BUT there is no GUARANTEE that the JPA HAS to provide the resource officer program with any funding. The mental health components, also have NO GUARANTEE of funding." The last paragraph read: "However, the community learning centers ARE GUARANTEED at least 40 percent of the JPA funding, and there is NO CAP on funding so the CLC's could receive ALL the annual JPA revenue. Again, please vote and believe there is much more discussion to be had. Clarice Bailey
Good Afternoon John,

It was a pleasure to visit with you regarding your questions about the cardboard ban in the landfill.

The link below will provide additional information relating to the corrugated cardboard disposal ban. Through this link, there is also information on the grants & rebates I briefly mentioned. I’m including Donna Garden, Assistant Director, Public Works and Utilities, as I’m confident she will assist you and your business in implementing a recycling program to meet your needs. She is also a great source should you desire more information on the grants and rebates program.


Should Donna Garden or Councilman Camp need to speak with you directly regarding your concern they can reach you at 402-540-6960.

Thank you for contacting the office of the Lincoln City Council.

Angie Birkett  
Office Coordinator  
Lincoln City Council  
555 South 10th St., Ste 111  
Lincoln, NE 68508  
Phone 402-441-6867  
Fax 402-441-6533  
adirkett@lincoln.ne.gov
City Council - Contact

Date: 5/7/2018 2:19:09 PM

name: John Love
address: 7914 Hunters Ridge Road
city: Lincoln
state: NE
zip: 68516
e-mail: john.love@bmlfh.com

comments: My name is John Love. I am in Councilman Jon Camp’s District and I have questions concerning the “Cardboard Ban in the Landfill”. I would appreciate a phone call back. Thank you.

IP: 72.46.49.169
Form: https://lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; WOW64; Trident/7.0; rv:11.0) like Gecko
Dear Mr. Cary/City Council Members, I would like to voice my opposition to the development of apartment buildings on south 29th street between Anytime Fitness and the Porter Ridge Townhouses. First, the height variances that are proposed do not seem reasonable in relation to what is considered accommodating to a nice neighborhood in a suburban area. The apartments should be in more of a urban setting. Having the apartments will impede on the aesthetics of Port Ridge.

Second, the traffic congestion, now that there is a daycare there, will be very unpleasant for those that live in Porter Ridge and use 29th street extensively. Need to take into consideration the amount children that play in the area, the visitors that shop in that area and the privacy of the Porter Ridge Townhouse occupants.

I hope the planning commission and city council will give this great consideration. I and many others, do not think this is a reasonable area for apartment development. I am sure Krueger, with their vast resources can achieve their goals in a more suitable area within Lincoln. Please keep in mind this is a suburban area, not urban. Urban area would be more reasonable for apartment development.

The people in Porter Ridge take great pride in their neighborhood.

Thank you kindly for allowing me to voice my opposition to this proposed project.

Thank you,

Mike Fine
3120 Katelyn Lane
Lincoln, NE 68516
Ph: 402-326-1821
Email: mfine@windstream.net
Jane Raybould,

Good Afternoon, I wanted to write to express my strong concerns and OPPOSE the proposed Krueger development (4 & 5 story mixed use buildings) to be located off S. 29th Street between Anytime Fitness & the Porter Ridge Townhome Association.

Permit #100C; Special Permit #1629H

1. The proposal Krueger is making will certainly not keep with the aesthetics in the area. This is an established residential neighborhood and what is being proposed with the number of buildings (4), the building height with apartments (4 & 5 stories), underground parking, pool etc.. is completely inappropriate for this area & the small parcel of land available.

2. When several of us purchased our townhomes we knew we were backing up to a commercial area, however the buildings are low profile. We were advised/under the impression that the undeveloped area may someday include 1-2 addl. commercial buildings of the same size & style.

3. The height variance Krueger is proposing will be excessive & intrusive. This would affect our quality of life as well as our property values immensely. I.e. who would want to purchase a $200k townhome and look out the back window and see several floors of apartments?

4. The traffic in the alley/access road (between U Stop & Anytime Fitness) as well as the traffic on Porter Ridge Rd. are already very congested. Mixed use buildings would obviously dramatically increase the traffic further.

5. Why can't Krueger build 1-2 more commercial buildings similar to what they've already built (low profile)?

6. This is a small/narrow parcel of land. We don't have much green space in the area, thus several people will walk/play with their dogs in this area, several people will exercise in this area. Suggestion: maybe Krueger can do something positive for the neighborhood and develop this small area into a park for the community and build their mixed use buildings in another area better suited (Haymarket etc..).

Please listen, understand and relate to what the residents in this neighborhood are stating/feeling regarding this proposed development.

Thank You,
Sarah Duer (2812 Porter Ridge)
I'm writing to express my opposition to the formation of a JPA or any other entity or arrangement that creates a new level of bureaucracy or taxation. Lincoln residents already suffer excessively high property taxes. The JPA or Inter-local agreement does not improve accountability or transparency but rather it further conceals and obfuscates. We have more than enough government already. We have way too much taxation. It’s well past time to put and end to this nonsense. I urge you all to vote no to any JPA or inter local agreement. The city and the schools have amble budget of their own to improve school safety.
To: Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Commission

From: Doug and Marsha Gerlach 2834 Porter Ridge Rd., Lincoln NE 68516

RE: Applications with Use Permit #100C and Special Permit #1629H

We are writing to you to voice our opposition for the requested waivers from Krueger Development and to ask that you deny the application/amendments to Use permit #100C and Special Permit # 1629H of South Ridge Village.

As homeowners of the townhouse at 2834 Porter Ridge Road, we would be directly behind the proposed 5 story mixed use buildings and would be negatively impacted by this proposed project. We do not feel that the application submitted by Krueger reflected the serious concerns that we have as homeowners.

Waivers requested in the application and our concerns include:

1. Additional height request to 65 feet. This additional height variance would have a grave impact on our quality of life. We purchased our home in 2006 knowing that the land behind us was zoned for commercial office space and we were led to believe that the buildings that were to be built directly behind us would be similar to the current buildings in the area.

We would have residents living on the 2nd, 3rd and 4 story apartments looking directly into and down into our bedroom windows, deck and patio 24x7.

The height of the buildings would look completely out of place with everything in this area and have a negative impact the value and re-sale of our home.

The trees (screening) that Krueger notes in the application does not show the actual height of the trees that they have planted, or could plant that would screen the 5 story buildings. When speaking with Krueger at the information meeting all of the trees shown on their drawings are 4-5 stories high. They told us they knew they
were not accurate and they could add more trees to help screen, but they would be about the same height as what is already there. It is impossible for them to plant anything that could screen the 5 story buildings.

Most of our townhomes do not sit as high as shown on the Krueger drawings in their application. The townhouse shown in their drawings is at the top of the hill on 29th and Porter Ridge Rd. We would like to invite you to our home at any time to see our view. We will make arrangements to meet everyone’s schedules.

2. Krueger is requesting that the balconies of some of these apartments extend into the setback area. If the building is too wide to fit the plot of land then it is not acceptable to have them encroach into the setback and have the residents of the apartments even closer. The narrow and extremely tall 5 story building is not appropriate for this piece of land. Krueger should adhere to the current commercial zoned property.

3. Krueger is asking to reduce commercial parking to 1 stall per 300 square feet and 1.5 per apartment. The height of this 5 story apartment building (100-1 bedroom apartments and 35 2- bedroom) would mean more traffic in what is already a very small, high traffic alley. They would need more parking than what is proposed and we have attached pictures to show what parking currently looks like at various times of the day. (See attachments 1 & 2) The only place that residents or their visitors of the 5 story (135 apartments) would be able to park would be on 29th street or Porter Ridge Road. Krueger stated that the parking lot by Anytime Fitness is underutilized but we have also attached pictures showing that as well. (See attachment 3) Both of those streets are already extremely high traffic. We also worry that this will cause a safety concerns for not only us living on Porter Ridge but the residents of the apartments. The excessive traffic and side street parking would make it difficult for fire trucks and other emergency vehicles to respond.

We would like to request that the city planning commission does a traffic study of the alley, 29th Street and Porter Ridge Rd. before any consideration is made. The alley has very high traffic at this time with Starbucks and the U-Stop being on both sides of the alley. The alley has semis and large trucks delivering products daily to the current businesses. (See attachment 4 & 5) Krueger noted in their application that they added stops signs, but that will not reduce traffic concerns. The additional 200+ vehicles from the residents of the apartments, plus the businesses leasing the office space will cause great safety concerns. The alley is not adequate to service the proposed mixed use building.

We respectfully ask that you give careful consideration to this very serious decision, as it will affect many homeowners in the Porter Ridge area.

Thank you,
Doug & Marsha Gerlach (2834 Porter Ridge Road)
Dear Mayor Beutler,

Thank you for your continued work in school safety. We are incredibly thankful for these important conversations. Attached please find a courtesy copy of the letter we are sending to the Lincoln City Council and School Board specifying our opposition to the proposed MOU.

