



Civilian Police Advisory Board Study Committee

Date: November 15, 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*	p
Laura Gitelson	p
Jillian Harvey*	

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

* - non-voting member | p - present

Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 7:05pm

1. Discussion: Listening Sessions - Susan Ryan-Vollmar

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) hopes that people have had a chance to peruse the summary she sent out earlier in the day.

(Sanjay Newton) thanked everyone for taking the time to participate in the many listening sessions we held over the last two weeks.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) noted that residents were very glad to be listened too. She shares three stories from the listening sessions which illustrate the dynamics at play.

The first story came from the BIPOC listening session and was from a mother who was questioned by police after leaving her 5 year old, who was staying home sick, in the car while dropping her other child at school on a cool fall day. She understood why the officer had to respond when called, but did not understand why his questions continued after she had explained what was going on. She was left wondering whether she was getting additional questions because of her race. Susan shared that the listening session participant had shared upfront that the committee needed to know that subtle instances of racism happen all the time in Arlington, and so it is easy to see how she would interpret the interaction in this way. The participant did not file a complaint because she did not think it would do any good. She had no proof that she was being treated with bias. This same participant also had positive things to say about police. She is an advocate around community safety issues and had partnered with former Chief Ryan on things.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) also shared a second story which was about how one bad apple can indeed ruin the whole bunch. The ill will created by a negative interaction does not get erased when other officers go above and beyond the call of duty. The story came out of the LGBTQIA+ listening session. An older woman shared that when her wife was dying, her wife's condition sometimes caused seizures which led to her falling to the floor. This woman would need to call emergency services to help get her back up. Sometimes police would respond, sometimes fire, and sometimes both. One night when this happened the police officer who responded initially refused to help the wife off of the floor. He told her to get up, badgered her, and told her to get up off the floor on her own. The behavior of the officer was upsetting to this woman and to her wife. She explained that she did not feel that she could call and complain because she knew that she would need to call again for help in the weeks ahead and did not want to risk retaliation. From that incident forward, anytime she called for help, she would emphasize to the dispatcher that they should only send the fire department. During this time, while her wife was ill, her wife's father passed away. This woman was the one to discover her father-in-law's body. When she called 911, she asked for an officer by name, because he was a family friend, but was told he was not on duty. A different officer responded to the call, but in the meantime the dispatcher tracked down the family friend who also responded to the call. Both Arlington officers stayed with the family for several hours through the process of getting the body transferred to a funeral home. The woman shared that both officers were incredibly kind and their support made an incredibly trying situation slightly less horrible. And yet, in our time with this woman, she kept returning to the officer who had refused to help and badgered her wife to get up off the floor herself.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) also shared a third story about how easily miscommunication can occur when the level of trust is low. During the town employee listening session, 40-50 people showed up. A number of APD officers were on the zoom call. Only a handful turned on their cameras and identified themselves by name. In contrast many of the other town employees did turn on their video and identified themselves. This created some tension in the call - were the officers there to participate? Were they just listening? Were they keeping track of who was saying what? Susan did have a chance to speak about this with Chief Flaherty who noted that some officers were tuning in from desktops without video cameras and so video was not an option. The session started slowly, as they often do. There were questions about the current complaint process and follow-up questions. There were questions about whether any change was needed, about whether the state-wide public safety law would negate the need for change. Someone asked if the committee understood how collaboratively departments work with each other. Someone wanted to know if we knew of any instance ever of someone having a negative interaction with an Arlington police officer. Someone wondered if the committee was possibly trying to fix a national problem locally. And then a town employee who is also a resident pointed out that none of the officers were talking, which was sort of an elephant in the room. The person knew of people in town who had had difficulties with APD, and had herself had difficulties. She wondered if people on the call were worried about talking freely in front of police officers who weren't identifying herself. Sanjay and Michael thanked her for her comments. They both reiterated that nobody was obligated to speak - sometimes it can be helpful to listen. Toward the end of the meeting, a police captain shared that officers were likely not comfortable speaking out about these issues in public. Officers were concerned that they would be treated unfairly in the study committee process and that was likely feeding into some of the silence. Over the weekend the town employee reached out to Laura, Susan, Sanjay and DEI Directory Jill Harvey to share that she had found the presence of police officers intimidating and that she was unhappy with how the listening session had been conducted. She had interpreted the captain's comments as an attempt to intimidate people. Susan can understand why the town employee felt that way. Susan also understands that police officers are not comfortable having open discussions about these issues with the public.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) notes that conversations about racism and cruelty are difficult to have. And conversations about policing are difficult to have, especially when they are about our neighbors. Susan concludes by noting that the stories underscore the gravity and importance of the study committee's work. She says that we're not looking for a problem that doesn't exist. We are responding to a charge from Town Meeting which we are taking seriously.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) offers Chief Flaherty a chance to add anything, if she wishes.

