

C I V I L I A N R E V I E W B O A R D
PUBLIC SESSION MINUTES

December 21, 2017

Present at the meeting were Civilian Review Board members Bridal Pearson (Chair, Northern District), Betty Robinson (Northeastern District), Mel Currie (Southwestern District), Ebony Harvin (Southern District), Marcus Nole (Eastern District), George Buntin (Western District), and Leslie Parker Blyther (Central District).

Also present were:

Director Jill P. Carter, Director of the Office of Civil Rights
Jesmond Riggins, CRB Supervisor
Evangula Brown, CRB Investigator
Shaun Clark, CRB Investigator
Mark Ciccone, Office of Professional Responsibility
Chief Rodney Hill, Office of Professional Responsibility
Chief Luke Brackett, Baltimore City Environmental Police
Randy Williams, Caucus of African American Leaders
Amy Cruice, ACLU
Jerrell Bratcher, Strategies for Youth

Members of the public and community members were also present.

I. Welcome and Introduction of New Board Members

Chair Pearson welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 6:07PM. He recognized and introduced non-voting members of the Board and staff.

II. Director's Report

Director Carter noted that the CRB had had their first meeting with the Community Oversight Task Force the previous evening and expressed her hope that the collaborative process would continue between the two bodies. She noted that the COTF is an important vehicle for change and CRB's input is critical to their process.

She also noted that the Office of Civil Rights would participate in the Martin Luther King Day parade on January 14th at 11PM. Every Board member that would be available on that day was asked to march with OCR.

III. Approval of Minutes from November 16, 2017

Bridal Pearson motioned to approve the minutes from November 16, 2017. Mel Currie seconded, and all were in favor.

IV. New Complaints

CRB2017-0157 H CRB

A majority of Board members voted to authorize an independent CRB investigation.

CRB2017-0193 EF CRB

Board members unanimously voted to authorize an independent CRB investigation.

CRB2017-0198 FA FI CRB

A majority of Board members voted to authorize an independent CRB investigation.

CRB2017-0201 H AL IAD

Chief Luke Brackett of the Baltimore Environmental Police introduced himself and explained his agency's investigative process, detailed the work that had already been done in the case, and explained that he had already given investigative materials to the CRB investigator. Mel Currie asked if Chief Brackett would receive the final results of the investigation and Chief Brackett stated that he would. Chief Brackett noted that the agency had 0 complaints the previous year, and were happy to be open and transparent. He noted that they had an agreement with Sherriff's Internal Affairs Division for all complaints that they were not able to investigate internally. Board members unanimously changed their votes to review only the IAD investigation.

Supervisor Riggins suggested a change to allow investigators to begin working on time sensitive cases as soon as possible. He noted that there was a complaint that he had assigned an investigator to begin work on as soon as it was received, and stated that he felt that the decision to begin an investigation should lie with the staff on the front end. Leslie Parker Blyther asked what would happen if the Board decided that they did not want to authorize an independent investigation. Supervisor Riggins clarified that in this particular case, the investigator had already been assigned to that case, hoping that the Board would vote for CRB, and they could potentially forward what they had received to IAD if the Board did not authorize the investigation. He noted that allowing staff to immediately begin investigations would increase CRB's efficiency. George Buntin stated that this measure was something that they should consider, especially in cases that were time sensitive. Supervisor Riggins noted that in the past the decision on whether to independently investigate was made by the staff, however the prior investigators chose not to investigate any complaints, and so the prior Board decided that they would make the decision as to whether to authorize and independent CRB investigation. Supervisor Riggins noted that in other oversight agencies, office staff did complaint intake and made their decision on whether to investigate based on that intake in order to be more efficient. He noted that there

were issues with CRB receiving complaints late and having to complete an investigation with fewer resources. Mel Currie stated that while he agreed with staff authorizing an investigation on the front end, he felt that the issue would be when staff did not authorize an independent investigation in cases where the Board wanted one completed. He would propose that they report on complaints that they chose not to investigate and the Board would advise whether these cases should remain IAD only, or whether the Board wanted to review an independent CRB investigation. Mel Currie motioned that the staff begin investigation into any case that they felt warranted investigation, and the Board would vote on those that investigators chose not to investigate. George Buntin clarified that the Board could also request that cases revert back to IAD only in cases where the Board did not want an independent investigation, and Mel Currie agreed. George Buntin agreed with the motion, noting that there could be multiple witnesses and the cases could be time sensitive. He stated that he wanted to maintain the process of review, but allow investigators to immediately begin investigations when they felt that this was necessary. Leslie Parker Blyther wanted to ensure that this motion was in line with the law, and expressed concerns that it could be mitigating to the power of the Board. Supervisor Riggins clarified that the manner of authorizing an investigation is an internal procedure that can be changed by Board preference and vote. George Buntin clarified that the motion would only allow staff to preemptively investigate and the Board would still have the final authority to authorize other investigations. He noted that the Board could always change the procedure if it was not working out. Betty Robinson suggested that the Board reevaluate in 6 months. Motion passed with six in favor and one against.

