

Links:

[Meeting #16 Ref Docs including Agenda Slides](#)
[Shared folder - Internal Communications Folder](#)

- Moment of Silence
- Report Presentation
 - Folks will have opportunity to review document and provide input after today's meeting as well
 - Budget section not yet included in this draft of the report
 - Recommendation around department naming as "Department of Community Safety" is approved
 - Recommendation around leadership of new Department of Community Safety
 - [REDACTED] Description could be better. Change "should be a civilian" to "may" as it was not agreed that the lead had to be a civilian.
 - [REDACTED] Council left that open for us to decide and I feel strongly that it should be "should be a civilian"
 - [REDACTED] The reference to "should be" means that this is not a law enforcement position. It doesn't exclude anyone who has been a police chief or officer but when they are in this position, they will not need to meet the qualifications of being in law enforcement.
 - [REDACTED] I have a question around meaning of "sworn" - I thought public officials in Ithaca were all "sworn" to uphold the law and constitution.
 - [REDACTED] I believe city department heads are not "sworn in" but elected officials are. (Correction by [REDACTED] Department Heads do take an Oath of Office.) I would leave this as it is currently written.
 - I also recall [REDACTED] reference to our Council meeting, but I think the current wording meets what we're trying to achieve.
 - [REDACTED] I have a question around the word "should" - how will people receive it? Secondly, the "background in social work, public health, [etc.]" - are those things required (=> "must")? Would it be clearer in two separate sentences?
 - [REDACTED] I think "should" is pretty clear. Anything that comes out of this would have to go to HR and be vetted through NY State requirements and channels.
 - [REDACTED] I like keeping "should" because it keeps possibilities open, e.g. for a seasoned officer to work part-time, retire, etc.

- [REDACTED] I think the word “may” allows for more flexibility and strongly suggests that it be a civilian, which is not what Council said.
- [REDACTED] When I went back to look at the video from Council on this, there was a lot of discussion. I strongly think the language should be “should” as it should be a civilian.
- Recommendation around structure of Department of Community Safety
 - [REDACTED] I think the language should be kept simple and understandable. People should be called what they want to be called. Police officers want to be called police officers, and they should be called as such. We don’t need to create tensions. Just call them the “Division of Police/Police Division” instead of “Division of Police Operations,” and call the Chief of Police the Chief of Police.
 - [REDACTED] For this organizational structure, I agree that language is clear and concise, and I think “Division of Police Operations” is clear, and that “Department of Community Solutions” is also clear, so I would leave those as written.
 - [REDACTED] Agree
 - [REDACTED] I would agree with [REDACTED] here. We are facing a recruitment struggle in Ithaca. Even with the new contract, we are still struggling. Officers want to be treated as professionals and work for a police department. I would argue even further that it be called the “Ithaca Police Department” even if it gains no traction in this group.
 - [REDACTED] Reminder that we don’t want to revisit discussions that have been decided, only the things that are blatantly presented incorrectly in this document.
 - [REDACTED] I agree with everyone in different aspects. Just flagging that I don’t know if it’s clear what the director of the armed side is going to be called in this report.
 - [REDACTED] Our understanding is that the name chosen was Director of Police Operations, but that due to NY State Law, the Chief would have to be called the Chief.
 - Clarification on when this was addressed
 - [REDACTED] Can we clarify what is meant by “may consist of all existing civilian and non-civilian members of the current Ithaca Police Department”?
 - [REDACTED] This was meant to capture the lack of resolution that I perceived with regards to the conversation around where certain types of current staff may go in the new department, be it under the armed division or unarmed division.

- [REDACTED] Part of the resolution passed last April was that no IPD officers would lose their job with this reimagining. “Initially” and “may” suggest otherwise.
 - [REDACTED] We will improve this language
 - [REDACTED] If it perhaps says that it initially will include all members of current IPD, that gives the opportunity to include others and captures what council intended (I believe).
- Recommendation around key responsibilities of the two Department of Community Safety units
 - [REDACTED] Lifting again that “non-sworn” seems inaccurate in capturing profile of officers and public workers.
 - [REDACTED] You could refer to them by title.
 - [REDACTED] I just noticed that for unarmed responders, there’s no mention of mental health, etc. I thought that was the spirit of what we’re including here.
 - [REDACTED] Can use title of “community solutions officers” in place of non-sworn.
 - [REDACTED] In the report --- These unarmed responders should bring skills in community engagement, de-escalation, crisis intervention, and referral to mental health and social service providers.
 - [REDACTED] I agree armed/unarmed is awkward, but at the same time it’s IMO part of the driving force between having two divisions. I don’t have an easy solution to this, though. I also expect that with a very lightly staffed DCS to start that unless we accept very long response times, police officers will likely have to take up some of the unarmed responses
- Recommendation around call delineation
 - [REDACTED] question - before this document comes out there is language that comes out, paramedics should go to some calls without PO’s- have they been looped in to this or will it be dropped on them in a common council meeting
 - [REDACTED] I thought that we had ended with intoxication being an "it depends" and also I think that it is important that it should be.
 - [REDACTED] The categories being used is insufficient - when talking about assault there are so many different types of assault
 - I may not have been consistent with my responses in part because calls themselves (I do not understand how these types are decided)
 - [REDACTED] Met with Michael Stitlely to go through these - we did decide with him and go through it and on Doers part that they will make some changes
 - [REDACTED] Michael stitlely met with EMS providers in rethinking that - it will not be a new conversation, it has been initiated

- [REDACTED] unarmed responders - use the word “May” be done by unarmed respondered
- [REDACTED] DOer does not know what happens on the road - just receiving the calls
- [REDACTED] Scotts point about iterative nature about reviewing and continuing to improve
 - I think it is important to request an ongoing structure to review and improve
- General Recommendation:
 - [REDACTED] Should there be a reference to collaboration with the CJC also in this Exec Summary?
- Recommendation around Subcommittee;
 - [REDACTED] Technology & Tools - replace RMS system, they are all in one with Spilman, you might want to examine that a bit and dig into that
 - [REDACTED] Tech subcommittee- I do not recall replacing RMS, there are other layers to it that city and county can replace it
- Wrap Up