

**COMPREHENSIVE NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY STRATEGY
COLUMBUS SAFETY ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, March 27, 2019**

Commissioners Present:

Chair Janet Jackson, Dr. Chenelle Jones, Dr. Vlad Kogan, Erin Synk, Tiffany White, Emily Buster, LaShaun Carter, Oleatha Waugh, Ellen Moore Griffin, Andrea Morbitzer, Mary Wehrle, Matthew McCrystal, Brooke Burns, Dr. Reginald Wilkinson, Pastor Jason Ridley

Commissioners Absent:

Tammy Fournier-Alsaada, Traci Shaw,

Staff Present: Elon Simms, George Speaks, Chief Quinlan, Kate Pishotti, Jeff Furbee, Bryan Clark, Cmdr Meader, CD Bash

WELCOME

Chair Jackson called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm and welcomed the Columbus Community Safety Advisory Commission ("Safety Commission") to the 17th meeting of the group. Chair Jackson asked Pastor Jason Ridley to share a prayer for the loss of community activist, Amber Evans, who was taken from us way too soon. A prayer was offered by Pastor Ridley. Chair Jackson also asked for the group to be mindful of the youth in our lives in light of the recent suicides across the country. Discussion followed regarding officer wellness as it relates to CPD. Chief Quinlan is to present a five-pronged plan for improvements to the officer wellness program, including new technology that relates to this topic. The commission will be provided with a copy of this proposed plan.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 23, 2019 and MARCH 14, 2019 MEETINGS

Chair Jackson thanked Commissioner Griffin for her work to date on very detailed minutes, but requested that the minutes going forward err on the side of brevity and not be so extensive. All commissioners approved the meeting minutes for January 23 and March 14, 2019 meetings.

REPORTS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEES – there will be a public meeting around sub-committee draft recommendations to gather input and comments – not scheduled as yet

- A. Hiring/Recruiting – draft recommendations are being compiled, with input from the full commission
- B. Training – we are meeting with representatives from Hot Topics and 21st Century Policing subcommittees today after the commission meeting to discussion overlapping topic to avoid duplication of efforts.
- C. 21st Century Policing – meeting as described above
- D. Hot Topics
 - 1. Meeting as described above
 - 2. Circulating information to members about best practices in other cities

Discussion followed regarding receiving regular updates from CPD. This will not be an agenda item going forward, but the agenda for the meetings will be sent at least 2-3 days in advance of meeting dates, if possible.

PRESENTATION FROM JOHN SCRUGGS, MATRIX CONSULTING GROUP

USE OF FORCE - NATIONAL TRENDS AND BEST PRACTICES

- I. Use of Force defined - there is no single, universally agreed-upon definition of use of force, but the International Association of Chiefs of Police has described use of force as the "amount of effort required by police to compel compliance by an unwilling subject."
 - A. Training
 - 1. Basic/Recruit Academy – more hours for scenario-based training
 - a. focus of training – the trend is teaching situational awareness, adapting to the situation, using de-escalation and other options (winnable scenarios - many do not require force)
 - b. training debriefs – the trend is discussion focused on tactics and options (de-escalation, distance = time = options)