CRB2017-0202 FA FI EF CRB

Board members unanimously voted to authorize an independent CRB investigation.

CRB2017-0203 AL H CRB

Board members unanimously voted to authorize an independent CRB investigation. Supervisor Riggins clarified that this was the investigation that he had assigned to the CRB investigator immediately because there were eye witnesses, one of whom would only be in a certain area in a certain time. He noted the need to interview a particular witness while the school year was still in. He also noted that there were cameras in the area, and wanted to get to the footage before it could be deleted or cycled out.

CRB2017-0205 EF CRB

Board members unanimously voted to authorize an independent CRB investigation.

CRB2017-0206 H IAD

Betty Robinson noted that she felt that this case presented an issue for traffic court, although there seemed to be some additional harassment issues. Board members unanimously voted to review only IAD's investigation.

V. Completed Investigations Noted on Via Email to Avoid Expiration

<u>CRB#</u>	<u>IAD#</u>	<u>Allegations</u>	<u>Findings</u>
PD178-16	16-0633	EF FA	Officer 1-NS Officer 2-EF-S

Mel Currie stated that the sergeant who was called to the scene was supposed to improve the situation and got frustrated. He stated that the sergeant had knocked the camera out of the complainant's hand and taken him back to the kitchen, where he was heard screaming. He sustained because he felt the sergeant's actions were unnecessary. Ebony Harvin did not feel that the sergeant had handled the situation appropriately, and noted that the complainant had his child in his hand. Marcus Nole was concerned that anything could have happened to the child, and felt the officer was not protecting the safety of the child. Bridal Pearson felt he did not deescalate for the safety of the child. George Buntin noted that the sergeant had lied about the questions he asked and why he felt the need to become aggressive. He noted that the questions he claimed he had asked were not the questions he had actually asked. He lied about why the situation escalated, which IAD sustained as a false statement. **Board members sustained excessive force for the sergeant and recommended 18 days suspension and a severe letter of reprimand. The allegations of false arrest were administratively closed due to expiration.**

PD180-16	16-0644	EF H	Officer 1-S-EF Officer2-NS-EF
-----------------	----------------	-------------	--

It was noted that the harassment allegation had expired. Leslie Parker Blyther asked Chief Hill to explain the Body Worn camera program. Chief Hill clarified that the program called for 50 officers per month to receive the cameras, and that cameras should be on during any enforcement action. Leslie Parker Blyther wanted to know under what circumstances an officer could turn the camera off, and Chief Hill clarified this was permissible when talking to victims, witnesses, and confidential informants. He stated that there is no official date on how long footage is archived, but noted that he believed it is held in a cloud software. He noted that the body worn camera unit did random audits and disciplined officers with 2 days suspension or loss of leave for not turning on their cameras during police actions. He noted that counseling was assigned for the first two offenses, followed by discipline for subsequent occurrences. He stated that the punishment increases to a middle letter of reprimand and 2 days suspension when there is a complaint that results from the incident in which the camera was not turned on. Leslie Parker Blyther asked if there was a difference if a use of force occurred, and Chief Hill stated that it would be treated like a complaint and the automatic discipline would revert to the more severe punishment.