(Michael Brownstein) wants to add some context first, as he was also at that listening session. There was perhaps a reverse trust issues. He heard from them that there was a sense of “why trust this process.” He interpreted their silence as that. The instruction we gave was that you could be on camera or not, you could speak or not. This was an opportunity to be together and hear things and move forward together. He believes there’s a need for civilian voices to be heard this way.

(Laura Gitelson) would like to go around and hear from people about what they learned from the community input sessions. Most members were able to attend at least one listening session, if not more and Susan has distributed her document.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) wants to make sure we give Chief Flaherty a chance to offer input on the earlier parts, in case she wants to.

(Chief Flaherty) appreciates the work that went into the listening sessions. It is important work to hear from the community. She attended the first public listening session, but she had been asked not to attend the smaller ones so that people felt like they had a safe place to talk openly about their experiences about the police department. In terms of the first story, she was putting herself in the officer's shoes. APD gets calls every day about animals and children in vehicles. People walk by and have concerns. Having not spoken to the person in this particular incident, there’s not much for her to add, but this kind of call is an everyday occurrence for them. She understands why the person was upset about it, and why she decided not to file a complaint. She thinks Susan mentioned that she was friendly with Chief Ryan, so perhaps she mentioned it to him, but she does not know. She reminds the committee that the officer would be there in response to something, likely a call from another resident. She would love to have an opportunity to have a conversation down the line if that person felt comfortable contacting her.

(Chief Flaherty) doesn’t know what to say about the second story. She is so sorry that this person had this experience. She would welcome a chance to talk with that person if they felt comfortable. She does understand why they did not feel comfortable filing a complaint at the time. Maybe if this person knew there was another option, she might have felt comfortable going that route. She would be very willing to talk to either person if they felt comfortable.

(Laura Gitelson) would now like to go around and hear from committee members.

(Kathy Rogers) attended the larger session, a session with one participant and a third session that had a zoom link issue. She doesn’t have a whole lot to add at this point. She thinks our community holds a wide variety of opinions. In the

first session, we heard from a gentleman saying “If you don’t have subpoena power, it’s all worthless” which is one extreme. And at the other extreme we had “if it ain’t broke don’t fix it.” Our job is made harder because our mandate from the town is to identify a solution and she’s not sure there is one and so we have a challenge before us. She respects what we have heard. What was interesting about Susan’s stories was that there was a negative reaction, but also positive praise. That’s a delicate balance we have to respect as we do our work.

(Anne Brown) feels in a similar position and she missed the large session. Anne has read through the comments to the online survey. There were all extremes and everything in between. What comes out to her is that there are people who are feeling uncomfortable about the current system. If there are people who don’t know, or don’t feel comfortable then there is something we should do about that. She’s torn about whether a review board is the thing to do about that. She is unsure how significant the problem is, but there are people who are uncomfortable with our current process, and so to her it does merit having some sort of a recommendation so that everyone in town is aware of processes and feels comfortable using them.

