

Notes - RPS Working Group Meeting #3
Date: August 12, 2021 - 6:00 - 7:30 pm ET

Attendees:

RPS Working Group Attendees: Eric Rosario *Co-Lead*, Karen Yearwood *Co-Lead*, Amir Tazi, Mar'Quon Frederick, Tom Condzella, Luca Maurer, John Guttridge, Scott Garin, Mary Orsaio, Yasmin Rashid, George McGonigal, Amos Malone, Ducson Nguyen, Travis Brooks, Laura Lewis, Thaddeus McClain*

Technical Advisors: Schelley Michell-Nunn, *Director of Human Resources*, Melody Faraday, *Public Information Specialist*, Deanna Carrithers *Chief Equity and Diversity Officer - County* + Savante Myrick, *Mayor* and Lisa Holmes, *Deputy County Administrator* (1st 30 minutes)

CPE Attendees: Tracie Keesee *Co-Founder & SVP, Justice Initiatives*, Josh Young *Deputy SVP, Justice Initiatives*, Dominique Johnson *Senior Advisor, Community & External Engagement*, Rob Kenter *Dir. Law Enforcement Field Engagement*, Niles Wilson *Relationship Manager*, Lydia Imani *Program Manager, Triage Response*, Emma Decker *Community Engagement Specialist*, Price Nyland *Project Coordinator, Community Engagement*, Michelle Stack *Executive Assistant, Justice Initiatives*, Lillian Hua *Project Assistant*

Did not attend: Amir Tazi, Mary Orsaio, Thaddeus McClain, Travis Brooks, Yasmin Rashid, Savannah Gonzalez (we had 11 WG members in attendance).

Reference Materials:

- [Agenda](#)
- [Presentation](#)

Next meeting: Thursday, August 19, 2021 6:00 - 7:30 pm ET - Invite/Agenda to be sent

Homework Assignment:

- Continue adding feedback on the Call Types in the [Google form](#) -

Action Items:

-

Notes:

- Karen reminded us of group expectations
- Moment of silence
- Karen walked through the agenda for today
- Mayor Myrick and Lisa Holmes - the interim county admin, started us off with a discussion on delineated calls.
 - Mayor: This will be the trickiest part of the process, be realistic about probability rather than possibility. Need to do serious triage, and rely on and trust intuition

- and reliable resources. I trust you, if you find yourself second guessing, know my faith in you will get you through this process.
- Lisa: Recognized the group and the work they are taking on, and offered that the County is a partner and will support through the process, thanked everyone for work and commitment on behalf of the County, wishes for best possible outcomes.
 - Karen: Reminded the group that it started with [Executive Order 203](#). Encourage you to read it again, and focus on Recommendation 1, which is our charge.
 - Eric: (it is 3:30 am where he is!) And he appreciates the Mayor's reminder to be bold, and in the spirit of what the City and County have agreed to do, added encouragement to be truly responsive to the people of the community. Thanked Karen for her sharing of responsibilities.
 - [REDACTED] [Worksheet](#) - Call Types [Google form](#) - some folks completed that, will go one by one (Emma will add notes in the linked worksheet) to capture what WG members want to be added.
 - Josh: Any questions about call types before we begin? [Call Types Example Sheet](#)
 - [REDACTED] One thing that stood out to him is that many of these things are not police matters, what we choose to do and not to do are both important.
 - [REDACTED] how many UNARMED officers would be hired at the beginning, what their training would entail and whether they would work 3 shifts, or 24/7? That will affect how many calls they will take, what is the training, and will they be working all 3 shifts or what will the hours be? A lot of these calls can be answered by whoever is available.
 - [REDACTED] If we go through the list, if the Q is whether there should be armed, unarmed or hybrid response, then we can go back based on what we think the response should be to then what would be required, look at what do we think is the best approach, then look at staffing and training required to meet what we are envisioning. Don't look at present constraints.
 - [REDACTED] [REDACTED] made good points, offered that we don't operate in a bubble, other agencies and entities would involve how dispatch would operate and a uniform response -all calls get a response, and if it does not fit in a box - it is police (right now), there are a number of things to consider, availability, and appropriateness.
 - [REDACTED] It is important that we consider scene safety and 1st responders, safety does not mean the same thing to everyone, how do we balance safety for everyone? If the EMTs decide they don't feel safe, the PD has to respond - the police are the only ones who can deem the scene as safe. (seems like a vague mandate that police must respond if others don't feel safe, is this the case?)
 - Josh: The first thing is to decide on the realm of possibilities with this group and then look at what is needed, discuss the call types as a group. There are 3 groups, armed, co-response, and

unarmed. The difficult part is the grey areas, people have made errors in judgement before, but we need to look at what is possible, absent any regulations or policies, those are the Q's we need to answer in the working group.