Betty Robinson asked what percentage of the police force had the cameras, and Chief Hill stated that he was not sure, but he believed that almost every officer in patrol had them, although there could be some stragglers. With regards to the first officer, Board members sustained excessive force, and 3 members voted for termination as the disciplinary recommendation. Marcus Nole noted that he felt strongly about termination in this case because it was a minor with a disability. Leslie Parker Blyther agreed and noted that she felt that she was repeatedly seeing police officers behaving in a way that suggested they were unable to restrain themselves. She stated that quality of life crimes such as loitering should not be offenses that lead to an arrest. Director Carter noted that there was an issue regarding the designation of which public places could enforce anti-loitering laws. Leslie Parker Blyther noted that she felt the level of force taken was unnecessary and that in order to change the culture, the Board needed to send a message that these actions were unacceptable. She noted that these issues disproportionately affect African Americans. Marcus Nole noted that the victims were moving to comply with the order, but they said something the officer did not like, and the officer reacted in anger. He noted that they were told to move because they were waiting for another group of youths, and the officer asked them to leave. George Buntin agreed and noted that he considered making his vote termination in every case where an officer did not cooperate with a CRB investigation because he felt that lack of cooperation was disrespectful and problematic. He also noted that he had a problem with the fact that the officer lied about why the body camera was not operable. He further noted that all of the officers were on the scene, and none had their cameras on. He noted that when he found an officer lying in an official report, he felt that that was sufficient cause for termination. He noted that the officer engaged a civilian, and wondered how many times officers engaged a civilian with no camera footage or paperwork to document the interaction. He also noted that the victim's mother was there and took the victim to the hospital, and that the victim was injured and had documented facial injuries. He noted that the officer admitted to punching another person on the scene. **Board members unanimously sustained the excessive force allegation for the first officer, and did not sustain for the second officer. The harassment allegation was administratively closed. After further discussion, Board members unanimously recommended termination for the first officer.**

VI. Appeal

<u>CRB#</u>	<u>IAD#</u>	<u>Allegations</u>	<u>Findings</u>
PD024-15	15-0338	EF	Sustained

Mel Currie noted that there was an independent witness and a medical report corroborating the complainant's statements. Bridal Pearson agreed. Leslie Parker Blyther asked Chief Hill to clarify that officers were directed to the home based on the helicopter's instructions, and that there were exigent circumstances. She asked the investigator to comment on whether the complainant was compliant. Investigator Brown noted that she was only looking at the allegation of excessive force. She read the policy and noted that according to the policy an officer should only use force as

necessary, regardless of whether the complainant was non-compliant. She stated that he may not have initially been compliant, but that the level of force used was not necessary and was therefore excessive. Mel Currie noted that the officer had stated that he “guided” the complainant out of the house, and felt that this was problematic, as the language he used in his description was misleading. Bridal Pearson noted that the shoulder was injured through an unapproved technique. **Board members unanimously sustained the excessive force allegation and by majority recommended 19 days suspension and a severe letter of reprimand.** Chief Hill clarified difference between the different letters of reprimand.

VII. Completed Investigations

<u>CRB#</u>	<u>IAD#</u>	<u>Allegations</u>	<u>Finding</u>
PD041-15	15J-0018	EF	Continued

Mel Currie noted that the complainant was not an eyewitness, but was on the phone with the victim when the incident occurred. Leslie Parker Blyther noted that there were a lot of contradictions as to where the gun was found. Betty Robinson noted that the victim’s gun was never shot. Leslie Parker Blyther asked why the officers did not give a statement for 6 months, and wanted to know the required timeline for providing a statement. Chief Hill noted that until there is a declaration from the State’s Attorney’s Office as to whether the case will be charged as a criminal investigation, the officer does not make a statement. He stated that a police involved shooting is automatically considered a criminal investigation until this declaration is made by the State’s Attorney and the officers invoke their Miranda Rights. He noted that the State’s Attorney has asked IAD not to compel a statement from the officers as it could create problems with the criminal investigation should they choose to pursue it. Chief Hill noted that a use of force report occurs immediately, but only contains basic information. He stated that he felt that the time limit did not cause an issue and ultimately gave IAD more information with which to enter the interrogation. Chief Hill clarified that the State’s Attorney declined to prosecute the officer, at which point the 10 day rule took effect and the officer was compelled to give a statement within 10 days of the request. Leslie Parker Blyther wanted to know what protocols existed to prevent officers from colluding. Chief Hill stated that they were ordered not to talk but there was no defined protocol. Mel Currie wanted to ask under what circumstances the CRB would issue a subpoena for witness officer as the witness officers had declined to respond in this case. Mel Currie moved that the Civilian Review Board issue a subpoena for the witness officers. He felt it would be an important exercise to understand how the subpoena process worked. Leslie Parker Blyther seconded, and all were in favor. **The case was tabled pending the subpoena of the witness officer.** George Buntin clarified that due to the Law Enforcement Officer’s Bill of Rights, the Board cannot subpoena accused officer, but can subpoena witnesses and witness officers.