If you have any questions, concerns or just need additional information, please do not hesitate in contacting me at rgodinez@aclunebraska.org or (402) 476-8091 ext. 105.

Kind regards,

Rose Godinez
(Pronouns: She/Her/Hers)
Legal and Policy Counsel | ACLU of Nebraska
134 S. 13th St. #1010, Lincoln, NE 68508
■ 402.476.8091 x105 ■ rgodinez@aclunebraska.org

www.aclunebraska.org

This message may contain information that is confidential or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately advise the sender by reply E-mail that this message has been inadvertently transmitted to you and delete this E-mail from your system.
May 8, 2018

Lanny Boswell
School Board President
Lincoln School Board
5000 South 63rd Street
Lincoln, NE 68516

RE: Agenda Item 7.2- Opposition to Lincoln Safe and Successful Kids Interlocal Cooperation Agreement

Dear Honorable School Board Members:

For over 50 years in Nebraska, the ACLU has worked in courts, legislatures, and communities to protect the constitutional and individual rights of all people. With a nationwide network of offices and millions of members and supporters, we take up the toughest civil liberties fights. Beyond one person, party, or side — we the people dare to create a more perfect union.

The ACLU of Nebraska is committed to challenging the “school-to-prison pipeline,” a disturbing national trend wherein children are funneled out of public schools and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems. Many of these children have learning disabilities or histories of poverty, abuse, or neglect, and would benefit from additional educational and counseling services, but instead, they are isolated, punished, and pushed out. The ACLU of Nebraska believes that children should be educated, not incarcerated. We are working to challenge numerous policies and practices within public school systems and the juvenile justice system that contribute to the school-to-prison pipeline.

We do not take a position for or against the various options presented as part of the interlocal agreement, JPA, or other options for funding and governance but we do write in general opposition to SROs and expansion of SROs in the most recent proposals as documented in our prior communications. However, we do appreciate that the SRO program in our community is longstanding and it is unlikely to be entirely disbanded at this juncture.¹

¹ While we understand your need to provide a quick response to a national tragedy, it is important to note that just .2% of all U.S. public schools reported an incident involving a school-related shooting and .1% of all schools reported a school-related homicide involving a student, faculty member or staff member. Dept’ of Educ. Office for Civil Rights, 2015-2016 Civil Rights Data Collection: School Climate and Safety, available at https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/school-climate-and-safety.pdf.
Still, we encourage you to invest further into mental health services and restorative strategies for youthful misbehavior in schools. If the SRO program is maintained or expanded we do write with strong support for a robust and comprehensive MOU as an important safeguard to prevent the funneling of students, in particular students of color, disabled students, and students who identify as LGBTQ, into the school-to-prison pipeline.

First, we want to extend deep gratitude to School Board member Barb Baier for starting this conversation and elevating this solution and conducting important community outreach. We would also like to extend our gratitude to Councilpersons Raybould and Shobe for extending similar professional courtesies and working hard to listen and be responsive to community concerns expressed by the ACLU, NAACP, and other community members and leaders. We are also deeply grateful to the families that have bravely shared their stories detailing how the SRO program has impacted their children.

In looking at the most recent draft of the MOU posted online we do appreciate that it covers many important topics but still lacks important details in many areas based upon proven models and best practices utilized in other communities.

For example:

1) **SRO Training.**

*Section 1(4)* - “To employ best efforts so that SROs and LPS staff have access to appropriate training on effective strategies to work with students that align with program goals;”

*Section 1(5)* - “To employ best efforts so that all students are treated impartially and without bias by SROs and LPS staff in alignment with applicable City and LPS equity policies;”

This provision does not specify what trainings SROs will attend or be required to complete prior to being placed in a school or as part of continuing education. Best practice is for SROs to be invited to school district trainings, so they can understand the preventative and support programs and practices offered by the school and community. Additionally, there should be a pre-service training minimum hour requirement and annual hour requirement specifying the required training areas, i.e., child and adolescent development and psychology, positive behavioral interventions and support, conflict resolution, peer mediation, children with disabilities or special needs, and cultural competency/anti-bias.
2) Defining School Discipline.

Section 2(3) - “SRO should not act as a school disciplinarian. LPS staff should not involve SROs in disputes that are related to issues of school discipline...”
This provision could either define “school discipline” here or define it by reference to a school policy or state statute. We request that the parties list acts that are solely “school discipline” and for which an SRO should never be involved.

3) Include Notification to Parents Provision.

Section 2(6) - the second version of the MOU read “LPS will provide discipline notification to parents consistent with LPS policies set forth in the LPS Important Information Handbook.”
This provision should remain part of the MOU.

4) Interviews by SROs and Collection of Evidence.

Section 2(4) - "SROs should not be asked by LPS staff to interview students or collect evidence solely for LPS disciplinary purposes."
We request that the parties include additional language regarding SROs’ authority to conduct interviews, collect evidence, and place limitations on the use of force and mechanical restraints except as a last resort when there is risk of serious harm.
Sample model language:
- Absent a real and immediate threat to student, teacher or public safety, a SRO may conduct or participate in a search of a student's person, possessions, or locker only where there is probable cause to believe that the search will turn up evidence that the child has committed or is committing a criminal offense.
  - The SRO shall inform school administrators prior to conducting a probable cause search where practicable.
- Absent a real and immediate threat to student, teacher, or public safety, a SRO may question or participate in the questioning of a student about conduct that could expose the child to court-involvement or arrest only after informing the child of his or her Miranda rights and only in the presence of the child's parent or guardian.
- Absent a real and immediate threat to student, teacher, or public safety, a school official shall not ask a SRO to be present or participate in the questioning of a student that could expose the student to court-involvement arrest.
- Strip searches of children by either school officials or SROs shall be prohibited.
• Absent a real and immediate threat to student, teacher or public safety, a SRO shall not use physical force or restraints—including handcuffs, Tasers, Mace, or other physical or chemical restraints on a child.

5) Immigration Status Inquiries.

Addition of provision on immigration status inquiries. The presence of SROs in schools will deter refugee and immigrant students and/or students with refugee or immigrant family members from reporting a crime they were a victim of or that they have witnessed at school. In fact, a recent study done in San Diego, CA discovered that when undocumented Mexican nationals believe that local law enforcement will cooperate with ICE on deportation raids they are: 1) 60.8% less likely to report crimes they witnessed; 2) 42.9% less likely to report being the victim of a crime; and 3) 42.9% less likely to place their children in after-school or day-care programs.²

The proposed JPA seeks to expand after-school programs in addition to adding 12 SROs to our public schools. Given the results of the above study, these goals are counterproductive—the addition of SROs will potentially make immigrant parents less likely to place their children in after-school programs. The proposed provision above may help decrease the fear immigrant parents may experience as they see a greater police presence at school.

Sample model language:
"No SRO or LPS staff shall question students on or adjacent to school district property or remove students from school district property for the purpose of inquiring about the student’s immigration status or the immigration status of their relatives."

6) Disaggregated Data

Section 4: "LPS, in collaboration with LPD, shall prepare an annual report of the SRO programs and school discipline for review by the Lincoln Board of Education, the Mayor, and City Council, which shall include disaggregated data comparing data from year to year..."

This provision could be improved by stating how the data will be disaggregated. Preferably by school, offense, student’s age, grade level, race, sex, national origin,

disability status, enrollment in ELL, and disposition/result/disciplinary consequence imposed. The disaggregation of this data is crucial to monitor LPS’s impact on the school-to-prison pipeline.

Moreover, as you may be aware, on April 24, 2018, the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) released data on school discipline for the 2015-2016 school year. The ACLU of Nebraska ran a Lincoln Public School District-specific report and highlights for you the following data:

- Nationally, a student is twice as likely to be referred to law enforcement if they are Black or Native American. Specifically, nationwide, black students represent 15% of the total enrollment population, yet account for 31% of referrals to law enforcement or school arrests. In Lincoln Public Schools, Black students represent 6.4% of the population yet they account for 26.8% of referrals to law enforcement.

- Nationally, Hispanic students make up 26% of total school population, but represent 24% of students referred to law enforcement or school arrests. In Lincoln Public Schools, Hispanic students represent 13.3% of the total student population and 20.6% of the referrals to law enforcement.

- Nationally, disabled students represent 12% of the population, yet represent 28% of the total population of referrals to law enforcement or school arrests. In Lincoln Public Schools, disabled students represent 15.5% of the population yet they account for 50.5% of referrals to law enforcement.
  - 7.7% of all disabled students are Black, yet 38.8% of all disabled students referred to law enforcement are Black.

