

City of Worcester Human Rights Commission Minutes
VIRTUAL MEETING – Monday, November 8, 2021, 6:00pm
Spanish interpretation provided

Video of meeting online: <https://play.champds.com/worcesterma/event/1024>

Members Present: Jacqueline Yang, Elizabeth O’Callahan, Jorge Lopez-Alvarez, Edward G. Robinson, LaToya Lewis, Guillermo Creamer Jr, Lilian Chukwurah

Members Absent: Deidre Padgett

Staff: Jayna Turchek

Guests: Professor Jack McDevitt, Northeastern University

1. Call to order and Introductions

A quorum was established, and Chairperson Yang called meeting to order. The Chairperson welcomed members of the commission and those present and a roll call for attendance was taken.

Chairperson Yang began with an acknowledgement of the traditional, ancestral, territory of the Nipmuc Nation, the first people of Massachusetts and those who’s land we are convening on tonight. While the Nipmuc history predates written history, records from the 1600s inform us that the original inhabitants of Worcester dwelled principally in three locations: Pakachoag, Tatesset (Tatnuck), and Wigwam Hill (N. Lake Ave). It is important to make this acknowledgment and to honor the ancestors that have come before us. It is all too easy to live in a land without ever hearing the traditional names and the history of the people who first resided and prospered in these lands and continue to reside and prosper.

The Human Rights Commission was established to promote the city’s human rights policies. It is the policy of the City to assure equal access, for every individual, to and benefit from all public services, to protect every individual in the enjoyment and exercise of civil rights and to encourage and bring about mutual understanding and respect among all individuals in the city. Our work requires us to address institutional racism so that as a community we can achieve racial equity. Our work also requires us to make visible the unheard, unearned, and unquestioned privilege enjoyed by some members of our community to the detriment of others. We take time to make this acknowledgement, to educate, so a path can be cleared for healing.

The term “**institutional racism**” refers specifically to the ways in which institutional policies create difference outcomes for different racial groups. The institutional polices may

never mention any racial group, but their effect is to create advantages for whites and the oppression and disadvantage for people from groups classified as people of color.

The term “**racial equity**” is the active state in which race does not determine one’s livelihood or success. It is achieved through proactive work to address root causes of inequalities to improve outcomes for all individuals. That is, through the elimination or shifting of policies, practices, attitudes, and cultural messages that reinforce differential outcomes by race or fail to eliminate them.

The term “**privilege**” describes the unearned social power and informal institutions of society to all members of a dominant group. For example: “white privilege” and “male privilege.” Privilege is usually invisible to those who have it because we are trained to not see it but nevertheless it puts them at an advantage against those who do not have it.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes and Summary of Listening Sessions

Approval of the meeting minutes for the July 12th meeting as well as the five listening sessions (8/23/21, 9/13/21, 9/27/21, 10/4/21, 10/18/21). Motioned to approve as written by Commissioner Lewis, seconded by Commissioner O’Callahan. Approved unanimously by roll call.

Approval of the draft report summary from the listening sessions. Motioned to approve as written by Commissioner Lewis, seconded by Commissioner O’Callahan. Approved unanimously by roll call.

3. Suggestions for Upcoming Meeting

Commissioner O’Callahan motioned to take up for the purposes of examination the issue of broadband internet and access and health equity issues related to that within the city and its impact on city residents. Seconded by Commissioner Creamer. Unanimously approved by roll call.

Commissioner Robinson motioned to have a written report about the RITE training that the Worcester Police Department participated in including a syllabus. Commissioner O’Callahan seconded. Unanimously approved by roll call.

Commissioner O’Callahan motioned to consider requesting that the Worcester Research Bureau or some appropriate body come back and talk with us about the census results and help unpack what that means for the city. Chairperson Yang seconded. Unanimously approved by roll call.

Commissioner Robinson asked if we have a timetable about when we will have next steps now that the public input about the police bodycams will be sent to the city manager?