PD069-15

15-0772

EF

Sustained

Bridal Pearson noted that he felt that injury did not need to occur for force used to be considered excessive. He noted that the officer was also trying to intimidate the complainant. Mel Currie noted that this was tied to another case with the same complainant and the same officer. Leslie Parker Blyther noted that there only certain circumstances in which an officer can ask for ID. Amy Cruice clarified that the officers can ask for ID but a civilian does not have to provide it. Supervisor Riggins clarified that they can arrest a complainant for not having an ID if they are planning to charge them. Amy Cruice noted that when an officer is going to write a criminal citation, they have to confirm the identity of the person being cited, however if they can't confirm their identity through identification, the office will make an arrest. Director Carted noted that they would often find a reason to arrest on this basis. Amy Cruice noted that this was a gray area with regards to marijuana, due to the fact that less than 10 grams is not an arrestable offense, but officers could issue a criminal citation if the person in question does not have identification. Betty Robinson felt that the police escalated the situation unnecessarily. **Board members unanimously sustained and recommended 30 days suspension and a severe letter of reprimand.**

PD035-16

16-0118

EF

Sustained

Mel Currie stated that in this case, the officer recognized that he had made a mistake. Bridal Pearson noted that the crime scene tech observed the complainant's injury. Mel Currie noted that officer failed to write a citizen contact receipt. He noted that the complainant called 911 after the encounter, and complainant did not get cited for the initial stop, which he felt made it unlikely that he would follow the officer and report his license plate number without cause. Mel Currie noted that no one answered the dispatch call asking which vehicle carried the license plate number the complainant had reported. Leslie Parker Blyther noted that choking is an unapproved use of force, and in this case she felt it was deliberate. Betty Robinson noted that the complainant was initially stopped because he didn't have his lights on. **Board members unanimously sustained and recommended termination.**

PD067-16

16-0335

EF

Sustained

Bridal Pearson the felt evidence did not support the complainant's statements. Mel Currie sustained the case because he felt that elements of the arrest were problematic, and noted that the officer had refused to allow the complainant to use the bathroom. He noted that the correctional officer corroborated the complainant's account and stated he did not refuse the complainant entry. He noted that the officer lied about this, in addition to lying about the manner in which he moved the complainant from the door. He stated that he felt the force used to pull the complainant away from the door was excessive. Marcus Nole noted that the correctional officer state that the police officer would need to escort the complainant to the bathroom and the accused officer refused to do so. Marcus Nole felt it was unnecessary, and the officer did not treat the complainant with dignity. Bridal Pearson changed his vote to sustain. **Board members unanimously sustained and recommended 5 days suspension and a**

middle letter of reprimand. Chief Hill stated that Internal Affairs did not sustain the case because they did not believe the correctional officer's statement. He said that he did not accept the story that the correctional officer gave, stating that there were certain processes that arrestees have to go through in order to move through the facilities which presented custody issues. George Buntin asked what the correctional officer's motivation might be to lie about this case, and Chief Hill stated that he may have wanted to avoid a problematic situation. Mel Currie noted that the correctional officer wouldn't have done anything wrong if he had refused to let the complainant in without the proper paperwork. Mel Currie wanted to know what options the officer had, and Chief Hill said that in this case the person would have had to wait. Leslie Parker Blyther noted that once the arrestee is received by corrections, there is a bathroom available in the cell. Chief Hill stated that it took some time for the person to be placed in the cell. George Buntin noted the correctional officer admitted that he would have let him use the bathroom in violation of the policy, and stated that as such he found it unlikely that the correctional officer was lying.