(Clarissa Rowe) did attend the big meeting. With all of this we need to give Chief Flaherty an escape valve. As a select board member she had people come to her with problems and she would call Julie and say “Julie, please deal with this.” and she did in a wonderful way. She things we need to help them and they need to be our partners and that will help build trust in the community. We need to rebuild trust in the community.

(Carlos Morales) notes that much of our early work was academic, but now it has become very real. This is our neighbors, and he’s learned about how people are experiencing policing. We are in the next phase - it’s about us in Arlington and not just models and study. Anything that can help us with perception and trust would be good. On a personal note - what brought him to join the committee was a question about how residents experience the town government and town police. How can that experienced be enhanced for some extent, especially for people of color like him. He has not felt different from anyone else in Arlington in his treatment by police, but that is just his own personal experience. He has heard and seen that is not everyone’s experience. How do we move from here is a different question that we can discuss later. He’s thankful for how much he has learned from everyone on the committee. People have asked lots of great questions.

(Laura Gitelson) mentions that there was an issue with the Zoom link for the APS listening session and so the session has been rescheduled for Wednesday 7-9pm.

(Elliot Elkin) one thing that stood out was that there were going to be a lot of opinions on both sides. He thinks we've talked a lot about public outreach and having people understand what we're doing even if they don't agree with it. He thinks there's another part to it - what do the police think? In Susan's third example, where the police had their cameras off. If we do something and leave out the police themselves, we're leaving out half of the story. We're going to have to keep the community and the police in mind so that everyone gets it. Otherwise we might be creating additional problems. If the police feel that people are out to get them, we haven't really accomplished anything.

(Michael Brownstein) thinks that Elliot raises an interesting point. He also feels like he heard a need for some sort of system to help people raise issues. What's there today isn't quite working.

(Karen Bishop) took notes as she was re-reading things today. She appreciates being part of this committee. She was also re-reading Jillian Harvey's memo. She was heartened to see the thoroughness in those particular cases. She has not had issues with police in town, but she knows from listening sessions and people close to her that's not the case for everyone. We need to do something to rebuild trust. Thinks that Elliot made an incredible point - that we have to be careful to not make things even more adversarial. If we do create a body, she wants to make sure that the members understand what police do every day.

(Bob Radochia) wasn't able to attend any listening sessions. He doesn't open his computer every day. He hasn't had a chance to open Susan's memo that she distributed this afternoon. Bob thinks we have a lot of people in place who can be trusted. The Chief and Jill - in what they did they allowed some trust to build. He thinks Julie and DEI are the best place to go for some of these things. They're familiar with these issues.

(Sanjay Newton) thinks the stories that Susan pulled out at the beginning covered a lot of what he's been thinking about. In addition, he's been thinking about two separate things we've heard: "the police are fine and there's no problem" and "I was in a situation and I didn't know if I was being treated fairly and I didn't know how to find a resolution." Thinks that both of those things can be true at the same time. Just because nothing was done "wrong" doesn't mean there isn't something for us to do better. Even if just a small portion of Arlington feels unsafe bringing a complaint, our job is to ensure that as close as possible to everybody feel comfortable bringing forward a complaint if needed. They know how to do it, they feel comfortable doing it.

(Laura Gitelson) doesn't have much to add that hasn't been said already. She appreciates how much thoughtfulness people put into answering this question tonight. Feels that listening to people has forced us to focus in on the work that the committee has been doing for the last several months. She agrees with

much of what's been said. It's interesting how many people who had experiences which lessened their trust also had positive experiences, particularly off-duty officer showing up to help after the family member died. She's also struck about how the smallest negative experience can take over. It was moving and important information. Asks whether anyone wants to add anything about the learning sessions before we move on.

(Doug Heim) jokes that you haven't seen quiet in a room until there's a lawyer in the room watching. He didn't think it was the best idea for him to attend the listening session. Having read the summary, he's grateful for the work of the committee and he feels the committee's collective wisdom is reflected in the responses. He's heard many of us share these perspectives even before we had the listening sessions. That speaks to the folks who were appointed to the committee - it was well appointed and has had ears open long before holding the listening sessions. He's also really grateful on behalf of town employees. That's not something that happens a lot. Increasingly, fewer employees are town residents, so it was personally meaningful to him, and other folks that the committee chose to reach out in that way.