---

4 Id.
5 Id.
6 Dep’t of Educ., Discipline Report: Lincoln Public Schools, Civil Rights Data Collection (Survey Year: 2015), available at https://ocrdata.ed.gov/DataAnalysisTools/DataSetBuilder?Report=6. To obtain the report: 1) Mark 2015-16 collection year. 2) select “District” for level of data. 3) Click on “Further refine your report by selecting the school/district name or by other criteria” and type in “Lincoln” under “District Name.” Next, indicate “Nebraska” under “State” and click “Find.” Checkmark the box next to “LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS” and click “Add to Data Set.” 4) Next to “View your custom report” click on “View Report.”
7 Dep’t of Educ., supra note 3.
8 Dep’t of Educ., supra note 6.
9 Dep’t of Educ., supra note 3.
10 Dep’t of Educ., supra note 3.
11 Id.
As reflected above, students of color and disabled students are far more likely to be referred to law enforcement in comparison to their white peers. These disparities should not be ignored as you move forward in the process of ensuring school safety via an MOU agreement while simultaneously working to end the school-to-prison pipeline.

Thank you for your consideration of the above and we look forward to working with you as this process moves forward. Please do not hesitate in contacting me with any questions, concerns or requests for more information at (402) 476-8091, ext. 105 or rgodinez@aclunebraska.org.

Sincerely,

Rose Godinez, Esq.
Legal and Policy Counsel

CC: Lincoln School Board
    Lincoln Public Schools Superintendent Dr. Steve Joel
    Lincoln City Council
    City of Lincoln Mayor Chris Beutler
# Model Memorandum of Understanding Between School District and Police Department
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I. INTRODUCTION

This memorandum of understanding (“MOU”) is effective as of [DATE] and concerns the relationship between the Local Law Enforcement Agency (“Department”) and the Unified School District (“District”).

A. Governing Principles

Both the District and Department recognize that:

1. Excellent and equitable public education is essential to the well-being of individuals, communities, and the State of California.

2. For students to access an excellent public education, they must feel safe in school.

3. Positive relationships and a supportive school culture are crucial in maintaining safety and security in school.

4. Law enforcement officers can provide an important role in the community.

All parties acknowledge and agree that:

1. District staff should and must be responsible for addressing student discipline issues.

2. Students who are referred to police officers for school discipline issues or disability-related behavior may experience long-term, negative consequences as a result, including a higher likelihood of not graduating and having future interactions with the criminal justice system.

3. Young people who are facing behavioral challenges or engaged in minor criminal activity are most likely to benefit from positive behavioral intervention and supports, access to adults who mentor and guide them, and additional counseling or tutoring rather than arrest and exclusion from school.

4. Searching and interrogating students, and arresting and referring students to court, unless absolutely necessary, is counterproductive to the purpose of schools.

5. Meaningful engagement of all stakeholders – including students, parents, teachers, and other school staff – is essential to school safety and positive school climate.
B. Program Goals and Action Plan

Both the District and Department share the following goals:

1. To promote school safety and a positive school climate;

2. To create a school environment in which conflicts are de-escalated and students are provided developmentally appropriate and fair consequences for misbehavior that address the root causes of their misbehavior, while minimizing the loss of instruction time;

3. To create a common understanding that:
   a. School administrators and teachers are ultimately responsible for school discipline and culture;
   b. Law enforcement should not be involved in the enforcement of school rules; and
   c. A clear delineation of the roles and responsibilities of law enforcement, with regular review by all stakeholders, is essential.

4. To minimize the number of school-based arrests and citations while maintaining a safe school climate;¹

5. To promote effectiveness and accountability;

6. To ensure that any Department officers who have contact with students will first receive the requisite training and experience on how to work with youth, especially youth with disabilities and youth from high-risk or high-need backgrounds;² and

7. To ensure that Department officers do not have disproportionately more contact with high-risk or high-need populations.³

To the extent that Department contact with District students is disproportionately with high-risk or high-need populations, the District and Department shall set goals for reducing the disparities and develop an action plan to reach such goals, including training for District and Department staff as noted above. The District and Department shall also identify any services or resources that are needed from the District and community to support students who have experienced multiple law enforcement contacts and to reduce such contacts.


² This training should include but not be limited to officer training on topics such as de-escalation techniques, adolescent development, mental health and other disabilities, implicit bias, and cultural competency.

³ Such student groups include, but are not limited to, low income students, English learners, foster youth, students of color, and students with disabilities.
II. THE SCOPE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT INVOLVEMENT

The intent of this section is to give clear guidance to law enforcement officers and school officials, and to ensure law enforcement is not involved in the enforcement of school rules and policies. This section is not intended to be a recitation of existing law. Instead, it spells out heightened protections for students and parents that are more consistent with the unique setting of schools, the mission of the District, and the special characteristics of young people.

A. Roles & Responsibilities

1. Disciplining students is the responsibility of District and school administrators, while preventing serious crime is primarily the responsibility of Department officers.

2. District or school staff should never ask for officer assistance simply because the officer is available.

3. Designated school site administrators and staff may request Department officers’ assistance only as a last resort when: (1) required by law under California Education Code § 48902; or (2) there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, teacher, or public safety.

4. Except where there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, teacher, or public safety, school administrators shall conduct an investigation prior to making a decision to request the involvement of Department officers. The school investigation should include interviewing the student suspect and other witnesses to determine whether law enforcement involvement is appropriate, pursuant to the standards set forth in Sections II(B)-II(E), below.

5. In all matters involving the police, the role of the District administrator is clear: s/he must act to safeguard the student’s rights because of his/her in loco parentis (i.e., “in place of the parent”) relationship.

6. Training on the administrator’s in loco parentis role shall be provided to all District administrators annually and on an as-needed basis.

7. Disproportionate use of police intervention in inappropriate situations shall be cause for corrective action by the District, including, but not limited to, raising the issue with the Department and/or Board of Education.

The following guidelines are intended to assist both school personnel and officers in evaluating when and how it is appropriate to involve Department officers in situations involving District students.
B. School Disciplinary Issues

1. School administrators, in partnership with the community and parents, have exclusive authority over school discipline issues.

2. No Department police officer shall act as a school disciplinarian. Accordingly, officers must refuse to engage in disputes that are related to issues of school discipline, even if District staff (including school staff) have requested the assistance. Issues that should be considered “issues of school discipline” are listed in detail below.

3. Department officers should not be asked by District staff to interview students or collect evidence for District disciplinary purposes, including expulsion matters.

4. District staff shall not notify or request the assistance of Department officers, and Department shall not respond to notifications or requests for assistance, to resolve student disciplinary issues (“Disciplinary Issues”).

A non-delinquent act is a typical adolescent behavior that should be addressed by school administrators without the involvement of law enforcement. Issues that would not be appropriate for Department officer involvement include, but are not limited to:

1. Disorderly conduct such as yelling, disrupting class, throwing food, or running;
2. Failure to participate in class or being unprepared for class;
3. Failure to carry hall-pass or other appropriate identification;
4. Trespassing;
5. Loitering or hallway wandering;
6. Using profanity against students and/or staff;
7. Insubordination/defiance;
8. Verbal altercations, abuse, and/or harassment;
9. Altercations, abuse, and/or harassment over the internet;
10. Vandalism and/or graffiti;
11. Failure to follow school rules;
12. Inappropriate public displays of affection;
13. Failure to wear or correctly wear school uniform or follow policies regarding clothing;
14. Possession of a prohibited item that does not violate the penal code (e.g., cell phones or markers);
15. Inappropriate use of electronic devices;
16. Being late, cutting class, absenteeism, or truancy;
17. Physical altercations that do not involve a weapon or result in serious bodily injury;
18. Unintentional contact with school personnel when staff is breaking up a fight.
19. Perceived drunkenness or intoxication;
20. Possession of alcohol;
21. Possession of a tool that could be taken to be, but is not intended as a weapon – such as a nail clipper or file, small pen knife, butter knife, toy gun, pepper spray, etc. – unless that item is being brandished as a weapon;
22. Alleged or witnessed promoting or claiming of a neighborhood or crew (including verbally, through graffiti, through clothing, or hand signs);  
23. Theft, including unarmed robbery; and  

Department officers or personnel who witness Disciplinary Issues shall locate school staff (including, when available, intervention workers) to respond to the situation.

C. Low-Level School-Based Offenses

Low-level school-based offenses (“Low-Level Offenses”) rise above Disciplinary Issues and are defined as an offense involving:

i. Battery;  
ii. Battery on school property;  
iii. Battery against a District employee;  
iv. Disturbing the peace (or similar offense such as causing a disturbance); or  
v. Possession of marijuana for personal use.

When a student commits a Low-Level Offense, District administrators should exhaust all other alternatives before involving police officers. Such alternatives include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) issuing a warning; (2) admonishing and counseling; and (3) referring for community service, restorative justice, or mediation. District administrators shall develop a matrix for, and track the use of, alternatives. Department officers shall have the discretion to refer students who have committed Low-Level Offenses to District or school administrators.