PD083-16

16-0389

EF

Continued

Bridal Pearson voted to sustain and noted that a witness had observed the interaction. Mel Currie noted that the complainant had lied at least twice during the interaction, which he felt degraded the complainant's testimony. Marcus Nole felt that lying on the part of the victim did not excuse any use of excessive force. Amy Cruice clarified that she may have lied to the officer because she felt intimidated. Bridal Pearson stated that someone observed her being kicked and punched, which in his view made the lie irrelevant. Investigator Clark noted that the witness was inside the vehicle in the backseat, and that he did not leave the vehicle. He noted that the witness was in the rear seat and was looking backwards. Mel Currie stated that he would have felt more strongly if the witness were impartial observer, rather than a personal acquaintance of the victim. Betty Robinson wanted to know if there were medical reports, and it was clarified that there were no medical reports. George Buntin noted that witnesses did not recall seeing the punch, and felt that there was not enough evidence to sustain the case. He also wanted to note that there was a difference between a civilian lying to police officer and a police officer lying in an official report. George Buntin noted that anyone would react negatively to an arrest, which is when situations can escalate. Betty Robinson noted that this was a simple traffic stop, and wanted to know why it had escalated to an arrest. Chief Hill noted that the complainant was arrested for driving without license. George Buntin noted that the medic did not find evidence of physical trauma, however just because there were no injuries did not mean the force used was not excessive. Several Board members were conflicted, and Ebony Harvin stated that she would like more time to review the case. It was noted that the votes of the missing Board members would be needed to break the tie. The Board chose to continue the case for consideration at the next meeting. Investigator Clark believed that some parts of the complainant's statements were credible, and some parts were not based on witness statements. He noted that it was unlikely that the witness viewed second part of the interaction with the officer in entirety. **The case was continued until the January meeting.**

PD159-16

16-0574

EF

Continued

Leslie Parker Blyther wanted to know if the camera footage was available that could identify the officer involved, and Chief Hill stated that there was not. Investigator Jeffrey stated that she wrote the report and that there was body camera evidence, but the IAD disk provided to her would not work on her computer. The complainant had indicated that she was shown footage from the body worn camera in her IAD interview, as well as screenshots. She noted that the complainant saw herself being pushed. Investigator Jeffrey noted that she could tell by the border in the screenshots that the footage was from a body worn camera, but could not confirm that the officer had pushed the complainant. She noted that it was dark and it was hard to see, and that it was a crowded scene and several people were in the shot. Leslie Parker Blyther wanted to know if it was possible to continue the case pending the investigator viewing the video. Chief Hill noted that there were many different software types used to play media and that there were occasionally issues with different media players. He clarified that Investigator Jeffrey could go to IAD and view the video, as the issue could be the disk. **Board members agreed that the case would be continued to the January meeting pending the investigator viewing the relevant footage.**

CRB2017-0001

17-0004

FA FI

Not Sustained

Betty Robinson noted that complainant was insisting that sheriff should conduct the eviction. Chief Hill noted that the initial eviction was done by the Sheriff. Betty Robinson noted that it was unclear when the bank got the property. **Board members unanimously did not sustain the case.**

CRB2017-0005

17-0011

AL

Not Sustained

Mel Currie noted that there was a claim in this case that the Board did not have jurisdiction. Chief Hill noted that in this case and another case there were jurisdictional issues. Chief Hill noted that there was an officer on duty and both the officer and the station attendant were acting in their capacity as city employees. He felt that the issue should have been reviewed amongst their supervisors, and did not view it as a civilian issue. Mel Currie noted that Board members had heard complaints regarding off duty officers in the past. Chief Hill felt that the Law Department should resolve the issue. Ebony Harvin noted that the complainant was terminated as a result of the incident, and no longer worked for the city. Leslie Parker Blyther stated that police officers are not an equal peer of other city employees. Investigator Clark noted that he had recommended a finding of Not Sustained. Mel Currie did not sustain because of insufficient evidence, and other Board members agreed. **A majority of Board members voted not to sustain the allegation.**

CRB2017-0058 **17-0193** **AL** **Not Sustained**
Bridal Pearson did not sustain because the social worker did not corroborate the complainant's statement. It was noted that the officer's statement in the body worn camera footage was not fully audible. **Board members unanimously voted not to sustain the allegation.**

VIII. Presentation From Jerrell Bratcher, Strategies for Youth, on Youth/Police Encounters

Jerrell Bratcher introduced himself and his organization, Strategies for Youth, as an organization that worked towards positive youth/police encounters. He noted that they had conducted a "train the trainer" session to prepare BPD to interact with youth, and discussed their "Policing the Teen Brain" program. Their ultimate goal is to teach officers how to interact with youth and people of color in a trauma informed and equitable manner. He stated that they also reviewed and critiqued BPD policies on how law enforcement interacts with youth, and helped develop equitable, trauma informed, developmentally appropriate approaches. He noted that Department of Justice attorneys had also reviewed BPD policies prior to the last election. He noted that the program also trained youth in the community regarding interactions and altercations with the police. He briefly discussed their juvenile jeopardy game and their goal to reduce the school to prison pipeline. He noted that they would be training Department of Parks and Rec, as well as meeting with people from juvenile court systems, and that they were always willing to meet with the Board to further discuss efforts. He clarified that they were funded through the Office of Crime Prevention, and that Board members would be welcome to observe trainings.