- c. training hours – the trend is “seat time” is being replaced by scenario-based training, skill demonstrations and testing in firearms, defensive tactics, driving, de-escalation
 - 2. In-service Training
 - a. update on case law
 - b. update on use of force policies/trends
 - c. state-mandated training
 - d. scenario-based training/simulator - developed to stress de-escalation and identified risks, such as lawsuits, improper techniques, information from use of force
- B. Tactics
 - 1. The tactics used at an incident can impact the need to use force – tactics should be considered when reviewing use of force incidents
 - 2. Lawful but Awful (no policy or law violation)
 - a. officer positioning
 - b. governmental interest (suicidal, drunk, type of crime or threat to others)
 - 3. Tactical Decision Making
 - a. pre-planning
 - b. post-incident debrief
 - 4. De-escalation
 - a. taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situations and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolved the situations without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary
 - b. techniques – tactical repositioning; slow, lowered voice using non-threatening commands, positive reassurance; building rapport and trust; slow things down
 - 5. Crisis Intervention
 - 6. Walk Away
- C. Policy
 - 1. Garner vs. Tennessee – court ruling on reasonableness requirement in regards to use of deadly force – has impacted policy
 - 2. Graham vs. Conner – offers little guidance on how agencies should revise policies, strategies, tactics and training relative to use of force
 - 3. Use of Force Continuum - Mechanical Model – ease of training
 - a. some agencies are moving away from it and going to an options model
 - b. depending on assessment of the threat, officers are expected to make decisions based on the range of option available to them
 - 4. Sanctity of Human Life, De-escalation clauses in policy
 - a. affirmative obligations to de-escalate prior to using force, when reasonably safe and feasible to do so, and to assess and modulate force as resistance changes. (Seattle PD)
 - 5. Critical Decision-Making Model
- D. Documenting/Monitoring
 - 1. Use of Force Reporting
 - a. all force documented, with contributing factors and de-escalation attempts noted, as well as other options considered
 - 2. Early Intervention System
 - a. uses patterns/comparisons, thresholds by unit/shift/assignment, and tracks other variables
 - 1) complaints, overtime, crashes, lawsuits, critical incidents
 - b. if threshold is met, immediate assignment to supervisor to conduct preliminary analysis
 - 3. CPD uses a reactive review system, but is working toward implementing a pro-active system
- E. Supervision
 - 1. Are they arriving on critical incidents or incidents that have the potential to become violent?
 - 2. Supervisor ratio is important
 - 3. Mentoring – 50% of complaints arise against officers with less than 5 years on the job
 - 4. Assists with making a plan

5. Coordinating resources
 6. Post-incident debrief
 7. If not on scene during use of force, quick response afterward to document
 8. Administrative review – interview witnesses (both community members and officers), narrative written by officer and supervisor and review by chain of command
- F. Investigation
1. Handled by detectives – sometimes all “in house” with DA assist; sometimes by outside jurisdiction; hybrid model (multi-jurisdictional team)
 2. Administrative Review of Policy
 3. Training Review (tactics and training)
- G. Civilian Oversight Boards
1. Vary in scope and authority; exact number is not known
 2. Three main types:
 - a. investigation-focused – routine, independent investigations of complaints against police officers, which may replace or duplicate police internal affairs, though non-police civilian investigators staff them (Atlanta, Chicago, New York)
 - b. review-focused – concentrates on commenting on completed investigations after reviewing the quality of police internal affairs investigations (Baltimore, Boston, Phoenix)
 - c. auditor/monitor model – focuses on examining broad patterns in complaint investigations including patterns in the quality of investigations, findings, and discipline rendered. This model often seeks to promote broad organizational change by conducting systematic reviews of police policies, practices or training, and making recommendations for improvement. (Calgary, Los Angeles County, Fresno)
 3. Earliest models started in the 1960s – no empirical evidence that they work (study is needed)
 4. Drawbacks – large time commitment, training, trust (internal and external), expense, timeliness
 - a. any research data on how officers feel about these boards? No, but a lot depends on how boards are structured.

Discussion followed – please refer to video (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RkerENr9Hnk>) at 1:35:00

COMMISSION TIMELINES – LOOKING AHEAD

- I. There will be two separate reports – one from Matrix Consulting and one from the Commission
 - II. Our report will be released at the end of July – here’s the path to get there:
 - A. Week of April 14 – Juvenile justice issues and preliminary report from Matrix
 - B. Week of April 28 – Implicit bias (suggestion to include personal or organizational agendas)
 - C. Public testimony opportunity at City Hall – week of May 12
 1. Three minutes to speak per individual
 2. Members of the public may submit testimony online
 - D. Commissioners can submit individual recommendations – week of June 2
 - E. Matrix Consulting releases their report to CPD, Mayor, Commission – week of June 9
 - F. Week of June 23 – two, five-hour sessions to review commission’s final report draft and incorporate sub-committee reports
 - G. Week of July 7 – final report to be given to commission to review
- Q: Is there an opportunity for a meeting without CPD/Safety? A: We can make that happen, with public notice.
- Q: Will there be an opportunity to sit down with Mayor and City Council to debrief after report is submitted? A: Yes.
- Q: What is the process for the follow-up on our recommendations? A: There is no intention to disband the Commission.

Meeting adjourned by Chair Jackson at 5:32p.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Moore Griffin
Recording Secretary