(Elliot Elkin) thinks that at the base of a lot of this is a disconnect between the public and police officers. We can't just address the complaint process, but also the disconnect between police and the public.

2. Discussion: Recommendations

(Laura Gitelson) reads the first question "Do you think the complaints process can be improved?" She notes that several people gave their thoughts on this in the previous discussion.

(Clarissa Rowe) thanks Elliot for his comments earlier. She notes that she has some recommendations from Bob McKersie she would like to share as a starting point. He very much likes the Cambridge model. She thinks that we need to work with the police and they need to be involved in what our recommendations are. In Cambridge they started off with a more "stick" policy and over time they changed and they review all of the recommendations before they go to the Chief. The people on the committee really need to know police procedures. The committee needs to work hand-in-glove with the police. She thinks that for years people have gone to the Human Rights Commission, but we need someplace else for people to go. Someplace that's welcoming. This very fragile process that we're involved in now is something we should move forward with. She's been very impressed with this group. She thinks we should create a committee with subpoena power, but not use it. But just in case we don't have such a great chief in the future. She thinks we need to understand what they do and we need to partner with them.

(Laura Gitelson) thanks Clarissa for her comments. She wants to bring it back to the more narrow question of "Do you think the complaints process can be

improved?" She notes that we've heard from several people saying yes - she asks if anyone thinks that improvements aren't needed? Nobody indicates so.

(Sanjay Newton) notes that Susan's question also asked "if so, how?" He'd like to discuss that part of things, even if we don't make final decisions about that. He notes that one thing that really stuck out for him through all the conversations and Jill's memo was Jill's companionship of people through bringing a complaint to the police department. This is an intimidating process for people who may not understand. For police, this is routine and everyday. For people making a complaint - they've probably never done this before. Hopefully they're never going to do it again. The language, the jargon, the process can just be intimidating. Sanjay would like to be able to increase the bandwidth of that "companionship." He's not sure that's the right word, but helping people through the process so that they feel like they have someone with them who knows the process and isn't a police officer. He thinks that is a concrete outcome he'd like to see.

(Kathy Rogers) has a question. Do we envision that there would be two portals? People can still go down to the police department and file if they feel comfortable? Or they can come to this other place to file? Or does it become merged into some sort of ombudsman? She's trying to get some sort of sense about what people are thinking about this part of things.

(Laura Gitelson) says that she sees us as having almost an infinite number of portals right now. People come to the process from lots of different places. She thinks we can feel confident that as long as they do make it to Chief Flaherty that they do get followed up on, no matter where they come from. She doesn't envision getting rid of things that exist, but making a very clear place. She sees it as mirroring work that the Human Rights Commission does but in a very specific way and with more specific training. She doesn't want to tell people that they can't go to the police department with a complaint, but she wants to serve the people who are just never going to walk into the police department.

(Sanjay Newton) thinks there's also an opportunity to followup. Someone who's not a police officer to follow up after the fact and check whether people got the resolution they wanted or felt heard. That can be a feedback in the system.

(Carlos Morales) thinks that one aspect is some ability for the first contact to be anonymous. Another aspect is trained individuals who can help through the process. The other part is a database to keep track of the data about how many contacts come in, how many complaints result, and the life cycle of these things. Can we have those data points? We cannot manage what we don't measure. He notes that we heard several cases today about several cases where there was contact, but there was never a formal complaint. There was some interaction but they didn't file a complaint. He thinks that's important data that could be useful in the future.

(Sanjay Newton) has one other part of the process to discuss. One thing that we've heard is that sometimes people don't know what to do. He's not sure what the right thing is. He wonders if it's perhaps just clearer instructions on the webpage? Or a "how's my driving" style card for officers to give out in interactions? He thinking about how people find out about the process should be part of our recommendations.