IX. Public Comment

Randy Williams from the Caucus of African American leaders noted that the majority of the stops examined were Terry stops, and some were dispatch generated 911 calls. He noted that he wanted to know if Board members had BPD's policy with regards to Terry stops, and they clarified that they did. He wanted to state that regarding traffic stops there was a law (MD Transportation Section 25-113) requiring data tracking of traffic stops to mitigate racial bias. He stated that Baltimore City does not have Etix, which would allow them to do a real time analysis of racial bias in traffic stops. Leslie Parker Blyther encouraged him to go to a monitor's meeting and express these concerns. He went on to ask whether Baltimore City maintained a Brady's or Giglio's list, wherein if officers met certain criteria their testimony can never be used in court. The criteria for the list are met when an officer lies in official investigation or on the stand, lies in a report, manufactures evidence, or assists another officer in their fabrication. Bridal Pearson felt that this information represented the importance of public discussion and sharing. Mel Currie noted that there was a Community Oversight Task Force member present, and that these issues were within the lane of the COTF. Mr. Williams noted that one of the relevant cases was Brady vs. MD. Chief Hill clarified that the issue was covered by the Law Enforcement Officer's Bill

of Rights, and that in MD this was called the “do not call list”, and that an officer cannot be terminated simply by being on the list. George Buntin noted that everything the Board had come up against as a challenge was in the LEOBR. Chief Hill noted that whenever IAD sustained for a false statement, they would automatically recommend termination. He clarified that LEOBR states that an officer cannot be fired for being on the “do not call list”, but IAD does recommend termination when false statement allegations are sustained. Chief Hill noted that the State’s Attorney Office asks if they can see personnel files for Grady/Giglio issues when an officer will testify. If they find something in their file that is integrity related, there is an in camera review by the judge, and it can be used against the officer in court. George Buntin noted that two times in the reports there were inconsistencies in the officers’ statements that were reflected in the IAD report. Chief Hill noted that the Court of Appeals had stated that mere denial or failure to recall is not considered a lie. Randy Williams clarified that lies were differentiated between lies that affect the community and lies that do not. He noted that there was no requirement that a department keeps a list, and that it was at the discretion of the law enforcement agency. He noted that this was an opportunity where a policy could be added. Chief Hill noted that in BPD’s case, former State’s Attorney Bernstein discarded the list, while current state’s attorney Mosby considered these cases on an individual basis. He stated that an officer’s presence on the “do not call list” could be the result of the suspicion that an officer had lied without enough evidence to terminate.

George Buntin felt the department should want to track officers with credibility issues. He felt that it would be good to have an early warning system and the Etix program could be helpful, as it would be possible to pull the history of each officer’s traffic stop, based on demographic data. Luke Bracket noted that the Environmental Police were already using the Etix system.

Director Carter asked on average how often officers were terminated due to making false statements. Chief Hill stated that on average they terminate 25 officers each year, and approximately 10 of those terminations are due to false statements. Leslie Parker Blyther noted that publishing these stats would help increase public trust.

Denise Duval from the Community Oversight Task Force noted that it was her first time observing a meeting, and she was impressed with the work of the CRB. She noted that their work was important and wanted to thank Board members for their efforts. She wanted to know if there could be further explanation of the body worn camera policy in a future meeting. Chief Hill stated that the policies are on the website. Denise Duval stated she felt there was a need to ensure that citizens are informed about body worn camera policies.

Chief Bratcher noted that etix had been very helpful for his small agency. He stated that they produce a number for every citizen contact and record geographic and demographic data. He noted that the system gives a good thumbnail look and finds early warnings for bias based policing. He felt that the system was easier to use for

small agency, and that the cost of the unit was about \$2500 each. He noted that the units were assigned specifically to the traffic officers, and that they had a section for mitigating bias-based policing. He noted that their data could be downloaded onto an excel spreadsheet, and they had professional data analysts to analyze it.

Mel Currie stated that at some point he would like for the CRB to meet with Commissioner Davis.

X. Old Business

XI. New Business

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Muth