Director Turchek stated she knew the City Manager was expecting the summary. She will submit the summary to him electronically tonight. This was much anticipated and the City Manager is

eager to move things forward. She did not have a timeline to share but confirmed the objective was to have the cameras sometime in 2022.

Commissioner O'Callahan shared that next month is homelessness awareness month and she is looking forward to the annual report on homelessness initiatives.

Commissioner Creamer motioned to hold a conversation regarding access to the ballot and equity for the residents who are voting. Chairperson Yang seconded. Motioned unanimously passed by roll call.

4. Public Comment

A copy of the body camera report was requested. Director Turchek will email report tonight to attendees on virtual call who provided their email address and will also attach the report to the end of the meeting minutes from tonight.

Commission motioned to break until 7pm. Motion by Chairperson Yang and seconded by Commissioner Creamer. Passed on roll call.

At 7pm the meeting restarted with a roll call re-establishing quorum.

5. Presentation from Professor Jack McDevitt of Northeastern University sharing his work reviewing the Boston body camera program.

See: <https://news.northeastern.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/BPD-BWC-RCT-Full-Report-07272018.pdf>

It is an honor to be here, thank you for the invite. I'm sharing with you some of the lessons we have learned through the research that has been done and the research that I have done. I am going to go through different policy questions and what we know about them so far. I would not wait until the end to do questions, it might be best to do them as they occur to you, I am happy to take questions as we go along if you would like.

I am Jack McDevitt; I am the Director of the Institute on Race and Justice at Northeastern University. I have been at Northeastern for a number of years. Just to let you know a little bit about me, and what has been going on, so you can evaluate what you are getting from me, I have been doing research on police for over 40 years. I started by doing research on the death penalty and then did research on hate crime, human trafficking, police violence, police misconduct and, most recently, body worn cameras (BWC).

I direct the Institute on Race and Justice, for 20 years at Northeastern University, working with the community to address issues at the intersection of race and justice. I chaired the Social Justice Task Force for the Boston Police Department and, you will see as we go through this, they played a primary role in trying to roll out the BWC pilot that Boston had. The Social Justice Task Force was a community-based group with clergy, local politicians, advocates, and representatives of the defense and prosecutor bars. We weighed in on policy issues for the

department. We did that for about three or four years. With Professor Anthony Braga we did the pilot analysis for Boston. Boston put out 100 cameras first, to see if it was worthwhile. I will show you some of that analysis as we go through this.

BWC are becoming incredibly widespread in policing. In 2013, a third of the agencies were reporting officers wearing BWC. Five years later, 2018, it was up to 60% of the agencies. This is a little bit of a funny statistic because it counts agencies with a small number of officers wearing the cameras as complying. There is a wide verity of how implementation is done across agencies.

Audio. I would say that the biggest benefit of BWC is the audio. We do have video, from lots of different situations, and when it was first suggested for Boston, the (then) police Commissioner Billy Evans said that he did not need any video. Every time there is an incident, he could get a video from stores, parking lots, or the city cameras, etc. He could always get a video. Once he heard the video's audio, it changed things dramatically because you could hear, who is yelling at whom. Is the officer yelling at the individual community member or vice versa? Are there people in the background yelling? How is the tone of voice that the officer is using? There are just a whole bunch of nuances that you get from audio that you cannot get from just video. It really does allow for a much more nuanced understanding of cases where misconduct is suggested by the community member. This would be part of what they see and what they hear. One of the big additions is the audio. Of course, that means that the camera must be turned on for us to hear it.

Deployment. One of the things that the research seems to indicate is that while you may want it on everyone, here are a whole bunch of police officers who will not have any contact with the public (property room, trainings, etc.). If you are worried about costs, there may be ways to save costs by keeping it on officers who have access to the public. Officers who make arrests, who issue traffic citations, who are interacting, responding to police calls. All those officers would, in general, have a BWC. When we did the pilot, we put the cameras on the Gang Unit. There were some people who thought that the Gang Unit shouldn't have cameras because (1) they deal with confidential informants, and (2) officers sometimes go undercover. Neither of these were real concerns. Police officers, in Boston, were allowed to turn the cameras off when dealing with a confidential informant. Also, the videos never became so publicly widespread that it threatened the confidentiality of any Gang Unit member.