1. Graduated Responses to Low-Level School-Based Offenses

Department officers shall use the graduated response system outlined below to address Low-Level Offenses. Department officers shall not refer a student to the Juvenile Probation Department for the commission of a Low-Level Offense unless the student has committed a third Low-Level Offense during the same school year.

a. First Offense: If a student commits a Low-Level Offense, a Department officer shall have the discretion to refer the student to a District or school administrator, to admonish and counsel the student, or to take no action.

b. Second Offense: If a student commits a second Low-Level Offense in the same school year, a Department officer shall have the discretion to refer the student to a District or school administrator, to admonish and counsel the student, or to require the student to attend a District or other diversion program.

c. Third or Subsequent Offense: If a student commits a third Low-Level Offense in the same school year, a Department officer shall have the discretion to refer the student to a District or school administrator, admonish and counsel the student, or refer the case to the Juvenile Probation Department.
D. Serious Offenses

Serious school-based offenses rise above Low-Level Offenses. Below are examples of serious offenses:

1. Assaults involving serious bodily harm;
2. Serious violent offenses such as rape or kidnapping;
3. Possession of a firearm;
4. Use of a weapon; or
5. Armed robbery.

If a student commits a serious offense, District and school staff may request assistance from Department officers according to the following guidelines:

1. Only after considering the totality of the circumstance, including but not limited to: (1) whether a lesser intervention will achieve the desired goal of correcting behavior; (2) whether the child intended to cause serious harm; (3) whether the child acted impulsively without any specific intent to cause serious harm; (4) the child’s age; (5) the child’s disability status; and (6) other mitigating circumstances.

2. In an emergency or crisis situation, call 911 or any Department officer and notify school administrators as soon as possible;

3. If there is no immediate danger to students or others, school staff will contact their school site administrator to make the decision about whether to request Department police assistance for an incident potentially involving a serious offense by a student, based on the criteria in Section II(A)-(D)(1) of this MOU, above; and

4. The site administrator shall notify the District Superintendent and enter a written Incident Report the same day to detail Department police response to any incident involving a student. All Incident Reports shall be logged into the District centralized database system. All Incident Reports, and the centralized database system, must record key information about the incident, including, but not limited to: the school site, nature of the incident or offense, race, ethnicity, gender, disability, if applicable, and age of the student or students involved in the incident; but the database system shall be structured in a way that will protect an individual student’s identity if records from the system are released to the public. This data will be provided in a written report at the bi-annual Board of Education meetings discussed in Section III(F) of this MOU, below.
E. De-escalation Procedures for District Staff and Department Officers

Except where there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, teacher, or public safety, the first course of action should be the application of specific intervention strategies designed to diffuse the situation by addressing students’ emotional needs and de-escalating the immediate behavior. The intent of de-escalation is to restore the student’s capacity to control his or her immediate impulse or behavior and to move toward safer or more constructive resolution of the immediate problem situation. In the event of student behavior representing an incident warranting a police referral, as described in Section II(D) above, the following de-escalation strategies should be employed:

1. Identify student distress level and employ staff response utilizing appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and paraverbal communication strategies (i.e., identifying precipitating factors of behaviors, limit setting, empathetic listening, respecting personal space, and utilizing appropriate body language).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DO...</th>
<th>DON’T...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remain calm.</td>
<td>Raise your voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use positive body language.</td>
<td>Continue to argue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a step back.</td>
<td>Use negative body language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the student’s feelings.</td>
<td>Give ultimatums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use “I” statements.</td>
<td>Use sarcasm to defuse the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest talking about the issue at a later time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell the person what you are doing at all times, preferably before you do it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct yourself so as to avoid or minimize the possibility of accidentally touching private areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always respect the student’s history and cultural background.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Slow down the situation by means of tactical disengagement: If an officer can calm the situation down and walk away from a minor confrontation – and nothing bad will happen upon the officer’s exit – the officer should find a way to tactically disengage.
3. Other examples of de-escalation include:

   a. Placing barriers between an uncooperative student and an officer;
   b. Withdrawing;
   c. Decreasing the exposure to the potential threat by using distance or cover;
   d. Concealing oneself or others;
   e. Communicating from a safe position that is intended to gain compliance using verbal persuasion, advisements, and/or warnings:
   f. Avoiding physical confrontation unless immediately necessary, using verbal techniques such as Listen and Explain with Equity and Dignity (LEED) Training, to calm an agitated subject and promote rational decision making; and
   g. Calling additional support like a trusted teacher, administrator, parent, or other officer.

F. Officer Entry on Campus

Department officers should notify school officials (e.g., principal, dean, or head counselor) of their presence and/or purpose on District property. The only exception to this requirement is if there is a real and immediate threat to student, staff or public safety. During the meeting between the Officer Coordinator and the site principals before the school year starts or at the beginning of the school year (see Section III(B) of this MOU), the Officer Coordinator shall receive a list of school contacts to be used for this purpose.

G. Questioning Students on Campus

Department officers shall not interview or question students or collect evidence for District disciplinary purposes, including for expulsion matters. School site administrators and staff are responsible for interviewing students under those circumstances.

   1. Criteria Which Must Be Satisfied Before an Officer Questions a Student Regarding School-Related Matters

Absent (1) a real and immediate threat to student, staff or public safety, (2) a Department officer’s possession of a court order or validly-issued warrant authorizing the Department officer’s questioning of the student(s), or (3) where the student is a victim of suspected child abuse, Department officers shall not question students (including, but not limited to, students who are suspects) about their involvement in or knowledge of suspected criminal activity unless all of the following criteria are met:

   a. The officer possesses probable cause to believe the student has committed, or will commit in the foreseeable future, an offense that poses a real and immediate physical threat to student, staff or public safety;

   b. The student’s parent/guardian has been given an opportunity to be present and has consented to the questioning;
c. The officer has communicated heightened, developmentally appropriate warnings against self-incrimination (i.e., student and parent/guardian have been properly informed of the student’s *Miranda* rights);\(^4\) and
d. The questioning occurs at a time in the school day when it will have a minimal impact on the student’s learning.

Heightened, developmentally appropriate warnings against self-incrimination shall include the following:

a. “You have the right to remain silent. That means you do not have to talk to me.”

b. “Anything you say to me can be used against you in court or for suspension or expulsion from school.”

c. “You have the right to have a parent, guardian, or lawyer here while I question you. If you want one of them here, you do not have to talk to me until he or she arrives.”

d. “If you go to court for delinquency or criminal charges, you will be given a lawyer.”

If the student exercises his or her right to remain silent, including but, not limited to, choosing not to answer questions or requesting the presence of a parent/guardian or attorney, the officer shall immediately end the questioning.

2. **Criteria Which Must Be Satisfied Before an Officer Questions a Student Regarding Non-School-Related Matters**

Department officers will avoid interviewing and apprehending students on school grounds for non-school-related issues. Department officers shall not question students (including, but not limited to, students who are suspects) about their involvement in or knowledge of suspected non-school-related criminal activity unless all of the following criteria are met:

---

\(^4\) Immediately prior to questioning a student who is in custody, Department officers shall advise the student of the *Miranda* admonishment and attempt to contact his or her parent or guardian pursuant to Section II(L) of this MOU. The officer shall make every effort to ensure that the student fully understands the *Miranda* admonishment, including by checking for understanding, explaining any terms that may or may not make sense to the student, and invoking *Miranda* in the student’s primary language if not English. If the student decides to proceed with answering questions after the *Miranda* admonishment, the officer shall tell the student that s/he may have a parent/guardian present before and during an interrogation and that s/he may decide to wait for the parent or guardian before questioning begins. A request by a student to have a parent/guardian present may be interpreted by the courts as an invocation of the right of the student to remain silent. Any Department questioning of a student who is in custody shall be conducted in the language appropriate to the age of the student and in such a way as to ensure that the student understands the Department officer, if the student decides to answer questions or provide information.
a. The officer possesses a warrant supported by probable cause to believe the student has committed, or will commit in the foreseeable future, an offense that poses a real and immediate physical threat to student, staff or public safety;

b. The student’s parent/guardian has been given an opportunity to be present and has consented to the questioning;

c. The officer has communicated heightened, developmentally appropriate warnings against self-incrimination (i.e., student and parent/guardian have been properly informed of the student’s *Miranda* rights)*; and*

d. The questioning occurs at a time in the school day when it will have a minimal impact on the student’s learning.

Heightened, developmentally appropriate warnings against self-incrimination shall include those listed in Section II(G)(1) above. If the student exercises his or her right to remain silent, including, but not limited to, choosing not to answer questions or requesting the presence of a parent/guardian or attorney, the officer shall immediately end the questioning.

3. **School Administrators’ Duties When Officers Question Students**

   a. When any Department officer requests an interview with a student, the principal or designee shall request that the officer provide verification of her/his identity and official capacity and certify the legal authority under which the interview is being conducted. If the officer refuses to provide certification of the legal authority for the interview, the principal or designee shall document such refusal and should consult with District legal counsel and receive approval before allowing the interview to proceed.

   b. A school administrator shall allow a Department officer to question a student if the Department officer is in possession of a validly-issued warrant or court order pertaining to the student to be questioned. A school administrator may also allow a Department officer to question a student if the officer reasonably believes that there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, staff or public safety, and the Department officer executes a sworn declaration describing the real and immediate physical threat at the first available opportunity.

   c. If the Department officer needs to interview or question the student immediately, the principal or designee shall accommodate the interview in a way that causes the least possible disruption for the student and school and gives the student appropriate privacy.

