



Policing Advisory Commission
Monday, August 9, 2021
Virtual Meeting
6:30 – 8:00 pm
Meeting Minutes

Commission Members Present: Alicia Hudson, Jenn Lynn, Dalbin Osorio, Shabab Mirza, Cherri Branson, Jerome Price, Caroline Fredrickson, Vernon Ricks, Eric Sterling

Ex-officio Members Present: Sergeant Cate Brewer (FOP representative), Assistant Chief Dinesh Patil (Chief Jones' designee)

Commission Members Absent: Nadia Salazar, Robin Gaster, Justice Reid, Jasmine Williams

Support Staff: Susan Farag, Carlos Camacho

Guests: Heidi Rhodes (JUFJ), Bob Ravida, Carmen Facciolo (MCPD)

Meeting was called to order at 6:33 pm

Agenda:

1. Attendance and Recording of Meeting: Mr. Camacho took attendance and began recording the meeting. All guests were asked to enter their name and any organizational affiliation into the chat. Guests were invited to share their thoughts and comments in the chat with the understanding that Commissioners may keep these for their own records and that comments may be made public in the event of an MPIA request.

2. Administrative Items

- Approval of minutes from July 19 PAC meeting
 - Mr. Price was listed as being both absent and present. The minutes should reflect the fact that Mr. Price was present at the meeting.
 - The PAC unanimously approved the June 19 meeting with the above edit.

3. Subcommittee Updates

- Emergency Response
 - Held the Emergency Response Collaboration meeting on July 29.
 - The additional six social workers that were funded by the County were hired and were doing their CIT training as of two weeks ago so they may be done by now.
 - Ms. Lynn also forwarded the link to the next CAHOOTS training, which is scheduled for August 25. Anyone can sign up to participate. It is a two-hour training.
 - Have taken a look at the ELE4A MCPD Audit recommendations.

- With regards to behavioral and mental health programming in jails there is the [Jail Addiction Services \(JAS\)](#) and the [Medication Assisted Treatment \(MAT\)](#) programs that already exist within jails.
- A lot of what is recommended could be condensed and summarized as greater collaboration between 911, Fire & Rescue, and Police, which is all currently in the process of happening. There is a group that is working on the topic of an integrated call center to figure out how to ensure that the list of questions that are asked by the dispatchers work for everyone and that the training clarifies which agency responds to which call.
 - a. Ms. Lynn will check if Commissioners would potentially be able to attend any meeting held by the integrated call center group.
- MCPD is hoping to have more super CIT folks.
- There are also now three dispatch areas in the County.
- Also, the Crisis Center on Piccard Drive has two more beds available.
- Shepard Pratt now has their program working in Germantown for in-patient psychiatric beds. There are six beds currently with a potential capacity of 16.
- Policing in Schools
 - There has been a lot of discussion amongst stakeholder regarding who is going to be responsible for training MCPD in whatever model is chosen to replace or buttress the SRO program. Next Monday, August 13, the subcommittee will meet with the Restorative Justice Unit for MCPS. It seems like it will likely fall on them to provide this training. This connects to one of the audit recommendations that suggests requiring more human relations and procedural justice training on an annual basis.
 - Will also reach out to Sgt. Brewer to get her perspective on training recommendations. Would like to build upon what is already being done with regards to training.
- Discretionary Policing
 - Have not met about the audit review but will schedule a meeting soon.
 - We did send an email about changing the traffic stop/enforcement data request in preparation for the next public meeting.
 - Ms. Branson needed to leave early but wanted it to be known that she votes in favor of sending the draft letter on the Ryan LeRoux shooting incident.
- Hiring and Discipline
 - Are meeting this Wednesday to talk about the audit recommendations but are generally in concurrence regarding the recommendations.
 - Ms. Fredrickson and Mr. Sterling also made edits to the Annual Report

4. Approval of Ryan LeRoux Police-Involved Shooting Letter

- Mr. Osorio took all of the edits received and made the changes to the draft letter. Thanks to everyone who contributed to it. Would like to send it out tomorrow.
- There was conversation regarding which version of the letter would be voted on as Mr. Sterling and Ms. Fredrickson made edits to one version and another similar version was sent out prior to the meeting.
 - Mr. Osorio read the latest version of the letter to ensure all Commissioners were clear as to which version would be approved and sent.
 - Ms. Hudson pointed out that the version read aloud and shared during the meeting is a bit different from the version shared previously by Mr. Sterling and Ms. Fredrickson.
- Asst. Chief Patil pointed out that it was a civilian employee working at the 911 call center that

was speaking with Ryan LeRoux and told him to put his hands up, not an MCPD officer.