In thinking about which officers should have them, in Boston, the command staff had them, because they thought it was, politically, the right thing to do, but they were never very useful because they were just cameras that went to meetings and that was about all they did.

Transparency. Transparency is one of the big questions. How available is the BWC footage and what are the policies around it going to be? The conclusion in the field is that the policy, once developed, should be on the website. It should be something that the public can know. When the officers will have the cameras on, when they can turn it off, what officers will wear them.

That is a place where the Social Justice Task Force had a really big role. When the Boston Police started to first do their pilot, they decided that they were going to do 50 cameras and only in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan. They choose that area because, they said, that was the area where they got the most complaints. But the Task Force said they were not going to be just putting cameras in the communities of color in Boston. It was needed in West Roxbury,

Beacon Hill, and in other sections of the city where there would also be interactions with white folks. We wanted to be able to see the character of the interactions and if it changes in certain sections of the city. The police department agreed to increase the number of cameras to 100 and to put it across the whole city. It was also the Task Force who said they wanted it on the Gang Unit and they agreed to do that as well.

In terms of being posted on the website, the Leadership Conference did a survey in 2017 and 2/3 of the agencies who have BWC post their policies on their website. One of the things you will see as we go through this is that one size does not fit all. I have done a presentation like this to the Statewide Task Force on BWC and clearly a big agency like Worcester is going to have a lot more capacity to deal with the intricacies of BWC than some place like Clinton might. You have to think about where the policy is going to be put in place and if there are issues there that are going to make it more difficult for the policies to be put in place correctly.

Notification. Most agencies do not require notifications of the subjects when the officer is activating the BWC. The model kind of response would be that the camera would be off while the officer is driving around in the patrol car. Some places have dashcams. Boston does not. As the officer gets the call and drives to the call they would activate the camera as they were exiting the squad car.

There is a 30 second buffer in the camera which means that you get 30 seconds of video before the officer activates it. That has been helpful and is important. They now have a 45 second and a 1-minute buffer so I would suggest looking into how much you can have. Usually, with officers coming on the scene, those first few seconds are usually important to figuring out what is going on.

Boston did say that the officer had to notify people and had to say, "I am activating my camera" or "I have activated my camera." Interestingly enough, the Boston police officers we interviewed liked that and said it was really helpful. They thought that just telling someone they were on camera tended to calm down the interaction between the community member and the police officer. In the beginning they did not want to do it but once they were out in the field doing it they reported that it could help defuse a situation that might be volatile as they first arrived by saying that it was on camera and obviously, you can look at the action of the officer or the actions of the individuals.

Turning Cameras off. One of the big issues is when the BWC should be able to be turned off. There is a wide verity of situations that are out there, across the country, and you should do the situations that work for you all. Some of the ones from Boston and a few other locations include:

- When officers entered into a residence the camera was turned off unless there was violence that they were encountering within the residence. The reason for that being that they did not want to have children on the camera, grandparents on the camera and they wanted to keep that piece of it as clean as possible. They would always ask permission when they turned a camera on as they entered into a residence.
- When a victim, witness or informant asks for officers to turn off the camera. Sometimes with a confidential informant, or at a situation where violence has just ensued and someone is about to talk to a police officer about it, they may turn the

camera off. A victim may say they'd like to say something to the officer, and they'd turn it off. You would have request by the victim, witness or informant on camera asking for them to turn it off so it can be evaluated.

