MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Safety & Security Committee, Tuesday, April 8, 2025

Date	Tuesday, April 8, 2025
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 26m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/3760
- Official Board of Supervisors page (Fairfax County): https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/

> Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-30. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:00] Good morning, everyone. I'd like to go ahead and start our public safety and security meeting for April 8th. And before we get started, I'd like to make an announcement first. The first is that Chairman McKay will not be at today's meeting as he is testifying at the General Assembly's emergency meeting on the government cuts. So I just want to make sure everyone's aware of that. And then second, I wanted to see if we could just take a moment of silence to acknowledge the life and contributions of Claudia Arco, who passed away recently.

[00:00:36] She served as our legislative director and most recently in the General Assembly. Her leadership and her commitment were demonstrated each and every day in the way that she approached her work and the work that she did. And I want her family, her friends, and her co-workers to know that we are thinking about them at this time and thinking about her and that she will be truly, truly missed.

[00:01:02] So if you will join me in a moment of silence, please. Thank you very much.

[00:01:20] So today's meeting, we have two items that we will be discussing. This is our annual meeting where we bring both the independent police auditor to provide his annual report, and we'll do the same with the civilian review panel.

[00:01:36] They'll be providing their annual report. And we will start with the independent police auditor. So with that, let me turn the program over to Richard Schott, who will be making today's presentation. Thank you, Supervisor Lusk.

[00:01:53] Good morning, Supervisors. Again, my name is Richard Schott. I am the Independent Police Auditor for the county, and today I will be presenting my office's annual report for 2024. The Office of the Independent Police Auditor, or OIPA, opened 29 new cases during 2024.

[00:02:19] Those new cases included one officer-involved shooting, one death or serious injury case, and 27 use-of-force complaints. In total, my office had 100 active cases throughout the calendar year of 2024. This slide depicts the types of cases that were active at any point during the calendar year. Twelve of the investigations being monitored included seven officer-involved

[00:02:54] shootings, one officer-involved shooting of a domesticated animal, two deaths of individuals while in the custody of the Fairfax County Police Department, or FCPD, and two serious injury cases.

[00:03:10] The caseload last year also included a total of 88 FCPD investigations into complaints regarding force, 81 of which were submitted to the FCPD and 7 complaints which were submitted directly to the auditor's office.

[00:03:31] This high number of complaints in our caseload reflects what I have referred to as a backlog or retroactive reviews of complaints that were transferred from the FCPD to the auditor in May of 2023.

[00:03:50] The type of allegations in these complaint cases varied, with the most common types of force used, or at least alleged, having been takedowns, assaults, being forced to cuff, being grabbed or held, and being struck.

[00:04:13] Fifteen individuals alleged excessive force or injury, but did not provide any specific details about the type of force allegedly used on them. Since the Office of the Independent Police Auditor became operational in 2017, there have been a total of 16 Fairfax County Police Department officer-involved shootings. To date, I have conducted and completed my review of 12 of those officer-involved shootings. Actually, that number

[00:04:48] as of yesterday should be 13 with the report that was published to my webpage last night. Three of the officer-involved shooting reviews, however, were completed during 2024, and those are reflected on this slide. In those three officer-involved shootings, I agreed with the FCPD's internal investigative findings that the use of deadly force was objectively reasonable and complied with both Virginia law and departmental policy.

[00:05:22] In all three cases, the officers reacted to an immediate threat of death or serious injury. I also completed reviews of two in custody in the custody of the Fairfax County Police Department deaths last year.

[00:05:42] In all five of these reviews, I found that the FCPD's internal investigations met the standards of having been complete, thorough, objective, impartial, and accurate. However, I did make recommendations in two officer-involved shooting cases, which I will return to later in this presentation.

[00:06:08] Going forward into 2025, I have continued and will continue to monitor and review the investigations of the two remaining officer-involved shootings that occurred in 2023 and the one that occurred in 2024.

[00:06:26] And as of today, I do not currently have any active in-custody death investigations to review. In addition to the five reports I just outlined, during 2024, my office published reports or memos on my reviews of FCPD investigations into 18 complaints of force that were submitted to either the FCPD or to our office.

[00:06:59] In seven of those 18 reviews, I applied the typical standards to the FCPD investigations and found them to have been complete, thorough, accurate, objective, and impartial. In nine of the 18, I did not issue a finding based on those standards, but I found that the FCPD had adequately addressed the concerns presented by the complainant and that the force used or the pointing of any firearm was objectively reasonable. In one review of an

[00:07:39] excessive force complaint, I agreed with the FCPD's determination after only a very limited investigation that the officer was quote-unquote exonerated by technology. After viewing the body worn camera footage recorded during the event, I agreed with the conclusion that no force had been used during the individual's arrest and that the exoneration by technology was appropriate.