(Anne Brown) appreciates what Sanjay said about feedback. She notes that one of the things we've heard from people is "I'm not sure." When we have a "complaint" process that's a higher bar. It's for people who know that something was wrong. She notes that we heard cases where people didn't know whether is was wrong, but it didn't strike them as quite right. She wonders if this can allow more "feedback" about situations that weren't quite right but don't necessarily rise to the level of "complaint." She notes that when you collect more data you can sometimes see patterns. Especially about things that might not rise to the level of needing to reprimand people. It might lead to training or campaigns or things of that nature. She thinks that something in addition to just complaints is a good thing to explore.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) notes that Jill gave us an architecture for much of this at the end of her memo: Create a mechanism for filing complaints anonymously, triaging incidents, assessing outcomes that the complainant is interested in. She notes that different people want different things. She liked Sanjay's word "companioning" them through the process. She thinks Jill gave us a big gift with those recommendations in her memo.

(Clariss Rowe) thinks there are some social workers in the police department and perhaps they should be involved in helping us. Maybe some people from HHS. She has seen that police have to deal with people with lots of mental illness and she has seen that in her experience.

(Laura Gitelson) asks if anyone would like to make a motion to recommend improvements to the complaint process.

(Carlos Morales) made the motion and (Anne Brown) seconded. A vote was taken but Kathy Rogers expressed concern that it wasn't clear what exactly the vote was. The vote was revisited later in the meeting with clearer wording.

(Laura Gitelson) started to move to the next question asking about the components of a recommendation. She reads Susan's question "If you think that Arlington would benefit for the creation of a permanent civilian review board, please have no less than 3 and no more than 5 recommendations of what the board should be responsible for." She notes that if you don't think we should have a board, you should talk about that too. She notes that we could

recommend improvements to the process, but not necessarily a board and that's an important distinction.

(Kathy Rogers) thinks that it's a vital distinction. She sees "review board" as a loaded phrase and she's uncomfortable with it. She mentions earlier words. She thinks if we're going to talk about improvements or expansion that's one thing, but she's uncomfortable with "review board."

(Sanjay Newton) asks if Kathy thinks there is work or functionality that group of people who aren't police could do? He thinks that's really the question.

(Kathy Rogers) says that the answer to that is "yes" but that we need to be precise about the words. We should build it and then name it.

(Laura Gitelson) agrees with Kathy. She thinks this is a cases where we've gotten sucked into the wording of the charge and we don't have to do that. She notes that they did not intend that a body be named "civilian review board" given people's reactions to it. She returns to Sanjay's question about functionality.

(Kathy Rogers) reads again from the charge "that we shall study the creation of alternative mechanisms for civilians to file complaints regarding police interactions" She notes that she would have been comfortable with the earlier vote if it that had been what it was. She thinks that's the goal here.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) would like us to scrap the earlier vote, clarify the wording and do it again since she does think we're all really saying the same thing. She asks Kathy to propose the wording.

(Kathy Rogers) suggests potential wording.

(Doug Heim) thinks it's most important that the committee come out with the product that it wants. And to build the momentum the way you want to build it with shared understanding. He doesn't think we're voting on a final report or committed course of action. He thinks the co-chairs are trying to channel the committee to make some initial decisions. He thinks we're figuring out how to work one of those early gates.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) agrees. She also notes that she would like the committee to be unanimous when it can. She has a lot of respect for everyone on the committee, and especially Kathy.

There was a little more back-and-forth on the exact wording before setting on this final vote.

(Kathy Rogers) apologizes for being so specific about the wording.

(Laura Gitelson) assures her it makes sense.

(Sanjay Newton) thinks this is the fun part. He appreciates taking the time to get things right.

(Carlos Morales) was originally thinking we should use “enhance” instead of “alternative” but on second thought he thinks “alternative” is fine.

(Doug Heim) summarizes that what he’s hearing from the body is that something more or different needs to be done compared with the status quo as a first gate or step.