- Any kind of community policing outreach activity is something that they normally turn the camera off for. Let's say a police officer goes into a store to say hello, to see if everything is ok and if the store owner needs anything, that is generally a situation that we don't put on camera.
- If there is a major injury such as a car accident or something, or someone has been stabbed or shot, or an individual who is nude. Those are places where the officer is instructed to turn the camera off to protect the privacy of the individual.
- Some other places are in a religious institution during services, in a hospital room, and restrooms and in locker rooms. The presumption would be that cameras are turned off in there.

One of the things I was surprised at, and I looked at hours upon hours of video from Boston police officers, was that we have to be careful of people in the cameras. Even if it is someone who is being questioned by police. Generally speaking, when the police are asking about a crime, and we may have been involved, we are not in a good place. A lot of people may have been drinking or taking drugs. People may be scared. They may be lying to the police. There are lots of situations there. I don't think I would want my family members to see a video of me in those kind of situations. We need to be cognizant of that. It is the case that not only the officer's actions are on camera but also the actions of the individuals involved.

Commissioner O'Callahan: I appreciate that you brought up that last point, there is clearly a lot that has to be done by policy makers to address some of those nuances. Do you have any additional guidance or recommendations about how to further parse out those particular grey areas?

Professor Jack McDevitt: Sure. I think that I would be happy to talk to you about specific instances. The Police Executive Research Forum has a guide that they have put together. They are in Washington, D.C. The International Associations of Chiefs of Police has a guide that they put together. Boston has a policy that they share with other agencies. I think you could get your hands on some of the policies that give you the nuances of how this is all done and then decide what works for Worcester and the Human Rights Commission.

Officer Training. Almost every agency has training for the officers when they roll out the cameras. Boston did as well. I think the training is often too little. In other words, they train officers on how to operate the cameras but not why the camera is being used. I think it is important that you not only show the officer how to turn the BWC on and off and how to clip it on their uniform but also what are the elements of the policy and why they are there so that the officer has an understanding not only of the camera but also that they are there to protect the community members and the officers from acts of misconduct.

I think all of you that work with police know that officers tend to believe that everything is going to be used for discipline against them, no matter how much you share that it won't be, they believe it will. I think every officer I have ever dealt with on this issue thinks that their supervisor is going to look at the videos and then write them up for discipline based on what they see in the video. That doesn't happen very often.

I am going to give you an instance of a policy that I believe strikes the right balance. I think that training should show officers what the video looks like. We have officers who are out there for 6 months and have never looked at the video. The training should show them that if someone calls to the officer, they turn to that person the person originally on the video is no longer on the video and if they are running you almost can't see anything in the video. I think the officers should understand what the video looks like when its being used.

Officer Access to Videos. The ACLU has been very helpful on whether or not officers should have access to videos when writing their reports. One of the big balancing acts here is that (1) some believe that officers should write reports from memory and (2) others say that we want the report to be as accurate as possible so we should have the officer have access to the video if they want to and they can write a report. The police officers will probably tell you that if the victim can have access to the video, the officers should also be able to have access to the video.

Oakland has an interesting two-step process to deal with those concerns. The first step is that the officer writes their written report without access to the video. Just as they would have had there been no videos in the police department. Then the officer views the video and can provide a supplemental report. They do not change their original report. The supplemental report say that they wish to add additional information to their original report. We all know that we do not know everything exactly correctly. After seeing the video, they may want the report to be amended. But this does clearly indicate that one was the original report, and one is the amended report. That is something that you might think about.

In BPD, what they did was to treat the video as a police report. If a citizen could come in and get a police report of the incidents, they were involved with they could get a copy of the video. This was not terribly burdensome to Boston. I think with Worcester, not being all that familiar with the technology of the Worcester Police Department but historically they have been pretty good with that, it shouldn't be a terrible burden the department. Again, if you were thinking of a smaller agency, it could be a huge burden to duplicate a video and then provide it to a victim or person who had been arrested. Try to think through the process of how officers can have access and if they can. The ACLU's position has been that they do not want officers to have access to it. Just write the report and let it go at that. It is one of the complicated issues but I like the Oakland process which seems to be an interesting compromise of the concerns of all the different individuals.