[00:08:09] In one review of an incident that had occurred in September of 2019, and this is one of those retroactive investigative reviews, I found that the pointing of a firearm had not been objectively reasonable under the circumstances. And speaking of pointed firearms, it is worth noting that in April of 2022, the FCPD revised its general order 540 to define the pointing of a

[00:08:45] firearm as a display of force as opposed to what had been considered only a reportable action. As such, this level of force, the pointing of a firearm, will continue to be documented and investigated by the FCPD similar to any other use of force. And likewise, I will continue to conduct reviews of FCPD investigations into pointed firearms whenever they are the subject

[00:09:20] of a public complaint. During 2024, I made five recommendations to the FCPD. To briefly summarize their status as of today, one recommendation has been implemented. One is the subject of ongoing discussion between the FCPD and the Fairfax County Sheriff's Department. Two are in pending status while being reviewed or researched, and one is not being implemented, at least not at this time.

[00:09:58] After reviewing the investigation into the July 7, 2022 officer-involved shooting, which involved a person suffering from a mental health crisis, I made two recommendations to the FCPD. The first was that the FCPD continually stress to all officers the importance of utilizing time to their advantage, particularly when responding to calls for service involving people in crisis.

[00:10:31] The FCPD has implemented recurrent training in addition to previous changes to language in its General Order 540, and I believe that those steps do satisfy the recommendation I had made.

[00:10:49] Another recommendation I made is under review by the FCPD. In that recommendation, I recommended that the FCPD include criminal factors, including the well-known Graham factors, but also add non-criminal factors using explicit language from the estate of Corey Hill versus Miracle case in its general order 540 for it to consider when determining whether force was objectively

[00:11:26] reasonable during a non-criminal situation or in a situation where an individual was experiencing a medical or mental health crisis but also engaged in criminal activity. I have made this recommendation, that is to add these new non-criminal factors, in two previous reports.

[00:11:51] The FCPD has updated its training and made some language changes to the general order, but to date it has not added the factors I laid out, that were laid out, excuse me, explicitly in the Miracle case. While I agree that their new general order language has been improved, I remain convinced that enumerating specific non-criminal factors would be a better option. I also recommended directly to the Board of Supervisors that the Fairfax County

[00:12:27] co-responder program be fully implemented as quickly as possible to potentially avoid another tragic incident like the officer-involved shooting that occurred in July 2022. Following the incident, but prior to me making this recommendation, county officials had already announced its plan to expand the co-responder program to four teams operating seven days a week.

[00:12:57] I made my recommendation in this officer-involved shooting report merely to reiterate my support for this board's and the county's multi-departmental efforts to address this most pressing public safety issue and to do so as quickly and robustly as possible. However, at this point, I am wavering on my full-throated support of the co-responder model. A growing trend in the law enforcement

[00:13:31] community, which includes the DOJ under the previous administration, is to promote purely civilian response to as many behavioral health crisis calls as can be done safely. And there is a growing number of non-police response programs with documented outcomes that support the efficacy of expanding the use of purely civilian response. I will continue to monitor this topic and will

[00:14:05] share what I learn in a future report. The last recommendation on this slide, which is not being implemented, at least not at this time, was for the FCPD to consider the possibility of lobbying the General Assembly to add fleeing from police as a legal basis for law enforcement to pursue forfeiture of those vehicles in which the people had fled. While the FCPD is not seeking legislation

[00:14:38] on this particular issue at this time, it is worth noting that the county as a whole supported a bill during this past General Assembly session that includes vehicle seizure and forfeiture language for anyone convicted of racing a vehicle and also includes impoundment language for vehicles used by people arrested for exhibition driving. I offer that bringing a bill to the General Assembly

[00:15:12] allowing for the forfeiture of vehicles in which people flee from police is a logical extension to this legislative process. Finally, I would like to highlight some of the other activities my office engaged in during 2024. I was invited by FCPD Chief Kevin Davis in 2023 to participate

[00:15:42] in all future meetings of the FCPD's Performance Review Board, or their PRB. The PRB reviews all designated department critical incidents and any other incident as directed by Chief Davis.

[00:16:00] The purpose of the PRB is to assess whether improvements can be made to departmental training, policy, or equipment. There was only one critical incident in 2024, and therefore I participated in the lone PRB meeting, which was convened to examine the September 16, 2024, fatal officer-involved shooting. Next, while the OIPA has always partnered with the Office of the Police-Civilian

[00:16:33] Review Panel, as we are the two offices focused on police oversight here in Fairfax County, my office was even more closely involved with the work of the panel at times during 2024 for different reasons. Early in the year, we provided the brunt of administrative support to the OPCRP because there was a vacancy in its departmental head position until that position

[00:17:05] was filled. After that position was filled, with the newly created OPCRP liaison, the agency head, Mr. Craig Miles had joined the office. My staff continued to provide guidance on the panel's bylaws and its past practices, and we were consulted by Mr. Miles during a procedure revision that he had undertaken and an initiative to develop new procedures by the new liaison.