Vote: to endorse the creation of alternative mechanisms for civilian to file complaints regarding police interactions

Approved Unanimously

(Laura Gitelson) thanked Kathy for clarifying the wording and process. Asks the committee to begin sharing what alternatives members are interested in.

(Sanjay Newton) has been struck by how unsure most people we have talked to are about the data. “Is this a small number of complaints? Is it complete? What does it mean? Is it good?” He thinks there is a lot of room for people outside of the police department to really dig into what data could be collected or collected differently, or working with the analyst in the APD to explore how data could be reported differently. He’d like to see a board giving feedback to APD about what data the community would like to see to assure themselves of the quality of our police. He thinks there’s an appetite for that kind of data and analysis in town. Whenever he’s talked to town meeting members about any topic “what’s the data” is one of the big questions. So a focus on data as well as companioning people is one thing he’d like to see.

(Laura Gitelson) notes that this has been mentioned before but she thinks it is very important that if we recommend a body that they get good training. Both in police procedure and the kind of thing that Jill has done in shepherding people through a process.

(Kathy Rogers) went through pages 4-6 of our interim report and identified things she liked and thought were applicable from the models. In the investigative model she sees a civilian body of trained people to review complaints and confirm jurisdiction. “Is this in the right place?” Then she sees classifying them - “Is this a case of a police officer being rude, or something more serious?” From the auditor model she took out the participation in the complaint intake process and the data collection and analysis including patterns. From the review model she took “advocate to town and police officials for further review on individual matters.” She created a menu for herself from the three models. She thinks the

key things are assist the companion piece, to confirm jurisdiction and assess seriousness, to ask the complainant what they want out of it - an apology? a better understanding of something? And then to understand any patterns in data.

(Bob Radochia) asks what goes on in other communities for an alternate complaint process? He knows many communities don't have anything, but he thinks there must be something somewhere we can draw from.

(Sanjay Newton) thinks we've read about a lot of those possibilities in our study.

(Bob Radochia) is thinking more about places like Belmont and Lexington and places right around us. How do they handle this?

(Doug Heim) notes that the closest community in terms of size might be Brookline. Even in terms of towns, governments are structured differently. He thinks that one of the interesting things about Brookline and their use of the Select Board as an appeal entity. He notes that is a function of the choices of their town government. Arlington has a strong Town Manager. The Select Board doesn't make hiring and firing decisions about anyone besides the Town Manager and also somewhat the Comptroller. He notes that most of the models in smaller communities are partly a reflection of their size, but also of budgetary and other concerns. And also a reflection of the historical nature of those towns and how more affluent communities have had less diversity. He thinks there's a rabbit hole we can go down comparing ourselves to other communities. He wants to also caution that comparing us to other towns is hard too. Because hiring and firing in Arlington isn't made by an elected body there was a the perception in some circumstances that there was no way to hold somebody accountable to a civilian authority and it seemed like an extreme measure to engage in a conversation about the manager's performance when you're talking about a police officer's performance. He thinks it's very hard to compare. If you want to file a complaint in Brookline, but you don't want to go to the police department, you file it with the Select Board office. They assign it to someone to classify and then the police chief makes a recommendation for discipline and a civilian or a police officer can appeal that. He notes this is a simplification, but this is the closest community in terms of size, especially in Massachusetts that he's aware of that has something. The problem he sees with the comparison is that our Select Board doesn't make those types of decisions and so it doesn't translate exactly.

(Sanjay Newton) would also say to Bob that we heard from Brian Corr that a lot of communities are finding themselves in the position of saying that the traditional way of doing things has not always resulted in the trust that we want. And so we are considering doing something different from what we and maybe our neighbors have traditionally done.

(Laura Gitelson) starts to go around and prompt people.

(Anne Brown) doesn't have anything to add right now.

(Michael Brownstein) doesn't have anything to add right now.