Video Redaction. There are a bunch of other things that go on the videos. You may see the officer that is arresting someone for being drunk and disorderly but there are also people walking by and people who may ask what is going on, people who know the person being arrested and are trying to come in to help. There are a lot of other issues and that is where redaction comes in. Redaction is, generally, blurring the faces of people not directly involved in the incident.

I am not sure which company you guys are thinking about, but with Axon the technology is pretty good, and they can do that pretty well. One question is: do you pass along the costs?

The Metro Police Department in D.C. passes along the cost of redaction to the person asking for the video. I know of other places that only do that to third parties. That way, if the victim wants to have a copy, they get it at no cost, but if the media wants to have it to talk about the case, then they would absorb the costs of redacting it.

This is still an area that is in flux. In some ways this is a really difficult one, but some ways to redact the audio from individuals yelling, and if that is something you would want to consider, then the technology is really new for that. The companies that say they can do it, seem like they can, but they use voice recognition to identify the voices of the officer and the person involved and then they can redact the other voices. So, there is a whole issue around how much redaction you want to do.

As a national policy, police officers do not have an expectation of privacy while they are out doing their job so they could not be redacted. It is something to consider that a witness may be there, on video, and they may wish for their face to be redacted because they feel their safety is at risk if the video gets out there and they were involved. There will also be license plates which are able to identify whose car is around there and that might be an issue. If the video looks at different houses, there might be a street address of that house and that may be an issue. Sometimes there is audio that includes very personal information. All of these are complicated issues that I would suggest, a group, such as yourselves, working with the police department, could help get to a better place about what you want the policy to be.

Storage of Video. In terms of storage of videos, the model response is 6 months. The ACLU is trying to minimize that to say that we do not want these videos available for subsequent investigation by police departments. Dallas holds theirs for 90 days and Las Vegas, who has been doing a lot of this, has it for 45 days. For Boston, we did 90 days. Obviously, you all know, that the big cost in this is not the cameras themselves, it's the cost of the storage of the videos. So, if you can get rid of the storage, it reduces your cost. You can always keep forever certain kinds of videos. For example, any time an officer uses force, that could be just be marked and stored for however long you wanted to. If a gun was pulled in an incident, if there was some kind of drug that was particularly important in terms of investigation that was in the video, you may want to save that. You can still save categories of videos but the vast majority of them can probably be deleted in 90 days to 6 months.

Auditing of Videos. My pet-peeve is that we need to do a good job of auditing the videos. The public is going to say that once you give control over of the ability to turn on and off the video then they will turn it off in situations where they may be acting badly. I think that that is a real fear and is something we should be planning for. You can always audit whether or not an officer is turning on video.

When, in the Worcester Police Department for example, an officer goes into a situation where they are interacting with a potential criminal violation, they will call into the dispatcher for officer safety reasons to inform them what they are doing. Those are all recorded in the dispatch computer system.

Now, what some places do is just randomly pick maybe 30 of those a month and look to see if the officer turned on the video. Other places look at specific area of concern such as if an officer had been shown to not turn on their video in the past; do we audit that officer more regularly by checking their calls, or do we look at a particular crime we are dealing with, such as drug dealing in a particular neighborhood, and we want to just audit those videos. It is really

important to audit it so that officers know you are looking. Most of the time the videos in the police department will never be viewed by anyone. The volume is too much and the time is too long. If someone complains they go back to the video but if there is no complaint then not one ever looks at the video.

I believe that Oakland, again, has a really good model. What they do is they tell their Supervisors that each week they must go through enough video of the officers they supervise to find (1) a training tip, something that the officer may have done wrong and the Supervisor wants to talk to the officer about to help correct that and (2) to find one commendation to officer the officer. This way someone is looking at the videos and the officers are getting feedback on what they do right and training tools for the things they did wrong.

