

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/12/2025 09:37 PM

Council File No: 25-0600-S130

Comments for Public Posting: Request: Transparency in LAPD Staffing and Deployment FYI: Headcount Is Not the Same as Patrol-Ready Staffing I support this motion and appreciate the Council's effort to require clearer reporting on LAPD hiring and attrition. However, for this exercise to be meaningful, the City must confront a basic problem: "total sworn" staffing numbers do not equal patrol-ready officers. When the City cites total sworn headcount without distinguishing who is actually deployable, it presents an incomplete and often misleading picture of LAPD's operational capacity. Sworn staffing figures routinely include officers assigned to administrative roles and those on long-term light-duty or medically restricted status who cannot perform patrol or field work. As a result, the public hears one number, while frontline staffing tells a very different story. If the City is requesting additional funding, increased overtime, and expanded hiring based on claims of staffing shortages, then it owes the public a clear and honest accounting of how many officers are truly available to do the core work of policing. Hiring and attrition projections alone are not enough if deployment realities are left unexamined. I respectfully but firmly urge that any report produced under this motion clearly separate headcount from deployment, and include a breakdown of sworn personnel assigned to patrol, administrative functions, and restricted-duty status; the length of time officers remain in restricted assignments; and which administrative roles could be civilianized. Without this level of transparency, Council cannot fully evaluate staffing needs, budget impacts, or whether new hiring will actually translate into more officers on the street. This motion is an important step. Making deployment data public would turn it into a meaningful one.