[00:17:41] Also during 2024, I participated in several community meetings and FCPD functions to inform the community about civilian oversight here in the county. This included me addressing both sessions of the FCPD's Community Police Academy, as well as my addressing several other local and regional audiences interested in policing in general and oversight in particular. Finally, at the end of

[00:18:14] year, I was asked to and gladly agreed to join the One Fairfax Community Roundtable Foot Pursuit Equity Action Team as a non-voting member. Since December of 2024, I participated in all of the EAT's meetings and provided input on its draft policy recommendations, which were then provided to the FCPD as the PD developed its first ever foot pursuit policy, which as you know was

[00:18:51] publicly released by the department last Friday and which actually takes effect at midnight tonight or tomorrow morning. This concludes my presentation and I am now happy to answer any questions that any of you may have. Okay, thank you very much Mr. Schott for that comprehensive presentation and I'll just start by saying I very much appreciate reports that you provide and the analysis that you include in those your legal references are helpful and

[00:19:27] then I'll also state for me personally the recommendations that you've added have been extremely helpful for us to determine ways that we can make changes in policies general orders and those recommendations are ones that we should thoroughly consider. So let me maybe step back and look at the number of cases that you are trying to review. I see that there's a lot. So can you help me understand kind of what's the current status with the number of cases that you have to review? And if you can give me a sense of what

[00:20:02] you anticipate might be the timeline for you to complete those reviews with your current staffing. Yes, thank you. I'll address the current staffing first. I'm the first to recognize there is a bit of a backlog at the current time, and of course it's only been myself and a management analyst in my office for the past seven years, eight years actually, and throughout that time, sometimes to a greater extent than others,

[00:20:38] We've also been charged with providing all of the administrative support to the civilian review panel. With that burden, for lack of a better term, waning at this point, I do expect my review of actual investigations to pick up speed going forward.

[00:21:02] I also think that because I've put a pretty big dent in the reviews of the more time-consuming investigations, namely the officer-involved shootings and in-custody deaths, I'll be able to eliminate more of the backlog at a quicker pace than I have been able to in the past.

[00:21:25] And finally, I have explored the possibility and I think I anticipate that in the immediate future, I may be able to enlist a temporary employee to greatly assist me in reviewing mainly the backlog that we identified in 2023 and eliminate a big group of those retroactive reviewers.

[00:21:58] So a long way of saying I do hope that in the remaining nine months of 2025, I can greatly reduce the number of active reviews that are on my books at this time.

[00:22:14] No, no, I appreciate you saying that. And I'll acknowledge here that I'm personally supportive of your having assistance to do this. I recognize that that is a pretty high number of cases that you're trying to tackle and get completed. So you do need some support in order for that to happen.

[00:22:31] And also, if I can interrupt, I know it looks intimidating or imposing, at least to me, showing 100 active reviews. Those were throughout the course of 2024. I did report out on 24 of those, so the number at the end of the year was not quite that dramatically high.

[00:22:53] And I do anticipate reporting out on more than new reviews that are open this year. So, again, the number at the end of the year should be less than it was at the end of last year.

[00:23:09] No, no, thank you for that as well. I'd like to maybe hearken back to a couple points that you made because they're resonating with me. The first is you talked about the need to have full coverage for the co-responder model, And that's something that we have to get to at some point here in Fairfax County.

[00:23:27] I know we have it as our objective, but we're not quite there. And that's something that we have to continue doing everything we can to ensure it happens here in the county. And then second, I really appreciate the point that you made about not requiring a police officer to be on each of those co-response calls.

[00:23:49] And this is a point that I have been expressing with the Deputy County Executive. We've had several conversations about this and how do we figure out a different sort of process. And I'm really looking forward to seeing any reports or additional information that you can provide on your recommendations there because I think this is a vital and important next step for the co-response model.

[00:24:17] And I'll give a little credit to Supervisor Alcorn. When we first talked about this, we always envisioned that there would be a model that might not require the police, and I think we need to be evolving to that, and the thoughts that you have suggested here today are helpful in helping us get to that place.

[00:24:39] So I just want to say thank you for that. Thank you, and I can share the literature that I referred to with the supervisors immediately. No, that's perfect. And then I heard you also on the point about time and distance and cover.

[00:24:58] I think you were referring to how we can reduce use of force. And I know that we've trained all of our police officers with ICAT, and I think you mentioned that we're doing additional trainings of that. But I think this is really, really important, And that we have a process by which we continue to ensure that people understand what the latest and greatest is as it relates to time, distance, cover, patience, and communication.

[00:25:33] Because all of these things are vital to ensuring that we have less uses of force in our county. And I just appreciate that the original recommendation came out as a part of the use of force study analysis that the University of Texas at San Antonio did with us a little more than four years ago.

[00:25:54] And I know we're continuing to implement a number of those recommendations, but that was a critical and important recommendation. And again, that one is making a difference here in Fairfax County and appreciate your points and continuing and your recommendations to remind us of that need.

[00:26:13] So just wanted to state that as well. So let me give my colleagues a chance here. I could probably spend some more time. So let me look around the desk here. So I'll start with Supervisor Alcorn

and I'll work my way down the road. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[00:26:29] And just to go back to the co-responder model, I also appreciate your comments on that and looking at that. And it would be helpful to share the literature that you've seen with the rest of the board. And I'd also just point out, you know, this isn't just other places around the country that have done this.

[00:26:49] Our community services board has had the mobile crisis unit for many years. Well, now we have two, but that still has been another effort to address mental health crises. And I guess as you look at this issue, I would be particularly interested in how police departments interact with such units that are outside of the police department, you know, in terms of the timing, in terms of the coordination.

[00:27:25] And I would also be interested in any examples of how fire and rescue departments have some responsibility in terms of a co-responder type response.

[00:27:43] So thank you for looking into that. Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Alcorn. And just on the point that you just made, there is a model in Denver, there's a star model there, different than the model we have here.