---

*5 Id.*
d. If a parent or guardian cannot be found, the school site administrator shall offer
the student the option of having an adult of his or her choice from the school
available during the questioning. The school site administrator shall immediately
notify the parent or guardian by telephone regarding the questioning pursuant to
Section II(L) of this Policy.

e. District shall inform the Department and prevent them from questioning a student
until the student’s parent or guardian is present if that student:
   i. Has an individualized education plan (IEP);
   ii. Has a Section 504 Plan;
   iii. Has a learning disability;
   iv. Is 13 years or younger; or
   v. Otherwise may not be capable of fully understanding the waiver of their
      right to remain silent.

4. Officer Conduct While Questioning Students

When questioning a student on school grounds, Department officers shall do so in compliance
with the Fourth Amendment standards that apply to detaining and questioning a student off
school grounds.

Questioning or interrogating a student by Department officers shall meet the following criteria:

   a. Officers must inform students of their Miranda rights immediately. The officer
      shall make every effort to ensure that the student fully understands the Miranda
      admonishment, including by:
         i. Checking for understanding;
         ii. Explaining any terms that may or may not make sense to the student; and
         iii. Invoking Miranda in the student’s primary language if not English.

   b. If the student decides to proceed with answering questions after the Miranda
      admonishment, the officer shall tell the student that s/he may have a
      parent/guardian present before and during an interrogation and that s/he may
      decide to wait for the parent or guardian before questioning begins.

   c. A request by a student to have a parent/guardian present may be interpreted by the
      courts as an invocation of the right of the student to remain silent.

   d. Any Department questioning of a student who is in custody shall be conducted in
      the language appropriate to the age of the student and in such a way as to ensure
      that the student understands the Department officer, if the student decides to
      answer questions or provide information.

   e. Whenever a Department officer questions or interrogates a student, the juvenile’s
      age and the nature of the alleged offense must be taken into consideration.
f. Special effort shall be made to ensure that the student understands his/her rights as well as the juvenile justice system.

g. If there is any indication that the student does not fully understand, the questioning shall end immediately.

h. A child is presumed to be incapable of a knowing, willing, and voluntary waiver of his or her legal rights if that child:
   i. Has an individualized education plan (IEP);
   ii. Has a Section 504 Plan;
   iii. Has a learning disability;
   iv. Is 13 years or younger; or
   v. Otherwise may not be capable of fully understanding the waiver of their right to remain silent.

5. Record of Questioning Students

The school shall keep a record of any interviews of students by law enforcement officers on school premises. The record shall include the following information:

   a. Date and time of the interview;
   b. Name and identifying number of the officer;
   c. The agency employing the officer and his/her official capacity;
   d. The time when the officer arrived and left;
   e. The fact that the school site representative or parent/guardian was or was not present during the interview; and
   f. The reason for the questioning and/or release of the student, and any other pertinent information.

A copy of the record must be emailed to the Child Welfare, Attendance & Safety Office at childwelfare@schooldistrict.org. A copy of the record must be retained by the District in an administrative file created specifically for these records. No copies of the record shall be placed in student files.

H. Searches of Students on Campus

The same Fourth Amendment standards that apply when police conduct a search off school grounds shall apply to all searches conducted by Department officers on school grounds. Department officers shall not ask school officials to conduct a search to avoid this requirement.

1. Department officers shall obtain permission of the school principal or designee before the officer conducts a search of a student’s person, possession, locker, or other shared property. The only exception to this requirement is if there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, staff or public safety.
2. Department officers shall also provide the school principal or designee with an opportunity to be present during the impending search, unless there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, staff, or public safety.

3. The individual officer conducting the search of the student shall be of the same gender as the student, unless the student expresses a preference for a different arrangement.

4. A school official and community intervention worker or counselor shall be present at the time of the search.

5. School officials shall not ask Department officers to be present or participate in a search of a student about a suspected discipline issue. Department officers shall similarly be prohibited from observing other searches conducted by school officials related to school discipline issues.

6. Probation officers shall not use schools as a place to conduct searches (including drug tests), questioning, or pat downs of students, unless there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, staff, or public safety.

7. The District shall designate a section of its Parent Handbook that informs parents of its practice with respect to police searches of students.

8. Strip searches of students are prohibited. A strip search is any search where a student is directed to remove or lift clothing revealing a part of the body that would normally be covered in school.

9. Stop and frisk searches of students are also prohibited. Stop and frisk is the practice by which a police officer initiates a stop and pat-down of a student’s outer clothing based on reasonable suspicion that a crime has been, is being, or is about to be committed.

All searches and pat downs that take place at school should happen outside the view of other youth (unless emergency situations make it impossible), to maintain the student’s privacy and to decrease public embarrassment, humiliation, and any other future stigmatization and discrimination against the student(s) involved.

I. Seizure of Student Property

Whenever Department officers seize any item belonging to a student as a result of a search of a student or the student’s belongings on school grounds during regular school hours, the following guidelines must be met:

1. The officer will inform the student in writing within two school days after the seizure of the item;
2. The officer will provide the location where the student may obtain an itemized receipt from the Department for any and all property seized;

3. The written notification will include the relevant case number and telephone number to call, enable the student and/or the student’s parent or guardian to obtain the itemized receipt; and

4. The Department officer shall either give the student this written notification and receipt at the time of the search and seizure or give the written notification and receipt to the school administrator within two school days to deliver to the student.

J. Arrests of Students on School Campus

Department officers may enter a school to take a student into custody or to make a lawful arrest of a student only if the officer has a warrant or court order or the student presents a real and immediate physical threat to student, teacher, or public safety.

1. If the arrest is not made pursuant to an authorization order or warrant, the school principal or designee shall inquire as to the reason for the arrest by the officer prior to releasing the student into the officer’s custody.

2. A Department officer shall not conduct an arrest without first consulting with the school principal or principal’s designee and providing the principal or designee with an opportunity to be present during the arrest. The only exception to this requirement is if there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, staff or public safety.

3. If there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, staff or public safety that prevents consultation with the school principal or principal’s designee before a student is arrested, the officer shall notify the principal immediately following the arrest and whenever safety permits before removing the student from the school site.

4. If the student is arrested, the principal or designee may release the student into the custody of the officer and shall immediately telephone the parent/guardian or responsible relative pursuant to Section II(L) of this MOU.

5. Students who are also parents or guardians must have an immediate opportunity to ensure that their children are in the custody of a trusted caregiver and have the opportunity to arrange for their child’s/children’s care for the duration of their time in custody.

6. In an effort to minimize disruption to the learning environment, Department officers shall consider the reasonableness of making an arrest on campus or summoning a student from a classroom. When considering whether it is reasonable to arrest or summon a student on campus, the officer should consider the following:

   a. Whether the arrest or summons is in response to a school-related offense;
   b. The seriousness of the offense;
c. Whether there is a real and immediate physical threat to student, staff, or public safety;
d. Federal or state legal requirements; and
e. Whether the officer is able to accomplish the arrest by other means.

7. Department officers shall not arrest students for minor offenses. “Minor offenses” shall be defined as including, but not limited to, the violations listed in Section II(B)-(C) of this MOU. If the arrest is not reasonable given the considerations listed above, the arrest or summons of the student should be made at another time or place.

8. A private location out of sight and hearing of other students should be arranged for the arrest of a student, where practicable, that will help avoid invading of the student’s privacy, jeopardizing the safety and welfare of other students, and further disrupt the school campus. Department officers shall not arrest students nor escort students through school hallways in view of other students.

A school site representative must notify the District Superintendent or designee of the arrest by completing the “Removal of Pupil from School During School Hours by a Peace Officer” form and providing a copy to the Child Welfare, Attendance & Safety Office.

K. Prohibition of Racial Profiling

To the extent practicable, District administrators and staff, and Department officers, shall not use or permit the use of actual or perceived race, ethnicity, or nationality when conducting stops or detentions, or in activities following stops or detentions, in the absence of a specific description of the suspect that provides sufficient identifying factors in addition to the person’s particular race, ethnicity, or nationality. School and district staff shall allow officers seeking one or more specific persons who have been identified or described in part by race, ethnicity, or national origin to rely on those descriptions only in combination with other appropriate identifying factors. The race, ethnicity, or nationality of individuals should not be given undue weight in the decision by law enforcement officers to stop or detain those individuals.

L. Notification of Parent/Guardian of Student’s Arrest, Searches, Restraint or Seclusion, or Questioning by Police Officer

Department and District shall ensure that school officials immediately notify a student’s parent or guardian when a student is arrested by a law enforcement officer, before a student is questioned by a law enforcement officer, or if a student is subject to use of force by a Department officer (as defined in Section II(M), below), except if the student is taken into protective custody by the officer as a suspected victim of child abuse or pursuant to California Welfare & Institutions Code § 305.