(Elliot Elkin) doesn't have anything to add right now.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) would include partnership in policy on the menu. She's thinking about how the rainbow commission assisted in updating the APD's policies for interacting with transgender individuals. She shares that the Rainbow Commission had the policy reviewed by two national experts and they offered updates. The policy originally only considered transgender people in the lens of criminal behavior. This police helped shift this. For example, how do you deal with the situation if you arrive at a car crash and the gender marked on a person's license doesn't match their presentation. She believes the Chief found it helpful.

(Laura Gitelson) notes that the same thing was on her homework list. She'd like to see the functionality of understanding and influencing, but not making policy. She really like the example Susan gave.

(Carlos Morales) will send his written out recommendations to the chairs, but he notes that they've really already been covered by others. He will walk through them quickly: a permanent independent body that maintains a database of interactions with police department employees, accepting complaints and other keeping track of interactions with the police. Number two would be some kind of monitoring of the life-cycle of complaints - doing the analysis of the data. Number three is guiding community members through the process, involving others as appropriate. Number four would be reviewing serious cases and possibly referring them to POST or other state-wide bodies. The last piece should be being engaged in educating the community proactively. He wonders how they can partner with the police to enhance how the community experiences policing. He notes that this is about bringing community information and perceptions to the police.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) asks Carlos to expand more on what he's interested in on the review of incidents.

(Carlos Morales) says it could be as little as data-collection. Or following complaints and keeping track of all of their resolutions and life-cycles.

(Elliot Elkin) thinks that if we have a board, a core thing it should do is to go out and try and quantify the data to have an idea about what their doing.

(Susan Ryan-Vollmar) notes that based on what we've learned about APD that every complaint gets investigated and in a reasonable time period. She is also thinking about the quest for stories and data. She doesn't think we will get the stories or data if people don't feel like they have a safe and confidential place to bring them. She doesn't want this to sound like a fishing expedition. She'd be ready to stop at Jill's memo. She thinks there are needs in the community that aren't being met.

(Sanjay Newton) thinks that one way to think about data is to be able to tell a compelling story about whether the police department works in the way we want it to. He notes we've heard lots of people interacting well the the police and stories of bad interactions. He thinks having people who aren't part of the police department interpret that data for the community is important. He thinks there is a section of the community that will not believe the data coming from a police officer. Having non-police understand and present that data independently can have value as well sometimes, even if it's the same data.

(Carlos Morales) thinks that Doug's memo show us that much of the data that a board might want is public record. And so it's really about having a set of trained people who can interpret that data for the community and affirm what is working and focus on improving the things that aren't working.

(Elliot Elkin) thinks that building the board is only half of the story. Looking through the stuff from the online forms and discussion, there were significant responses saying "we're looking for a problem that doesn't exist" He thinks that making a compelling story that's backed up by data you can't argue against is going to be really important, and just as important as a structure that we come up with.

(Laura Gitelson) wants to clarify if Elliot thinks there's more data that we need before we make our recommendations? Or is he talking about the function of what we're building?

(Elliot Elkin) thinks we have to back up what we're wanting to build with data. And if we do create this board, it's going to have to go find data.

(Sanjay Newton) has a different take on that. He thinks that quantitative data is great, but it is not everything. We're still in the building stage, but when we do get to convincing, Jill Harvey's memo makes a compelling case without particularly quantitative data. He thinks we will have to continue to talk about what has a compelling case and what doesn't. He feels good that we have the information we need to make a set of recommendations. He thinks it's not just about data, but also about putting a narrative on the data.

(Karen Bishop) feels like she's somewhere between Elliot and Sanjay. She thinks we do have data. And she thinks there's data out there we don't have

because there are people out there who aren't comfortable with the reporting process. She wonders how we get to those people?

(Sanjay Newton) was 100% Elliot on his earlier comments about a two-way street of trust. He notes that the trust can be between police leadership and the community, but he notes there's also a street of trust the community and the actual officers on the street. He's not sure how the recommendations we're talking about so far are creating that trust between the community and the officer on the street. He's continuing to this about how to create that trust as well as the trust with the leadership.