Biometric Technologies. There has been a controversy in just about every state around facial recognition. California is considering, I believe they just had a vote on it, a statewide ban. A number of agencies have limited use in the policy. Biometric Facial Recognition Software is more accurate for white individuals and less accurate for people of color. Knowing that, would we want to use it that way? Boston decided not to in their pilot and a lot of agencies are finding it to be not that helpful to do. It is something that should be in the policy about how it is going to be handled because there will be requests for that.

Impact of BWC. The BWC is not a Panacea, it is not everything that people hoped it would be. It has been associated with a reduction in citizen complaints. In Boston, during the pilot, we saw a statistically significant reduction in citizen complaints for officers who wore cameras. We also saw a statistically significant reduction in use of force. But, in many other studies that have been done, you see complaint reductions, but not use of force reductions. We have not seen changes in arrests with officers wearing cameras.

One of the things that is probably useful to know would be that officers will probably be hesitant to support the use of cameras when they start. That comes from a fear that they will be used to discipline them. But that support for cameras grows over time when officers realize that it can be used to exonerate them as much as to identify times when they acted poorly.

There are also some reports that the camera being turned on can cause some people to get anxious and maybe even increase assaults. The final thing is that the cameras themselves are one of the best and most reliable training tools. To show how an officer of the Worcester Police Department was searching a house and doing it incorrectly, that is a real training tool. It takes a lot of time and effort to use it that way, but it really is a great training tool for officers. But it is not, in general, used that way.

Impact of BWC in Court. This was something we did not plan on in Boston and I would suggest you think about it. The impact of cameras in court is huge. There has been a bunch of research on how the cameras impact court.

In Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) cases, what we used to call domestic violence, plea agreements and convictions were increased if there was camera footage.

There were also increases in crimes against police officers, an attack on a police officer, if there were camera footage.

Another random trial was done on drug cases, and it found that having a camera or not having a camera made no impact on the disposition of drug cases.

What some have written is that something like IPV cases capture injuries and the scene of the house or the chaos and, particularly juries will want to help in that case. Substance abuse

cases will also, typically, capture the suspect after having taken drugs and that will cause all kinds of confusion about whether there is culpability there.

Impact of BWC in Court in Boston. One of the things we were not completely ready for was, in Boston they did 100 officers, and they did not really think about how it was going to impact court. We interviewed both prosecutors and defense attorneys as to how they felt the cameras were working. They both felt they worked to their benefit. Prosecutors thought they helped them to get a conviction and Defense Attorneys they helped them to get an acquittal for their client. The Prosecutors believed that the juries were swayed by the videos, and they also thought that the absence of a video was a compelling fact for both juries and judges. In other words, if an officer had a BWC but did not turn it on then the juries and judges felt that it was an intentional act, and it did impact the cases.

The other thing that we found was that the courts, the district courts particularly, had so little IT support that doing this was a problem. Getting hundreds of hours of video and getting it ready for a court case or getting a request for the video from the court, all of these things were really complicated for a lot of the district courts to deal with. I would suggest that you want to bring the courts in for a conversation as the policy is being developed so that they can have input too as to how best to have the video be available to prosecutors, judges and defense attorneys when they are in court.

Commissioner O’Callahan: One thing that caught my attention, you mentioned it was a pet-peeve, is that there is not really a good way to audit videos. I really like what the Oakland Police Department does. It is an opportunity to give feedback. With the assumption that with every call that an officer gets that there should be a corresponding video. I am wondering how feasible it is to, after a certain amount of time (day, week, month) to total up the number of calls officers responded to and making sure that it comes close to the number of videos an officer might have accumulated. Would that be a way of accessing that there was at least some form of consistency going on in terms of recording calls?

Professor Jack McDevitt: Yes. I think that is a great idea and I think that would work. the challenge is, if an officer was turning off the video early or something, you would not get that from that form of counting. I think you would have to do both. The counting could make sure you have the videos for all, for example, every case where there was an arrest. Then for some subset of videos, did they seem to go for the whole situation.