1. A school site representative must call the student’s parent/guardian and give the parent/guardian a reasonable opportunity to be present when the student is questioned by a law enforcement officer, prior to the commencement of the questioning, unless the student is a suspected victim of child abuse. If the parent/guardian requests that the pupil
not be questioned until the parent/guardian can be present, the law enforcement officer may not question the student until the parent/guardian is present.

2. Efforts to contact parents/guardians by District officials must include: (1) calling all numbers listed on an emergency card, including (a) work numbers, (b) cell phone numbers, and (c) any numbers supplied by the student; and (2) sending an email to all email addresses listed for the parent/guardian.

3. The principal or designee shall record the time(s) of contact or attempted contact with the parent/guardian.

4. If the District or school site representative is unable to reach the parent/guardian, s/he shall make repeated efforts to call or otherwise notify the parent/guardian for at least the next 24 hours. If those efforts are unsuccessful, he or she shall leave messages, where applicable, and follow up with written documentation.

5. If the parent/guardian of a student who is a victim or witness (and not a suspect) cannot be reached, Department officers may not question the student unless there is a continuing real and immediate physical threat to student, staff, or public safety that justifies proceeding with the questioning.
   a. If the parent/guardian is unavailable, the principal or designee must be notified as soon as possible and must offer the student the option to have an adult of the student’s choice available during the interrogation before the questioning begins.

6. School officials shall convey the following information to parents:
   a. The basis for the student questioning, arrest, or other referral to law enforcement;
   b. Information regarding the student’s rights, including the right to file a complaint with the Superintendent or Board of Education according to the process described in Section III(E) of this MOU;
   c. Whether the child will also be suspended or face disciplinary consequences independent of the questioning, arrest, or other referral to law enforcement; and
   d. Whether the child has been taken into custody and where the parent or guardian can reach the child.

**M. Subject Control (Use of Force)**

*Subject control* is defined as the amount of effort required by a law enforcement officer to compel compliance by an unwilling subject.
Mechanical restraint is “the use of any device or equipment to restrict a student’s freedom,” and includes, but is not limited to, the use of handcuffs, flexicuffs, pepper spray, mace, TASERs and stun guns.

Law enforcement officers operating in a school environment shall be cautious about the serious and negative impact of subject control tactics on the subject student, any student witnesses, and the entire school environment.

Department officers may not use physical force, which includes the use of mechanical restraints, on a student except when the student’s behavior poses an immediate danger of serious bodily injury to self or others. Serious bodily injury means “bodily injury which involves (A) a substantial risk of death; (B) extreme physical pain; (C) protracted and obvious disfigurement; or (D) protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty.”

1. Department officers shall not use any type of physical force on a student, including by using mechanical restraints, to punish or discipline the student.

2. Use of force shall not be used as a response to inappropriate behavior by the student (e.g., behavior categorized as a “school disciplinary issue” as listed in Section II(B), even if the behavior is directed at a Department officer).

3. Even where an immediate threat of physical danger exists, Department officers must use the least restrictive force technique necessary to end the threat.

4. Officers will use physical force only when no reasonable effective alternative appears to exist, and only then to the degree which is reasonable to effect a lawful purpose. Reasonable effective alternatives may include isolating the student and simply waiting for her/him to calm down; see Section II(E) for further discussion of de-escalation techniques. The use of physical force on a student shall cease when the danger is lessened.

---
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10 Id. at 15.

11 Id. at 12.
6. A Department officer’s decision to use subject control tactics shall be determined by the totality of circumstances, including:
   a. The student’s size, age, and weight;
   b. The emotional capacity of the student;
   c. The physical capacity of the student;
   d. The severity of the alleged crime;
   e. Whether the student poses an immediate threat to the safety of herself/himself or others;
   f. Number of students present;
   g. Number of adults present;
   h. The potential for serious injury;
   i. Known violent history of the subject; and
   j. Whether the student has a disability.

7. The level of force used must be developmentally appropriate according to a child’s age, developmental abilities, and other factors.

8. The level of force applied must reflect the totality of the circumstances surrounding the situation, including the presence of imminent danger of serious physical harm. Proportional force does not require officers to use the same type or amount of force as the subject.

9. The health and safety of the child must be monitored during the use of force.

10. Department officers have a duty to prevent other officers from using unnecessary force. If an officer witnesses a colleague using unnecessary force, s/he is required to intervene and to report the unnecessary or excessive use of force to a superior.

11. Officers are required to render first aid to subjects who have been injured as a result of police actions and should promptly request medical assistance.

12. In assessing whether a response is proportional, an officer must ask:
   a. How would the general public view the action we took?
   b. Would the public think it was appropriate to the entire situation and to the severity of the threat posed to me or the public?
   c. Is this how I would want a child I love and care for to be treated?

13. An officer may never use force:
   a. To punish or retaliate;
   b. Against individuals who only verbally confront them unless the vocalization impedes a legitimate law enforcement function; or
   c. On restrained subjects (e.g., including subjects who are handcuffed or contained in a police vehicle) except in truly exceptional circumstances when the subject’s
actions must be immediately stopped to prevent injury, escape, or destruction of property. All such force shall be closely and critically reviewed.

14. Department officers shall not unholster a firearm on District property unless there is a reasonable basis to believe someone on the property may use a firearm or other weapon to cause death.

15. If a Department officer uses physical force on a student, the officer shall complete a “Use of Force Reporting Form”; and provide a copy of the form to: (1) her/his supervisor; (2) the school principal; and (3) the student’s parent in the parent’s primary language. The officer’s supervisor and the school principal shall maintain a record of the Use of Force Reporting Forms.

N. Prohibition Against Entries in “Gang Database” Absent Grounds Sufficient to Support an Arrest

In compliance with the Fourth Amendment, Department officers shall not take photographs of a minor to be included in any database or compilation, including any kind of “mug book,” absent grounds sufficient to support the arrest and booking of the student unless: (a) there is a lawful detention of the student and the photograph serves a legitimate law enforcement purpose related to the detention; or (b) the student gives express informed consent for the photograph to be taken or used in such a manner. Informed consent includes telling the student how the photograph will be used (to the extent that such uses are known by the officer at the time), including whether the photograph may be included in a database or compilation, including a “mug book.”

O. Limitations on Field Identification Cards Concerning Gang Activity

A Department officer shall not complete a field identification card regarding a minor student indicating that the student is suspected of gang activity, or otherwise collect information concerning alleged gang activity by the student, unless the officer detains or formally cites the student and:

1. The detention or issuance of the citation comports with the applicable Fourth Amendment standards;

2. The basis for the detention or issuance of the citation is related to criminal gang activity, or, during the course of the detention or issuance of the citation, the officer learns information that gives rise to a reasonable suspicion that the individual is involved in criminal gang activity; and

3. The detention is brief and lasts no longer than necessary to issue the citation or to address the suspicion that provides the legal basis for the detention.
III. OVERSIGHT; IMPLEMENTATION; ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

A. Qualifications of Department Officers

Prerequisites to being selected as an officer assigned to respond to calls for service from District schools shall be:

1. Experience working well with children and youth, including recommendations from youth or educators; and
2. A work history free of any substantiated complaints of excessive force, racial profiling, harassment, or discrimination.

The District shall also consider or require the following additional qualifications:

1. Years of experience
2. Knowledge of the specific needs and local concerns of the community; and
3. Interviews by school staff, students, parents, and families, community stakeholders, and youth development experts.

B. Coordination between Officer Coordinator, Officers, and Schools

1. Officer Coordinator

   a. The Department will assign an Officer Coordinator to serve as a liaison between the Department and District. The Officer Coordinator shall meet at least once per school year with the District and shall be invited by the District Superintendent or designee to one or more meetings for school site principals where the Department and District will share and exchange expectations, requirements, and operational procedures contained within this MOU with principals, other school staff, and Department officers.

   b. On an annual basis, the Department and District shall jointly conduct an analysis of the previous year and discuss any adjustments that should be made to District or Department policies or practices. The meetings shall occur before the school year or at the beginning of the school year.

   c. The Officer Coordinator will also meet with each school site principal on an as-needed basis when any issue arises that needs to be addressed.

2. Officers

   a. With the goal of improving school climate, where Department officers are permanently assigned to a school campus, they shall meet at least once time per month with their designated school site principal to exchange information about current crime trends, problem areas, or other issues of concern which have
potential for disruption in the school or within the community, and to strategize on how to improve school safety.

b. Each Department officer shall maintain a log of his/her meetings with any student and/or parent on District property. This log shall be known as the “School Police Department Officer’s Log.”

c. The log shall include:
   i. The Department officer’s name;
   ii. The name of the school where the student attends;
   iii. The name of the school where the meeting occurred;
   iv. Date and time of the meeting;
   v. The name(s) of the student(s) and/or parent(s) which whom the officer met; and
   vi. The purpose of the meeting (unless the law requires any of this information to be kept confidential).