- Ms. Mirza felt that the version Mr. Sterling sent to the PAC on August 3 has questions that were a bit more detailed and slightly more helpful so would like to use the phrasing of those questions.
- Mr. Sterling - moved that the version of the letter that we consider is the version that Ms. Hudson referred to and that Ms. Fredrickson and I made edits to on August 3, 2021.
- Mr. Osorio asked if anyone seconded the motion. Ms. Hudson seconded the motion
- Sgt. Brewer and Asst. Chief Patil provided clarification and additional information on the first question listed in the letter, which states: “It is our understanding that this call was initially deemed a low priority. If so, why was that and how did a low priority call lead to a fatality before the complete complement of negotiators and crisis team members could be deployed?”
 - Sgt. Brewer - A low priority can be everything from a theft occurred earlier to what this incident was initially labeled as, which was a failure to pay and trespassing (e.g. property crime). The incident being deemed a low priority had nothing to do with the mental health aspect of the call or who responded. A high priority is an in-progress call in which someone is either injured, being threatened, or a physical altercation.
 - Ms. Fredrickson and Ms. Hudson felt that the question should be left in to get that type of information on the record and get a clear explanation for the public.
- Asst. Chief Patil – MCPD prioritizes calls and this was a lower priority call. Believes that combining the question about why this was deemed a low priority call with the piece about the deployment of a crisis team member or negotiator is what makes this confusing. Maybe bifurcating the questions and asking “In what circumstances would crisis negotiators or a crisis intervention team be deployed?” The current question makes it seem like “because of x, then y.”
 - Ms. Hudson did not agree because if it wasn’t for the question as it is now then we would not have gotten this useful information from Sgt. Brewer and Asst. Chief Patil.
- Mr. Osorio again asked if there was a motion to send the version of the letter shared by Mr. Sterling. The motion was seconded by several Commissioners. The PAC voted on approving and sending Mr. Sterling’s version of the letter:
 - Aye – Ms. Fredrickson, Ms. Mirza, Mr. Sterling, Mr. Price, Ms. Lynn, Mr. Osorio, Ms. Hudson
 - Nay – Mr. Ricks
 - The motion was approved 7-1. Ms. Branson’s earlier vote was not included given the discussion as to which version of the letter was to be sent.

5. Planning for Fall PAC Public Hearing

- The PAC discussed the topic for the next public hearing
 - Mr. Camacho brought up a potential hearing as a follow-up to the first public hearing on drug enforcement, where the PAC and the public would hear from MCPD, the State’s Attorney’s Office, and others on any issues that were raised at the first public hearing.
 - Ms. Mirza reminded Commissioners about the PAC’s requirement to hold at least one public forum per year. The legislation is not clear as to what would qualify as a “public forum” so the public hearing on drug enforcement or a public hearing on another topic could satisfy this requirement.
 - Mr. Osorio – There was also an information request from the Discretionary Policing Subcommittee to MCPD on traffic stops. Dr. Gaster summarized MCPD’s previous response and included additional follow up questions. This will be sent to the PAC on

Friday. The PAC will review responses and the additional questions at the second meeting on August 23 so that MCPD can brief us on their responses. The hope is, that in September, the PAC will hold a public hearing on traffic stops. The more general public forum will then happen in October. We hope that Chief Jones and/or Sgt. Brewer can answer any questions the PAC has on traffic stops before the public hearing.

- The PAC has previously discussed the broader public forum and which organizations should be invited. Mr. Osorio and Ms. Salazar have already begun to reach out to organizations both on traffic stops and on policing in general. The goal is to facilitate the most inclusive forum possible.
 - a. Mr. Osorio and Ms. Salazar are hoping to do another interview with WUSA9. They have also reached out to some Spanish-speaking radio stations in the hopes of doing some PSAs.
- Ms. Hudson – Have we given any thought on allowing people to testify anonymously?
 - Mr. Camacho – we would like to do this but it would be difficult to allow people to testify anonymously due to security issues and not being able to avoid someone doing something inappropriate live during the hearing. We can still allow people to submit anonymous testimony ahead of time.
 - Mr. Osorio - have also spoken to organizations that would be willing to compile testimony from folks that they interact with and then submitting all of the testimony in the name of the organization and not from individuals.
 - Mr. Sterling – Could we allow people to submit previously recorded video testimony anonymously that we could be screened ahead of time?
 - Mr. Camacho – yes, we will definitely allow for that as we did for the first public hearing.
- Mr. Osorio – So going forward:
 - The PAC will receive the traffic stop information request on Friday;
 - The PAC will review the traffic stop information request (and basis for the September public hearing) at the August 23 meeting;
 - Will invite Chief Jones and/or other MCPD staff to come to the PAC's first meeting in September to answer any questions the PAC may have on traffic stops.
 - The hope would then be that the second September meeting would be the public hearing on traffic stops.

6. New Business

- There was no new business

7. Meeting Adjourned at 7:31 pm