



Police Civilian Advisory Board Study Committee

Date: August 24th, 2021

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: Conducted by Remote Participation

Attendance

Karen Bishop	p
Anne Brown	p
Michael Brownstein	p
Elliot Elkin	p
Kerrie Fallon	
Julie Flaherty*	†
Laura Gitelson	p
Jillian Harvey*	p

† Capt. Sean Kiernan attended

Doug Heim*	‡
Carlos Morales	p
Mona Mohtadi	
Sanjay Newton	p
Bob Radochia	p
Kathy Rogers	p
Clariss Rowe	
Susan Ryan-Vollmar	p

‡ Deputy Town Counsel Michael Cunningham attended

* - non-voting member | p - present

Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 7:04pm

1. Approve minutes from prior meetings
Vote: to approve minutes from August 3rd 2021
Approved 7-0-2 Elliot and Kathy abstained
2. Updates from committees/constituencies
(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) - LGBTQIA+ Rainbow Commission
Susan has asked to be on the September Commission Agenda.
(Carlos Morales) - Envision Arlington Diversity Task Group
Carlos was not present at this point in the meeting.
(Kathy Rogers) - Human Rights Commission
Kathy shared the August 3rd slides with the HRC and Kathy has reserved time on the HRC September agenda.

(Elliot Elkin) -AHS Student

No updates; school has not started.

(Michael Brownstein) - Envision Arlington Standing Committee

Has discussed with the chair and is on the September agenda.

(Anne Brown) - Council on Aging

CoA has not met, Anne hopes to have it on the September agenda.

(Karen Bishop) - Board of Youth Services

BoYS has not met since June, but Karen expects to review with them in September.

(Kerrie Fallon) - Disability Commission

Joined the meeting after this item.

3. Presentation on comparison to area towns - Bob Radochia

(Bob Radochia) wanted to understand what was going on with peer communities. He reviewed for the committee the report he submitted to the committee (see below). Bob reiterated that he still hasn't wrapped his head around what problem we are trying to solve.

(Kathy Rogers) asked whether any of these communities have something like what we are considering: Bob was not aware of any.

(Sanjay Newton) asked about whether there was complaint data: Bob did not find this kind of data in his search.

4. Discussion of draft interim report - Laura Gitelson

(Laura Gitelson) opened the discussion by thanking Kathy for the work that she did in creating this document. Laura also pointed out a chart that Michael created to summarize the models of civilian oversight.

(Sanjay Newton) thanked Kathy for her excellent work. We could also create an executive summary to add to this great document.

(Michael Brownstein) thinks the document is very well organized. Who exactly is the audience for this? Michael thinks the executive summary would be a good idea. Michael explained the table he created.

(Elliot Elkin) offered to cut down snippets of an executive summary for use at the high school.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) echoed the praise of Kathy's work. In answer to Bob's earlier question about what problem we're trying to solve, she pointed to the charge of the committee. In response to Micheal's question about who the audience is, Susan noted that Town Meeting is our primary audience, as well as other residents of the Town. Some will read this whole document and others will need smaller chunks as we've discussed.

(Carlos Morales) thanked Kathy. Agrees that an executive summary is a must. Also mentions the possibility of a pamphlet for a wider audience.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) offered to work with anyone who wanted to create a pamphlet.

(Sanjay Newton) suggested that the executive summary does not necessarily need to be part of this document, but can be a separate document as could a flyer.

(Karen Bishop) thinks the report is fantastic. Very interested in a shorter version to circulate.

(Anne Brown) was thrilled to see this and thinks it is perfect for sharing with her board to explain our work.

(Michael Cunningham) thought the report was very well done and will be excellent for sharing. Michael asked about the public input process.

(Laura Gitelson) mentioned that is upcoming work for the committee.

(Jillian Harvey) thinks the report is excellent. She is still wrapping her head around how to get this information out more than just the usual people.

(Bob Radochia) thinks the report is a great summary about where we've been. It's a good basis to go on.

(Capt. Brendan Kiernan) focused on the breakdown of the models and found it very well done and easy to understand.

(Laura Gitelson) asked whether there were any edits.

(Sanjay Newton) asked for the chart from Michael as an appendix.

(Laura Gitelson) pointed out that there were several places where appendices needed to be inserted.

(Michael Cunningham) clarified that the plan is to publish the report on the town website.