C. School Site Principal Duties Regarding Department Officers on Campus

1. It is the responsibility of the school site principal to facilitate ongoing communication between Department officers and school staff.

2. If the Officer Coordinator, District Superintendent, or Superintendent’s designee requests a meeting to address an issue that has come up at a school site regarding the Department, the site principal and any involved Department officers shall participate in the meeting.

3. At least once each school year, the school site principal shall distribute a school climate survey to all students at the school to assess student safety and climate as it relates to student and officer interactions and contact.

   a. The student climate survey shall be developed within 90 days of the effective date of this MOU in partnership with the stakeholder groups and organizations that work with District students.
   b. The surveys shall be anonymous.

4. If the District already regularly administers districtwide student, staff, and parent surveys, a separate school climate survey is not necessary. However, the existing surveys shall be adapted to include questions about school climate.

5. Information from the school site survey shall be analyzed, organized by school site, and shared with the Superintendent.

   a. The Superintendent or designee shall include this data in the report that s/he provides to the District Board of Education, as described in Section III(F) below.
In the event that a school site principal feels that a particular Department officer is not effectively performing his or her duties, or if the school site principal has a dispute or question regarding a particular Department officer or concern that the terms of this MOU are not being followed, the school site principal shall contact:

1. The District Superintendent, the Coordinator, and Station Captain as soon as it is practical to do so.

2. Alternatively, if any officer or other Department staff member feels that the District is not effectively performing its duties, or believes that the terms of this MOU are not being followed, the officer or Department staff member shall contact the Station Captain, Coordinator, and District Superintendent as soon as it is practical to do so.

D. Training and Distribution of MOU

1. Within three months of adopting this MOU, the Department shall ensure that this MOU is distributed to all of its officers, including school resource officers, and that appropriate training regarding the provisions of this MOU and their responsibilities under the MOU has been provided to Department officers. In addition, all new Department officers and staff shall receive this MOU within a week after their first day of employment.

2. Within three months of adopting this MOU, the District Superintendent shall ensure that this MOU is distributed to all District school sites and that appropriate training regarding the provisions of this MOU and staff responsibilities under this MOU has been provided to school staff. The District Superintendent shall also provide a detailed description of the MOU in the Parent-Student Handbook of each school.

3. Any Department officers who may interact with District students must first participate in an annual training series provided by the District. The training series shall consist of one training in each of the following areas, which shall be combined to form no fewer than five total training sessions:
   a. The policies and procedures described in this policy;
   b. Bias-free policing (including implicit or unconscious bias and cultural competence);
   c. Review of the negative collateral consequences associated with youth involvement in the juvenile and criminal justice systems, including immigration, higher education, employment, and housing consequences;
   d. Relevant confidentiality laws regarding student privacy;
   e. State and federal laws prohibiting discrimination;
   f. De-escalation and alternative approaches to conflict, including for students who have disabilities, mental health issues, or a history of abuse and trauma;
   g. Special education laws;
   h. Methods schools use to provide extra support to individual students (e.g., 504 Plans, Individualized Education Plans (“IEPs”), Behavioral Intervention Plans (“BIPs”), and Student Study Teams (“SSTs”));
i. Strategies for working and communicating effectively with students in Special Education programs;

j. Child and adolescent development and psychology;

k. Age-appropriate police intervention and responses to challenging behavior;

l. Cultural competency;

m. Appropriate responses to children with disabilities, LGBTQ children, and those with limited English proficiency; and

n. The relevant district and school site staff and their roles.

E. Complaints

Students, parents, administrators, and school personnel who believe there has been misconduct on the part of Department officers, or that the District or Department officers are violating any of the terms in this MOU regarding law enforcement involvement, may file a complaint with the District Superintendent or his/her designee within 120 days of the alleged misconduct.

Any Department officer, or District or school site employee, who receives a request from a person who wishes to make a complaint shall provide the person with the District Complaint Form, which shall include basic information about the complaint process in an accessible format, or direct them to the website at [Insert District Website URL], where the Complaint Form and information about the complaint process can be accessed. Members of the public who call the Superintendent’s office, or any other District pupil services or personnel services office, by phone to complain will receive assistance with filling out a Complaint Form, which will be mailed to them for signature. Complaint forms shall be provided in languages other than English according to the requirements of Section 48985 of the California Education Code. Complaints may be submitted in the complainant’s primary language.

The Superintendent or designee shall investigate any complaints regarding District staff who may be violating the terms of this MOU. Within two work days of receiving the written complaint, the District shall acknowledge to the complainant, in writing, receipt of the complaint, provide anticipated actions and timeline, and refer all complaints regarding law enforcement officers to the police department’s office of internal affairs for investigation. The Department shall report to the Superintendent within 30 days the results of its investigation into complaints regarding Department officers. The Superintendent shall make every effort on an ongoing basis to obtain the results of the Department’s investigation into complaints regarding its law enforcement officers. The Superintendent shall report to each complainant the results of the Department or District investigation into her/his complaint no later than 30 days after the submission of the complaint and as new information is obtained.

Individuals have a right to make an anonymous complaint. If an anonymous complainant provides a means of contact, the results of the complaint will be reported to the anonymous complainant. If the anonymous complainant does not provide a means of contact, the results of the complaint will not be directly reported to the complainant.
A Department officer or District employee who files a formal written complaint against a student shall provide a copy of the complaint to the student’s parent within two business days of filing the complaint.

Nothing in this policy shall limit legally mandated due process for students or the right of a private party to pursue legal action in a court of law.

1. Log of Complaints and Semi-Annual Complaint Statistical Summary Report

The Superintendent or his/her designee shall keep a log of all complaints received by her/his office and assign a separate reference number to each complaint. Reference numbers shall be provided to the complainant once assigned.

The Superintendent or his/her designee shall be responsible for preparing a semi-annual complaint statistical summary report to distribute to the Chief of the Department and to the District Board at a regularly scheduled public Board Meeting. The summary shall include the following:

a. Type of complaint, by source and classification;
b. Number of complainants and allegations against individual law enforcement officers, identified by the officer’s individual assigned code number;
c. Number of complainants and allegations against individual school security officers, identified by the officer’s individual assigned code number, if applicable;
d. Complaints per school site;
e. Trends in complaints, if applicable;
f. Length of time to investigate and resolve/prove a disposition for each complaint;
g. Disposition of the complaint, including action taken to address the complaint;
h. Number of appeals by type of complaint, source, and classification;
i. Disposition of the appeal, including any responsive action to address a complaint; and
j. Any and all steps taken by the [District] or [Police Department] to resolve systemic concerns.

This summary shall also be included in the publicly-available materials for each District Board meeting. All personal student information should be kept confidential pursuant to state and federal privacy laws.
2. **Timelines for Handling Complaints**

All complaints shall be investigated in accordance with the Peace Officers Bill of Rights.\(^{12}\)

The District and Department agree that best efforts shall be used in every case to provide a written response to the complainant, within 30 days of the date that the Complaint Form is received by the Superintendent, describing the District’s efforts to resolve or refer the complaint to the Department. If the complaint involves multiple individuals or incidents, the District and Department shall make best efforts to complete the investigation within 45 days. If additional time is needed for the investigation, the District shall inform the complainant in writing that additional time is needed, the justification for the delay, and an update on its progress. Such additional time shall not exceed 90 days in any instance, unless circumstances exist which are beyond the District’s control and render completing the investigation impossible.

3. **Disposition of Complaints**

In conducting its investigation into complaints regarding District employees or law enforcement officers violating the terms of this MOU, the District may contact any individuals that the complainant has listed to interview them with respect to the allegations. The District shall follow up in person, by phone, or in writing with the complainant to request any additional information or documents that might be helpful to the investigation and to inform the complainant of the assigned complaint reference number, if one has not already been provided.

The District shall not allow District employees or Department officers who were involved in an incident that is the subject of the complaint or who otherwise have a conflict of interest to participate in the investigation of that complaint.

Any District or Department employee who is the subject of the complaint shall be allowed to submit a written response to the Superintendent or designee.

Where serious allegations of wrongdoing are raised, the officer(s) involved shall be removed from having contact with students until the investigation is completed. Such matters would include:

- a. Allegations of physical assault;
- b. Verbal threats of violence;
- c. Sexual advances or assaults; and/or
- d. Discriminatory language or practice based on race, ethnicity, national origin, language, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, disability, economic or other status.

\(^{12}\) Cal. Gov't Code § 3303.
The District shall provide a written disposition of the complaint to the complainant when the investigation by the District or the Department is completed. The disposition must be signed and dated by the Superintendent or designee. The disposition shall include:

1. Whether the complaint was sustained or not sustained;
2. Any written response from the subject of the complaint;
3. A description of the investigation;
4. Findings of fact (i.e., a detailed description of what the investigator believes occurred and what, if any, laws, policies, or MOU provisions were violated);
5. An explanation of and rationale for the result and conclusion;
6. If a violation occurred, what remedies must be effectuated (i.e., what has to be done to make up for the harm caused by the violation(s)), as well as any other actions that will be taken by the District to address the concerns raised in the complaint; and
7. An explanation of the appeal process described immediately below.