[00:27:59] So there are other places that are doing unique and different things around their co-response. Thank you. Supervisor Stewart. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This year we had, in 2024, there were 88 complaints of excessive force, including allegations.

[00:28:20] My record is that there were 27 in 2023. Can you maybe speak to that? Yes, yes, sir, Supervisor Stewart. Actually, the 88 complaints were accumulative. Some of those complaints date back to incidents that occurred in 2018 as part of the retroactive.

[00:28:41] I don't have the number on the top of my head. I think there were 27 complaints made in 2024. very similar to 2023. Yes. In terms of not including the ones from the past that you were. Exactly. Okay. Yes. All right. Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Stork, Supervisor Walkinshaw.

[00:29:02] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, just on the civilian response piece, I think it's a very valuable thing to explore. You know, I will say I approach it with a degree of caution. We do have civilian response every day to mental health and behavioral health crises around the County, the co-responder model addresses 911 calls. And I know we went to great lengths to ensure that we had the right processes and protocols in place to ensure the safety of everybody involved in that response and on those calls. And having been on some of them,

[00:29:42] there are times when the call comes in and it seems relatively calm and that there isn't a significant safety risk. And then our teams show up and a situation can escalate. So I'm very interested to learn how other communities are addressing that and getting to it. But I would be in favor of moving slowly and cautiously in that direction because it only takes one tragedy and a program like that is over. So it's really important to get it right. And I appreciate you

[00:30:17] thinking about it. On the legislative suggestion in terms of vehicle forfeiture for fleeing the police, I also think that's a good thing to explore. It does seem to me the distinction between that and the exhibition driving legislation is that one of the challenges with the exhibition driving or street takeover issue is it was difficult to get felony charges for folks who are engaged in those activities.

[00:30:50] So the vehicle, losing, loss of the vehicle was a big potential, is a big potential stick to discourage people from participating. I presume when we're talking about fleeing the police and forfeiture

of a vehicle, you'd be talking about felony, but there's misdemeanor and felony charges for fleeing the police depending on the circumstances and situation.

[00:31:15] the felony charge is pretty serious. So I guess the question would be, is a vehicle forfeiture an additional stick if you have a felony charge for fleeing the police and you're looking at one to five years in prison and loss of your license for a long period of time? Yes, sir. Supervisor Walkinshaw, my thought would be to make it an additional penalty with the motivation being to discourage people from fleeing in the first place. So my hope would be that even a person

[00:31:51] knowing they're facing even a felony might agree not to flee if they know that the criminal justice process will take its course, but at least they're not going to lose their vehicle.

[00:32:10] so an added detriment to the fleeing itself. And then on the non-criminal factors for the mental and behavioral health use of force, I guess I'm just, I'm curious, because I read through, you know, the revised general, the streamlined general order for use of force and the three factors that you suggested based on the legal ruling. And I'm just kind of trying to figure out

[00:32:41] what it would add, because the current language obviously addresses the need to immediately, you know, protect officer or another. So that would apply to someone who's in a mental or behavioral health crisis and use of force was necessary to protect that individual or some other member of the community. That's one of the three outlined. There's kind of a proportionality

[00:33:13] element, which probably the police department would suggest is already contained in the language. So what do you see is gained by, because there's something lost every time we add more language to the general orders, because you're asking a police officer to remember another set of requirements in the midst of an incident, adding an element to training. So what would we get by adding those three factors that's not already included either explicitly or implicitly in the general order as

[00:33:48] it's written? I think what you would get is, one, an understanding by officers that it may be, in certain circumstances, justified for me to use force on a person who, at least at the outset, and maybe even beyond the outset of the call for service, for example, was not even in in any criminal activity. And you're exactly right. One of the three Graham factors, which

[00:34:27] did involve a criminal activity, well, actually the Graham case itself did not involve criminal activity, but the criminal factors came out of the case. One of those was any immediacy of a threat.

[00:34:43] the other two were very much related to the criminal activity. What was the level of the crime? The factors that were outlined in the case I referred to literally had no criminal aspect to them at all. And if you'll indulge me, the first one is, was the person experiencing a medical emergency that rendered him or her incapable of making a rational decision under

[00:35:19] circumstances that posed an immediate threat of serious harm to himself or others. So that one is fairly similar to the danger. Number two is, was some degree of force reasonably necessary to ameliorate that immediate threat? And then number three is language I think we're all familiar with.

[00:35:42] Was the force used more than reasonably necessary under the circumstances? So two and three really, in my opinion, deviate from Graham and say there may be situations where force, hopefully a minimal amount of force, may be necessary to provide the help that this person needs, although they're not involved in any criminal behavior.

[00:36:12] And that recommendation is noted as under review or pending review. I mean, can anyone, you or Mr. Arnold, give us the status of that review? Tom Arnold, Deputy County Executive.

[00:36:30] From my understanding, and Richard, correct me if I'm wrong, the police department are utilizing the Pinehurst case under the Fourth Circuit and disagree with the idea of using the Miracle case out of the Sixth Circuit. So I think it comes down more so from the police perspective that their thought is the Pinehurst case within the Fourth Circuit is more restrictive than what the Miracle case is out of the sixth.