(Kathy Rogers) is very struck by what Elliot said. She's interpreting what he said as we don't have enough right now to sell what we've built. She thinks that's a powerful statement.

(Elliot Elkin) wants to clarify that we also need to sell this to the police officers of the APD. If they don't get it, he wonders what's the point. From his personal standpoint, he agrees with what's in Jill Harvey's memo. But he wonders if that's enough to convince others. He wants to be specific that we're trying to convince almost everyone, which is an almost impossible task.

(Sanjay Newton) doesn't agree that we are trying to convince everyone. He doesn't think we will convince everyone. If we set the bar at convincing everyone, then he agrees that the task is impossible. He believes the bar is different than that. He is interested in whether we can make a case to the majority of the town and officers of the APD. He thinks we can do that with people who are willing to come engage with us in good faith. He thinks we've done that as a committee over the last months and that we can do that with others over the coming months. He notes we're a little ahead of ourselves in that we haven't actually built anything yet. He's meaning this as a pep talk.

(Carlos Morales) appreciates Elliott's point. He thinks that if we try to come up with something with the goal to enhance trust that will be well received. He thinks that enhancing that trust is big. He mentions that the Select Board was asking about the data saying that civilian boards bring down litigation against the police department. He doesn't think this has to be a zero-sum game. If we put something together that's good for the town, it will also be good for the police department because the outcome is increased trust. He thinks if we can manage that, it will sell itself. Not everyone will agree but there's a good chance we have a compelling case.

(Doug Heim) wants people to be aware that warrant opens soon and close January 28th. He doesn't think that's that scary for the committee. If they want something on the agenda of town meeting, it just has to be submitted by January 28th. He is at the ready if the committee wants to start putting things to paper. He's found the discussion very enlightening. He notes that we're talking

about big conceptual ideas, but also details that will help to have things fleshed out. He's found it very helpful and has strong idea of the permutations in his head.

(Chief Flaherty) wants to comment on a few things. She thinks the APD does a very good job investigating complaints. She thinks they could do a better job communicating the complaint process to the community. What she's hearing and seeing tonight and in the feedback we've gotten is that there is a need for some kind of body to receive complaints. She notes that it's been successful in the past working with the DEI director to have someone assist people through the process. She would be in favor of some type of committee, or board or commission that would receive complaints. She did want to caution people about asking people "how did I do." She notes that police are often dealing with people who are having a difficult time and that people call the police because they're in crisis and the outcome isn't going to be favorable for everyone involved. As an example, if she's responding to a traffic crash and giving someone a \$100 ticket because they went through a red light and a card asking them to comment to this board on how I did. She thinks the consequence of this is that she might give a warning instead of a ticket so she's not putting herself in the position of being judged. She also notes that POST has been receiving complaints since July first. All complaints or internal affairs investigations have gone to POST. She notes that they aren't up and running yet, but when they are they are tasked with certifying and decertifying police officers. She would like people to keep that in mind. She also wanted to comment on Susan's comments about policy. She it very helpful to have the Rainbow Commission review that policy. They found several policies that were outdated and hired a vendor to update them. She notes that POST will be delivering policy recommendations on topics like body worn cameras and SROS. She would welcome input on policy, keeping in mind that the state is likely to have blanket policies on some of these things including use of force.

3. Next Steps

(Laura Gitelson) asks if it makes sense to ask one or two committee members to flesh out recommendations.

(Sanjay Newton) agrees that we should. Perhaps given the time we should have people identify themselves to Laura and Susan.

The committee set meeting dates for December 7th, December 13th, and January 10th with the hope that we can be efficient on December 7th can cancel the December 13th.

(Sanjay Newton) thanks everyone for their diligence and patience. He notes that it has been many more meetings that perhaps most of us expected at the start.

(Laura Gitelson) asks for people to email if they would like to be part of a small subset to create a framework.

4. Approve minutes from prior meetings
No minutes ready for approval

5. Adjourn
Vote: to adjourn at 9:15pm
Approved Unanimously