Where allegations of abuse or misconduct are substantiated, the SPD officer(s) involved shall be removed from any school assignments, permanently prohibited from being present on District property, and their personnel file must indicate the incident in order to ensure that no abuse, racial profiling or other targeting of certain students or groups of students is taking place.

4. **Appeal of the Resolution of the Complaint**

If the complainant disagrees with the Superintendent’s resolution of the complaint, s/he shall have a right to appeal the resolution to the District Board. Within 60 days, the District Board shall either:

1. Uphold the Superintendent’s decision; or
2. Reverse the Superintendent’s decision and request further investigation.

The Board’s decision shall be made public, unless the complainant requests that the results of the appeal remain confidential.

Nothing in this MOU is intended to prevent or preclude a person from filing a complaint directly to the District Board in the first instance. The District Board shall also follow the same timelines and procedures as listed herein.

5. **Confidentiality of Complaints**

Personally identifying information regarding minors that is contained in the complaint are subject to constitutional and statutory privacy protections.

6. **Prohibition Against Retaliation, Intimidation, Harassment or Threats**
No [District] employee or law enforcement officer shall retaliate against, intimidate, harass, or threaten any person making a complaint. Any District employee or Department officer found to have retaliated against, intimidated, threatened, or harassed any person attempting to make or who has made a complaint will be disciplined to the full extent of the law.

F. Data Tracking and Public Review

1. The following terms are defined for purposes of this section:
   a. “School-related offenses” is a criminal offense occurring or originating on a District school site during hours the school site is regularly open to the public or its students for school-related business.
   b. “School site” is the property upon which the school is located. It also includes any location where a school-sponsored event is being held for the duration of such event.
   c. “Student” refers only to youth who are enrolled in a District public school (but not charter schools or private schools).

2. Department staff shall compile and submit to the District a monthly written report of the activities of Department officers who work within District’s jurisdiction. These monthly written reports shall be filed with the District Board of Education and should include:
   a. School site crime incidents reported to, or observed by, Department officers;
   b. Number of times that a Department officer was called to a school site, and included for each incident: the type of call, related offense (e.g., trespassing, disruption, battery, possession of a weapon), and resolution of call;
   c. Number of times Department officers issued a citation to a student:
      i. By Department officer on District school sites for school-related offenses;
      ii. By Department officer on District school sites for non-school-related offenses; and
      iii. By Department officer off District school sites for school-related offenses.
   d. Number of times that Department officers handcuffed, restrained, or summoned students on campus.
   e. Number of arrests of students made:
      i. By Department officer on District school sites for school-related offenses;
      ii. By Department officer on District school sites for non-school-related offenses; and
iii. By Department off District school sites for school-related offenses.

f. Such data shall be disaggregated by school site, offense, and student subgroup, including age, race, ethnicity, student English learner status, foster youth status, gender, and disability (if applicable), whether the student has an Individualized Education Plan or section 504 Plan, and the disposition of the matter.

g. Complaints/grievances: The number of complaints/grievances against Department officers present or acting in District schools, disaggregated by the number of complaints lodged against individual officers, identified by the officer’s individual assigned code number. Complaint/grievances should include but not be limited to any reports of injuries or excessive force. All complaints against Department officers shall be handled according to Department policy and procedure. All complaints received by the District shall be forwarded to the Department officer’s supervisors and the Department’s Office of Internal Affairs.

h. Referrals: The number of referrals by Department officers of students from school sites to wellness centers, medical facilities, tutors, mentors, or other resources in lieu of arrest or citation, including referrals pursuant to California Welfare & Institutions Code § 5150.

i. Full and complete copies of Department officers’ logs pertaining to activities on school campuses.

j. Any other information the Department believes is relevant, including but not limited to information regarding the nature of any collaborative efforts between the parties.

3. The Department Chief or designee shall provide the District Board with a written report twice a year (in January and July, or as soon as reasonably possible thereafter) during open session of a regularly-scheduled public Board meeting regarding:

a. The information contained in the aforementioned monthly report; and

b. The impact of the policies and practices described in this MOU, whether adverse or positive, according to the statistical information received, on the District and Department’s efforts to reduce disproportionate contact between high risk or high-need populations and the police and/or juvenile justice system, as well as to reduce the rate

13 Such student groups include, but are not limited to, low income students, English learners, foster youth, students of color, and students with disabilities.
of school-based arrests and citations while maintaining a safe school climate.

4. The Department Chief or designee will be available to answer any questions posed by the Board or community related to safety, disproportionate minority contact with law enforcement, if any, student arrest or citation rates, and any other issues.

5. This monthly written report shall be made publicly available through the standard Board process and thereafter shall be posted on the District website, consistent with applicable federal, state, and local privacy laws.

6. The significance of disproportionate contact between high-risk or high-need populations and Department officers, according to the foregoing anticipated data, shall inform and impact the development of the action plan contemplated in Section I(B), above.

7. The District shall provide the public with the following information by posting the information on its website, updated on an annual basis unless stated otherwise:
   a. Regulations, policies, and protocols governing Department officer interactions with students, including any changes made in the prior year.
   b. Training materials for Department officers about working with students;
   c. Number of law enforcement officers regularly interacting with particular school sites; and the
   d. Aforementioned monthly written report.

V. TERMS OF AGREEMENT

This MOU shall be reviewed and revised, as necessary, by the District Board and Department leadership on an annual basis. This MOU remains in force until such time as either party, with 60 days’ notice, withdraws from the agreement by delivering a written notification of such rescission to the other party.

---

14 Such student groups include, but are not limited to, low income students, English learners, foster youth, students of color, and students with disabilities.
Dear Council Members,

I am a member of the Porter Ridge Townhouse Association and am concerned with the proposal by Krueger Development to construct a 4 and 5 story mixed use building to be located off South 29th between Anytime Fitness and south of Porter Ridge Townhouse Association. It is our understanding that Krueger Development is hoping to get a height variance increase from the current maximum of 35' and 40' to 50' and 61'.

As this request comes forward from Krueger Development, I would encourage you to deny the request for the height variance for the following reasons:
1. The 4 and 5 story building is not in keeping with the aesthetics of the area;
2. Will influence the quality of life for current townhouse owners;
3. Impact property values; and
4. Significantly increase the already high volume of traffic in the area.

Thank you for considering this matter.

Dr. Julie Skrabal
2867 Porter Ridge Road
Dear Official:

The safety of our children at school is a top priority for me. I support doing what is necessary to ensure it. But I do not think creating an unaccountable government entity is the best way to provide safety programs.

I'm concerned that the Lincoln City Council and Lincoln Board of Education are considering creating a joint public agency to fund more school resource officers. This public agency would have the power to impose a property tax increase on Lincoln residents.

Nebraska – and Lincoln in particular – is paying some of the highest property taxes per capita in the country. Creating an unnecessary bureaucracy that has the power to raise taxes even more is the wrong approach.

I ask you to do better for Lincoln student, families, and residents.

Sincerely,

DAVID FIELD
6300 Tanglewood Ln
Lincoln, NE 68516
City Council - Contact

Date: 5/10/2018 9:10:34 AM

name: Carol Miller
address: 2230 SW 12th Street
City: Lincoln
State: NE
Zip: 68522
Email: carol.miller09@gmail.com
Comments: Please vote AGAINST the Joint Public Agency to fund School Resource Officers and additional security. We need additional School Resource Officers, mental health counselors, and additional security, but they do not need to be funded by a governmental agency. Cindy Lamm had good recommendations for how to handle the funding without setting up a JPA. I believe there are better ways to fund this without setting up a government entity. We do NOT need more government bureaucracy. A revaluation windfall is giving the city and schools millions in new tax dollars which can be used for the security in our schools and community without setting up a JPA.

Carol Miller

IP: 216.17.72.18
Form: https://lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.3; WOW64; Trident/7.0; rv:11.0) like Gecko
City Council - Contact

Date: 5/10/2018 11:11:11 AM

name     Dave Bauer
address   711 w harvest
          Lincoln
state    NE
zip      68521
email    dbauer1966@gmail.com
comments Please vote NO on JPA

IP: 98.19.49.136
Form: http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/66.0.3359.117 Safari/537.36
Dear Official:

The safety of our children at school is a top priority for me. I support doing what is necessary to ensure it. But I do not think creating an two unaccountable government entities is the best way to provide safety programs.

I'm concerned that the Lincoln City Council and Lincoln Board of Education are considering creating a joint public agency to fund more school resource officers. This public agency would have the power to impose a property tax increase on Lincoln residents.

Nebraska – and Lincoln in particular — is paying some of the highest property taxes per capita in the country. Creating an unnecessary bureaucracy that has the power to raise taxes even more is the wrong approach.

I ask you to do better for Lincoln student, families, and residents.

Sincerely,

Deb Portz
8232 Dorset Dr
Lincoln, NE 68510