[00:36:52] And so in any case that utilizing the Pinehurst to drive our current policy is more restrictive and would cover us. So I think it's more of a disagreement discussion over the impact of the fourth verse six. Yeah, that's accurate. And of course, my comeback to that has been, even though it's a different circuit, which is not binding upon us in the Fourth Circuit geographical territory, we can still use those factors as guidance to include in policy.

[00:37:27] And I understand the hesitation to include specific language from a different circuit. But I'm arguing that it could be used as guidance for policy. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. Supervisor Walkinshaw, Supervisor Palchek.

[00:37:44] Thank you. I'll be very brief. Just following up, understand and agree that training is very important. And as you mentioned, the calls, right, and the calls that are being taken in, I guess I'm wondering, and maybe that's a Tom Arnold question.

[00:37:59] Where are we in addition to trying to enhance our co-responder, enhancing our training of the call center and the co-responding at the intake of the calls? Sure. And I think Supervisor Walkershaw brought up a good point as far as the overarching goal of looking at the safety of what we're dispatching.

[00:38:19] So with the Marcus Alerts, we obviously were able to implement Marcus Alerts and the Behavioral Health Liaison. So there's a supervisor, a behavioral health liaison at the 911 center that's triaging the calls that come into the center, and they prioritize them as Category 1 through 4, with 1 and 2 being those types of incidents that we would send mobile crisis on, and 3 and 4 being what we would send the co-responder on.

[00:38:41] And so for clarification, we have the four teams of the co-responder, which is Phase 1, the full implementation. So I think I wanted to make sure the board is aware we have implemented that fully up to the point of the direction that was most recently provided. So we've also got the community response team, CRT, that's the combination of a firefighter and a mental health provider from CSB.

[00:39:05] They're not dispatched on incidents. Their incidents are brought forth through not the 911 center, but through calls for service and patients through the CSB that they would then go out on. And 80% of the calls that they go on are also mental health related.

[00:39:22] So our thought is really that with the behavioral health liaison, and one of the challenges when we look at the data is the calls for service are increasing. And so you really have to look at while we are diverting calls, we are receiving more calls. And then it's until we get the crisis receiving center up, where are we taking these utilizers to?

[00:39:43] So our thought is right now things actually work fairly well because with the four co-responder teams, to everyone's credit, we don't want to send police officers on all of those incidents either. And so

they are going on the more higher priority incidents. It certainly can take longer because you only have four teams out there.

[00:39:58] But that's the deployment model that works right now. When we look at the calls that they're already diverting that aren't even making it into the 911 system, as well as the calls that are being handled in through mobile crisis or CRT, right now we're doing fairly well.

[00:40:14] But there's just an influx in the utilization. And so I think it would be appropriate for us to come back to the board to update you on all of these components. And continue that one of the challenges what you mentioned Supervisor Palchek There's been a it's been hard to keep the behavior health liaison position filled on a consistency consistent basis at the 911 center And so with that comes challenges There were the primary point of contact that are determining what priority of these calls go out But the 911 center director Broman are actively engaged in that and routinely work with CSB to ensure that we continue building that out the familiarity and that the call takers are aware of that process.

[00:40:53] So I think we're tracking in the right direction, but there's certainly more demand than what there is to apply. Thank you. And maybe to the point you just made, Mr. Arnold, is that we probably should come back to the Safety and Security Committee and give an update on where we are on the co-response, and then maybe even if we've got some inputs from Richard Schott, we can bring those forward as well so we can have a conversation around all of that.

[00:41:21] And then let me now move to Jimmy Berman, Supervisor Berman. Yeah, just a quick question about the co-responder teams. You mentioned four teams. How many – so I know we've had trouble in the past keeping those slots filled.

[00:41:39] How many – are we at full staffing now? And if we aren't at full staffing, how much more staffing opportunities do we have? Now, we are at full staffing. We are at full staffing. Yes, and where they will utilize officers, the primary means to fill in when there is a vacancy because somebody's off for co-responder is pulling personnel from the MCRC.

[00:42:05] They're the ones that are getting the most experience on a day-to-day basis, and we would backfill those with officers that are qualified from patrol or anywhere else in the police department to go to the MCRC work. So right now, we're in a pretty good spot. Okay, thank you.

[00:42:20] And, Mr. Arnold, just so I'm clear, too, the point is on the 24-hour coverage in terms of where are we with that? We don't have 24-hour coverage because, I mean, we've got the coverage that I believe it's 12 hours.

[00:42:40] I get the exact times, but it's not 24 hours. So the point I was trying to make earlier is that we're talking about 24-hour coverage. So just so we're clear in this conversation that you're talking about 12, we're talking about 24. Well, I mean, I think the data has to show that it's needed as well.

[00:42:57] So that's something that we would want to report back on that identify that there's an issue that we need to identify before I would jump to the conclusion that we have to have 24 hours. But I don't have the data with me, so certainly we want to provide that for the board to consider. We're happy to have that come back to this committee to have that conversation.