Chairperson Yang: What are the repercussions, in Boston, for officers who do not turn on their camera?

Professor Jack McDevitt: They can be disciplined. They can be suspended. It goes into their discipline process so they have a hearing where the officer can say they made a mistake or forgot but they can still be disciplined. They can be docked a day’s pay, or it happens on multiple occasions it can be a week’s pay. It is part of the discipline process.

Chairperson Yang: In July, we had Rahsaan Hall from the ACLU come in and one of his recommendations was for officers NOT to review the footage before writing the report. Can you just speak to that some more?

Professor Jack McDevitt: Sure. Rahsaan and I have worked together for years, and this is one case where we don't fully agree. He thinks that if an officer sees the video, then they may change their original report and that original report, if it was wrong, would help the defendant if they were in court. The evidence could be raised that the officer had written a report stating one that but when looking at the video it did not quite happen that way. My feeling is that we have always had testa-lying but we have no data to show that it is wide spread and I would like to have the officers try to write a report that accurately reflects the situation and to try to give them access to it. That is why I like the Oakland thing because it gives a little of both worlds by writing the report and then having access to the video after to make amendments to the report. I think it's a nice way to balance it. Rahsaan is concerned about the ability of officers to have the video, particularly if the victim and the defense attorney are also going to have the video as well.

Commissioner Robinson: I was wondering how often Internal Affairs looked at the videos?

Professor Jack McDevitt: In other places they do random checks but in Boston its only when there is an allegation of misconduct by the police officer. They absolutely help though. If you have that on video you have who is swearing at who, who is striking the first blow, who is trying to defuse the situation, all of that. It is a very helpful tool in IA investigations, whether they are internally generated or externally generated.

Commissioner Robinson: Would the video be kept longer if the police officer has more complaints against them?

Professor Jack McDevitt: Some places do. Most police officers don't have many complaints or any but if you have someone who has a couple of complaints then you may want to take the video of that officer and keep it for a very long time.

Commissioner O'Callahan: Reflecting on that point, perhaps this is something that could be relevant to the WPD in their early intervention policy. Perhaps there could be some mechanism by which certain actions increase audits either as part of the Early Intervention policy or something parallel, or similar, to it.

Professor Jack McDevitt: That was being used in Boston, too, for officers in EIP. It can be an officer support model too. How is this officer acting on the street? It helps to define how we might be able to offer some kind of assistance to that officer.

Chairperson Yang: In your opinion should the Gang Unit have body cameras?

Professor Jack McDevitt: Yes. Absolutely. They were engaged in more chasing of suspects, take downs, group things, etc. we saw them doing many more arrests than some of the other

officers did. I think it was very helpful and they did not mind it. They did not want it in the beginning but once they had it they did not mind it at all. One of the things that does happen in those kinds of situations that can get a little complicated is that you might have a situation with a few individuals being arrested and they are resisting you are going to have 4-6 officers there and if they all have BWC then you have that many versions of the event which can be helpful, but it is also confusing. Officers get there at various times and videos are facing different ways. I think that having multiple views is generally better, but it also may take some technology to resolve what is being seen on video. It is not like a TV show. Its videos at different times and different angles, day and night, and it can be complicated.

Commissioner Robinson: How often do the videos show accommodations? A lot of times we only hear about the bad police officers and not the good ones. Id like to paint a clear picture because, like you say, they don't see us on our best day and a lot of times. They could be good 99.9% of the time and just not that one incident.

Professor Jack McDevitt: Two things. Like I said in Oakland they find one every week. Boston did not do that, but I will say more often, in the pilot period, the videos showed allegations of misconduct by the officer were unfounded then they were founded. There were certainly times when the officer was found guilty of misconduct but more often the person who had filed the complaint had sort of exaggerated their complaint.

3. Adjournment at 7:56pm. Commissioner Yang motioned to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Lopez-Alvarez. Passed on unanimous roll call.

Our next meeting will be December 6th, 2021.