(Jillian Harvey) asked to review the final version for ADA compliance before publishing.

Vote: to accept and publish the report with minor editorial adjustments and the addition of an appendix from Michael Brownstein.

Approved 10-0

(Laura Gitelson) asked to check in about the scope of the work going forward. It seems to her that our research points to the idea that the investigative model is not likely to be useful for Arlington, if we do end up suggesting some kind of civilian oversight.

(Sanjay Newton) is in a similar frame of mind to Laura. One of the big things he's taken away from our research as well as the presentation from Brian Corr is that tailoring to Arlington is the most important part. At this point, with the information we have so far he is drawn to parts of the Auditor/Monitor model and with pieces of the review model. Agrees that the investigative model is likely not right for us.

(Anne Brown) is in agreement with Laura and Sanjay based on learning so far. Also sensitive to not foreclosing ideas before get more public input.

(Karen Bishop) agrees that the investigative model is not likely right for Arlington. Karen agrees that future listening sessions are important.

(Jillian Harvey) asked whether we reviewed the current complaint process at a previous meeting. Sanjay believes it was the April or May meeting. Jillian is not interested in the investigative model for Arlington but a hybrid could work.

From her personal experience being involved in a complaint she could see how oversight and receiving complaints could work together. Added that we'll

need to keep in mind resources and costs. Leaning toward a hybrid but still open to more information.

(Michael Brownstein) wants to unpack more with Envision Arlington before forming an opinion.

(Carlos Morales) agrees with Sanjay that it's important to find what fits for Arlington. We already know some things that don't fit, particularly the investigative model. Models are really good for understanding, but now it would be good to talk about functions and picking and choosing the functions which are in the chart and document that are correct for Arlington. Carlos joined this committee because of how people experience being in their community. He shared an analogy to illustrate that the problem we're trying to solve is to make sure that everyone feels safe in his community.

(Michael Cunningham) is impressed with the foundation that's been laid and sees public input as future work for the committee.

(Bob Radochia) still needs to get specific about what exactly we're designing. He thinks we will get there soon.

(Jillian Harvey) asks whether there is survey data about the current reporting system and whether people are satisfied with it.

(Laura Gitelson) is not aware of that information already existing.

(Kathy Rogers) asks how much the handling of the Lt. Pedrini situation is related to our work.

(Laura Gitelson) mentioned the wider national discussion and momentum for civilian oversight.

(Carlos Morales) agrees that Jill's question is good, but we must keep in mind that the data doesn't exist by design. If someone is not comfortable complaining to the police then it's very difficult to find that data.

(Elliot Elkin) did not have anything new to add.

(Kerrie Fallon) worked for a number of years with women who were targets of domestic violence. Her experience was that having a support system to report complaints was important for people she saw in her work.

(Anne Brown) thinks Jill's point is very important. Anne is unclear about the history in Town Meeting and whether this relates at all to frustration with the Pedrini situation.

(Sanjay Newton) notes that the Pedrini situation was certainly part of the environment that led to this committee, but that viewing our work as solely driven by that would be a mistake. Sanjay suggests that we are charged with a much larger conversation than just that situation.

(Anne Brown) notes that it's important that we communicate to the community that we are here for a larger reason.

(Sanjay Newton) notes that our work, and the work of any possible future board, is larger than just specific complaints. Sanjay notes that regardless of how we got here, the charge from Town Meeting is clear. Sanjay notes that sometimes it's not about fixing a specific problem, but about figuring out a better way to do things.

(Capt. Brendan Kiernan) spoke for himself. He noted that no one model is going to fit like a glove. He noted that the size of most of the example

communities was much larger. Probably best suited to build a hybrid that works for you.

(Karen Bishop) notes that most people don't know how complaints can be registered.

(Sanjay Newton) notes that there are municipalities that ask officers to carry business cards with the commendation/complaint process outlined.

(Laura Gitelson) thanks the committee for the fruitful conversation.

5. New Business/Future meetings

(Laura Gitelson) has invited Sandy Pooler to our September 8th meeting to give an overview of the current police collective bargaining agreements.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) has invited Chief Wynn from Pittsfield (and recently appointed to the POST Board) to address our September 20th meeting.

(Sanjay Newton) will be interviewed by ACMi in the near future.

6. Adjourn

Vote: to adjourn at 8:24pm

Adjourned Unanimously