[00:43:14] Supervisor Alcorn. Yeah, I look forward to that coming back. I frankly there's nothing more popular with rank and file police officers in the co-responder program and I think the data I'm pretty sure

the data will show that we do need 24-7 coverage so I do look forward to basically how we could get there county-wide 24-7 I think that would be huge improvement I realize there are challenges potentially with that in other areas but look for that discussion. Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Alcorn. And with that, we will conclude

[00:43:51] this presentation. Thank you very much, Mr. Schott. And we will move to our second presentation, which will be provided by Sherry Belkowitz, who is the outgoing chair of the Police Civilian Review Panel. She will update us on their annual report. Thank you. Good morning. My name is Sherry Belkowitz. As Supervisor Lux said, I am the past chair of the Police Civilian Review Panel. I was

[00:44:22] the chair for March 2024 until February 28th of 2025. It's been an honor and a privilege to serve in this role. I've been on the panel since 2021, and I've told many people that it's a heavy responsibility, and it involves a lot of time and energy. I wanted to include a photograph

[00:44:53] of the panel, and because it is such a heavy responsibility and time-consuming, I really felt like it was important to introduce the members of the panel. So from the left, we have Dirk Hargraves, left back row. Dirk Hargraves, Todd Cranford, Michael Lau, Fazia Dean, David Adams, and then we have, of course, our esteemed supervisor, Lusk. Then I'd like to introduce Craig Miles, who is the

[00:45:25] panel's full-time liaison. Of course, Richard Schott. Going down to the first row, we have Brian Gardner, who is now the current chair, so he will be sitting here next year, myself. Then Ken Bynum and Madison Gibbs, who are our counsel, and Rochelle Ramirez from Richard Schott's office, who I want to thank both Richard and Rochelle for helping during the transition when we hired our

[00:45:58] new liaison. They really stepped it up when we did not have our liaison. And I also would like to introduce our newest employee, Shakish Ferguson, who is our panel analyst. And I want to acknowledge James Yang, who is missing from the photo. So if you count, you will see that there are eight of us, and we have nine spots available. So I'm hoping that the Board of Supervisors is working on filling that ninth spot. We do have at least nine cases in the queue, and the cases,

[00:46:37] the review can be anywhere from two hours to, I think I've done eight or ten hours of review of cases. So it is really helpful if we have all nine members. The panels, purpose, structure, and means. Um, I added this to the agenda, uh, for every meeting. So as a reminder to our members and to the public that we're here to enhance legitimacy and trust between the police department and the community. Um, you know, I don't want anyone to think that we're, um, overseeing or,

[00:47:15] or looking for problems. Um, we just, we actually have a very collaborative relationship with the Police Department. And our purpose is really just to increase the trust. So we review the investigations by the Internal Affairs Bureau, IAB. And I got tired of trying to remember the five adjectives, so I created ACTIO. So accurate. We look at the investigations of the IAB to see if I don't even have to look at my notes because it's accurate, complete, thorough, impartial, and objective.

[00:47:55] We do not have investigative authority, and so we are relying on the investigations provided to us by the IAB. We do make recommendations regarding policies and practices, and I'll discuss a couple of recommendations later in the presentation.

[00:48:18] As I mentioned, Brian Gardner is very interesting. The panel elects a vice chair, and then the vice chair automatically becomes the chair the following year. So Brian Gardner was my vice chair, and so he will assume the position.

[00:48:34] He already assumed the position of chair. We did have two panel members who resigned this year, as well as our management analyst. but um we we do have a new management analyst um i'm looking up there yeah thank you thank you um and uh we do have two new members uh david adams and uh he's fulfilling the position of the individual with police background and we were required to have one person who has

[00:49:09] police background and james yang and like i said we're still looking for that ninth member thank you. My assistant is talking. I was here last year when Todd Cranford gave the report, and I recall the Board of Supervisors recommended additional training, which I thought was brilliant and well appreciated, although it is more time for the panel members. And I've gone to several,

[00:49:42] you know, Saturday morning trainings. And I've also attended the three-day, three-and-a-half-day, four-day training at NAPOL, the National Association of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement.

[00:49:58] So it is a very time-consuming proposition to increase training. And actually, the liaison and I were just chatting about maybe creating some kind of a library so that new members can access trainings without present members having to repeat trainings.

[00:50:19] Although I will say that I did attend all three of the use of force trainings. I know Supervisor Lusk has attended that as well, and Supervisor Beerman. And if anybody has the opportunity, if they're doing it again this year, I highly recommend attending the use of force training. It's very, very valuable.

[00:50:44] Our new liaison has a lot of knowledge about, he has a heavy police background, so he has done some trainings for us, including trainings at our monthly meetings, which is really nice. Each of us got this book, The New World of Police Accountability, And Mr. Miles has been doing some trainings surrounding this book.

[00:51:13] Let's see. I think I covered. Oh, and this year, it's actually the Community Police Academy. We are very fortunate that we are able to make arrangements to go to individual classes. We can't attend the entire program because our meetings are Thursday nights and that's when the community police academy is.

[00:51:39] So rather than taking up spots, the police academy has graciously offered us the opportunity to have, I guess, like drop-ins. So we can choose if we want to attend a session, which has been really helpful. We're also encouraged to do ride-alongs, which I've done, which is really helpful.