- [REDACTED] [Call Types](#) Discussion (screen shared)
 - Vote on armed vs unarmed vs co-response for each one - using raise of hands (see document for vote)
 - [REDACTED] Is there any place to vote for a co-response?
 - [REDACTED] - it is up to the WG - yes we can.
 - [REDACTED] Do we have access to any technical advisors before voting, Chief Joly is not present - there are a lot of these call types, and he does not think the WG has had enough discussion or education on what each one of the call types are.
 - [REDACTED] We had that education session last week for that purpose, this is the WG charge - we wanted to have the DoER back, but they were not available today.
 - Josh: We will be talking about this for the next month or more, we are not making recommendations right now, there will be discussion around each one. Next week is when DoER will be back and we will have additional TA's
 - [REDACTED] Can we add "no response" as a vote?
 - Josh: That would be an unarmed response then. Anything other than a police officer - yes.
 - [REDACTED] A co-response could be unarmed and armed, or one or the other, is that right? Trained Public Safety employees?
 - Josh: Think of armed as IPD only, co-response could be IPD (armed or unarmed) and mental health staff, and the last one is anyone but IPD - but co-responders like EMT and mental health, etc.
 - [REDACTED] They (unarmed response) may not be police officers, they will have training, but they may not go to the police academy. Training will be decided by a subcommittee.
 - [REDACTED] Reemphasized that there is a clear distinction between police officers and any other public safety response to be named, caution drawing so much attention to whether someone is armed or not, or if someone brings a gun to the scene or not. I am concerned about there being a vote that he does not have a gauge on what the terms actually mean and are agreed upon yet. He feels ill equipped to do this exercise right now, DoER does not have much to offer in the way of education or experience in this. Added again, he is uncomfortable with this exercise.
 - [REDACTED] I am not a police officer, listening to concerns of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and he agrees, he has seen a simple traffic stop go from zero to 1000, in his mind, if he was an officer, you never know who you are stopping, feels

this needs to be thought through, we need to make sure our public safety - first responders are safe also. And training needs to be a core focus.

- [REDACTED] This is just a discussion at this point, let's go through these and see what talk about them.
- [REDACTED] I agree with [REDACTED] comment and was struggling myself with the breadth and definition of this first category.
- [REDACTED] Maybe we shouldn't call it voting. Each can be a conversation, because if we continue to make the worst assumptions of every type of event we'll end up marking armed officers for every category and see no change at all ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] all agreed)
- [REDACTED] We anticipated that this would be a very preliminary discussion, reading of RPS, conversations, and things that would make sense, to see where we are to find any points of contention. This is a rich conversation, it demonstrates that when it comes to doing this work, we will get to where we need to go. Council wants unarmed included in the new public safety model.
- [REDACTED] One of the outcomes of this conversation, seems to me, is that some of these categories should be made into more nuanced categories. Maybe (the term) Traffic Offense is too broad and should be broken up. [REDACTED] agreed.
- [REDACTED] I agree with [REDACTED] I get a lot of constituent feedback that they want more traffic enforcement, particularly wrt speeding, or ignoring stop signs, etc. Things that put pedestrians and cyclists in danger and that IPD doesn't have the resources to manage right now.
- Josh: Property check is a person who might need to check for any reason, break in, or people go away on vacation and want an officer to keep an eye out.
- [REDACTED] This is one of the ones that I thought perhaps should not be a response at all. Depending on the specifics, if we are talking about people just asking someone to keep an eye, vs. someone calling in because they thought they saw someone breaking in or something else like that.
- [REDACTED]: I'd love to hear the perspectives of [REDACTED] as well.
- [REDACTED] We do property checks of parks, public facilities, construction sites, as well as private properties.
- [REDACTED] If property checks are being done, something should be added to tax bills to inform property owners that this is available to them.
- Josh: To [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] is parking just tickets?
 - [REDACTED] That is straightforward, yes, but the property check one is not so simple.
- [REDACTED] parking - no officer wants to respond to that
 - We have consensus on this with 11 votes on unarmed response.
- Josh: [REDACTED]: Welfare check is checking on a person based on someone's observation of them, or a lack of seeing someone?

- [REDACTED] This could be one where someone calls about a person of color who is suspicious, needs pro- Q&A answered properly, police are always sent, does not see a way to break this down, it is how they relay the information that is coming in.
 - [REDACTED] Said there is a flag for suspicious vs. welfare where someone's health is involved. Can we delineate between the two?
- [REDACTED]: For IPD - from your experience, did you feel having a weapon was needed at the scene, or did it exacerbate the situation?
 - [REDACTED] We are drawing too much attention to weapons, if it is a medical issue, why don't we send the fire dept.? If it does not fit the flow chart, then IPD is sent. I don't think the tool we carry (a gun) should be what we are focusing on here, it amps up things from the start, and he pushed back against the armed vs unarmed being the issue, he does not think it factors into whether things go well or not.
- [REDACTED] Great clarifying Q's
- [REDACTED] Closing out - we will continue the exercise of completing the document in the next sessions.
- Josh: please fill out the form throughout the week and we will discuss next week 8/19.
-
- *See [worksheet](#) for updated notes on each call type and votes