[00:51:58] And Supervisor Alcorn walked out. But I will say that in my ride-along, we did try to reach out to CR2, the mobile crisis unit, but they were closed. And as a special education attorney, I have a lot of children who have mental health challenges, And it seems like a lot of these challenges happen late at night, you know, more so than during the day.

[00:52:30] So just, you know, I've discussed that with Supervisor Lusk before, that I do feel like we need more mental health community services. So the annual NACOL conference in Tucson that I attended was the second NACOL conference I attended.

[00:52:49] it was really invaluable. I did learn that many other review panels have remote access to the files, which I know has been a longstanding issue. But the current process is that a panel member needs to contact the liaison at least 48 hours in advance and make arrangements to review the file at a local police station or at the public safety building.

[00:53:25] And it's very difficult because sometimes you have to take copious notes on the file because you can't refer back to it again. It's your one chance to review the file. So I know this has been discussed previously. And I also learned that many other panels do have investigative authority. We do not have investigative authority, and I'm not recommending necessarily that we have

[00:54:00] investigative authority. I actually think that that would involve more like a paid position because we are already putting in a lot of man hours so my key takeaways as I mentioned we have at least nine cases in the queue for subcommittees three three panel members serve on each subcommittee and I believe that our increased numbers are not because of police misconduct but because we have

[00:54:37] done a better job of increasing community engagement. And you can see that we have attended the Colmore Day, which is where I met Supervisor Jimenez, the Mobile Consulate of Honduras, the Gum Springs Day in Mount Vernon.

[00:54:56] Our panel liaison attended many other events. You can read from the screen. And so I think that's been really helpful to get the word out the panel. The annual report by the numbers, this slide and the following slide are pretty self-explanatory, although I was, to be honest, I was a little confused because I do know that we had a racial bias case this year. It says that we had zero, but this report is based on when the

[00:55:33] case was filed. And so I did review a racial bias case this year, even though it's not indicated on the report by the numbers. I will tell you just briefly, over the years, we've had several cases involving the procedure of the citizens going to the magistrate's office. And so we submitted recommendations to the police department which they adopted most of the recommendations um

[00:56:09] there was quite a lot of confusion i i did speak to the chief magistrate paul koshitar for the 19th judicial district to get to the bottom of what the process is and um right now Well, as of June 2024, the police department amended their orders so that a police officer must accompany an individual to the magistrate's office in order to get a subpoena or a warrant.

[00:56:43] And it seems like there was a lot of confusion about that before. And so individual citizens were going to the magistrate's office and they were unable to get the warrant because they did not have the personally identifiable information of the individual involved in the incident.

[00:57:03] And the chief magistrate told me that something like the name and address of the other person, if it's a car accident or an assault or what have you, is something that needs to be sworn testimony. So as it stands now, the police officer will accompany the individual to the magistrate's office, and if they're unable to do so at the time of the incident, they will make arrangements to accompany them later.

[00:57:34] And the magistrate also wanted me to express that there's confusion about the business card that is given by the police officer to the individuals because the business cards give the case number.

[00:57:51] And the magistrate said that the case number means absolutely nothing in court because it's a police case number and it's not a number that the court can access. And so just for information, I don't know if there's a way to improve that system, but I think there's misrepresentation that individuals have the case number and they go to the magistrate's office and the number is meaningless to the magistrate.

[00:58:24] We also had a couple cases. One is actually in Mr. Gardner's year about treatment of children when their parents are arrested. And I reviewed an article by the Association of International Chiefs of

Police, and I also spoke with several other police departments and review panels about how to handle situations, dynamic situations, when a parent is being arrested in front of a minor child, especially a younger child.

[00:59:03] And, you know, again, given my profession, that's something that concerns me because it can have a lifetime impact on the child. It's considered an ACE, an adverse childhood experience. It can cause lifetime resentment to the police department.

[00:59:23] It can also cause PTSD. So I don't know if we can find some training on how to handle a situation. And again, I've been to a lot of trainings, I've done ride-along, and I know the police are doing a great job, and there's 15 different things at least that they're trying to look at at one time and making sure that everybody's safe.

[00:59:46] And so having a minor child there is just one more thing to consider. But I do think that it has a lasting impact on children to witness their parents being arrested. I also wanted to talk about our upcoming trainings.

[01:00:07] Thank you, Richard. So again, the Community Police Academy, we can choose if we'd like to go to some of those events on Thursday nights. Hopefully there will be a fourth annual use of force training. We already had a county-provided implicit bias training for the panel, and we are going to have a training that gives us an overview of the implicit bias training that the police department receives because I do think that's really important and it came up in

[01:00:41] one of our cases this year. The panel discussed the way the Internal Affairs Bureau questions the police officers and we are hoping that they can come up with better ways of asking if the police officer was racially motivated. I don't think any police officer will readily admit that the decision to arrest somebody was racially motivated. So there needs to be a better way other than asking directly, are you racially motivated? And the next snake hole conference

[01:01:18] is in Minneapolis um let me see um I also this my personal thought is I'd like to see use of restorative justice um I do I spent the year really trying hard to make the citizens feel like they were being heard um I think that's really important and I think even in the cases where we didn't find that there was a problem with the IAB's investigation, many of our

[01:01:54] panel members walked away satisfied because they felt like they had an opportunity to be heard. And I think that's really important. So I think restorative justice would be a really good way to sort of complete the circle.

[01:02:13] So, you know, even for cases where there isn't any problem with the IAB's report, I think it would be helpful if there was an opportunity for the complainant to sit down with someone from the police department and sort of work out their differences.

[01:02:35] So I want people to have positive relationships with the police. Another issue that came up in one of our cases is the need to offer same-sex officers to conduct body searches. So it's my understanding that the policy right now is that if an individual asks, do you have a same-sex officer, then if one is available, one will be provided. But a lot of individuals aren't in the mindset at that moment or know that they can ask so we were hoping that

[01:03:12] the police department would be willing to ask um if there's one available would you like to have a same-sex officer to conduct search um and i think that is oh my last comment is the um the bylaws for the PRPCRP indicate that we can have up to six public comment meetings. I'm not sure what the rationale was for that, but I personally would support public comment at every meeting.

[01:03:51] And at the beginning of the meeting, you know, you can limit it, limit the school board has done that, limit the number of people. Right now, we do not have a mad rush of people making public comments, but maybe someday we would. And I think it would be really nice if we can make every meeting have a public comment component. So I think that concludes my report. Did I miss anything? And I'm happy to entertain any questions on special education law. But if you do have questions about the PCRP, I'll do my best.

[01:04:29] Okay. Thank you very much for your presentation, and I'll maybe connect to a couple things you said. On the request for the six additional meetings that was approved by the Board of Supervisors a couple years ago to give you an expanded opportunity to have those additional public meetings, because before that you couldn't have those meetings at all.

[01:04:56] So just so we're clear, you weren't able to, then you got six. I will say that we can certainly look at this and determine if there's a need to go a little bit higher, and I think we want to be flexible, as the panel might need that flexibility.

[01:05:13] I'll also make the point I attended the meeting at Hila Valley, and I noted that the folks there were very interested and engaged. So in terms of what I witnessed at the meeting that I attended, you did have a lot of interested individuals asking questions and trying to really understand the role of the panel.

[01:05:37] So acknowledge that. What are you doing over the course of this year as it relates to community engagement? You kind of gave us the profile for last year. What are you proposing for this year? I can defer to Mr. Miles on that.

[01:05:57] I think we should do as many as possible, but again, it's one of those things where we are asking already taxed volunteers to dedicate more time on the weekends. We're currently working on this panel, liaison Miles, we're currently working on having our June meeting at Gumspring.

[01:06:18] We have nine cases in the queue, so I've talked to Ramona Carroll about reaching out to the county employees who deal with community engagement on looking at some community engagement further out. But with the number of cases we have pending, we're trying to balance not having citizens or community members waiting for their complaints to be adjudicated and the panel members' time.

[01:06:45] So we're trying to have a balance there. So we may look at kind of combining and maybe having a few more of our monthly meetings in public spaces, which gives us the outreach and lets community members know what we do. But we've been working on that, and we'll work on some more community outreach events.

[01:07:03] I know last minute we missed an event at the Providence District this past Saturday. But that's a, for me, and now that I have an analyst, that's a point that we will work on, get out in the community more.

[01:07:19] Okay. Now, I appreciate that comment and certainly support the outreach into the community. So get that. You also asked about investigatory authority. We've talked about this here previously at this

committee, and I think the board's position is probably the same as it was even a year ago, and that is we are supportive of having the panel move to some degree of investigatory authority.

[01:07:48] However, we see as you are continuing to bring on new panel members, we also see as you're trying to get those panel members trained and knowledgeable about their work, there's some time that's going to be needed for that to happen.

[01:08:03] So I think theory and practice, definitely we see it in theory, but we've got to get to the practice of it. So I think let us continue working with you as you're getting the members trained, getting the full complement, and then determining what will be the next steps as it relates to that investigatory authority.

[01:08:28] Right. I agree. It does require a lot of training, and we have like a rolling enrollment. And so we might do a really great training, And then a month later, a new person joins. So that's why we need to create this library of trainings.

[01:08:47] And investigative authority would take a lot of time. And our volunteers are ready. I've said this is volunteering on steroids. And I've had a lot of leadership positions in the county. And this is really a lot of time if you're going to do it right.

[01:09:05] Yeah, and it should be the goal. So I think we get that. Let me ask, is there a sort of curriculum for trains that we are expecting all the panel members to have? Are we developing sort of a process for that?

[01:09:22] Right. That's what I mentioned earlier, that we're working on having this library of training. So when I first joined, it was during COVID. And so I was able to access recorded trainings that had occurred prior to COVID. and I was able to listen to those trainings.

[01:09:41] So we're hoping to create, I guess, a curriculum that people can listen to. But there's nothing better than doing it in person. Okay. If I may, the current vice chair and I are talking to NACOL, the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement.

[01:09:59] Their primary trainer or the person in charge of training lives in Richmond. Yes. So they're close. So the panel now has a training day penciled in in the calendar the Saturday after the monthly panel meeting. And so we will start once the Community Police Academy ends.

[01:10:19] June 7th will be our first weekend training where we'll have an overview of the implicit bias training the police officers receive. And we're in communication with the trainer from Richmond to come up monthly through the rest of the calendar year and into next year to provide, starting with basic NACOL training and then more complex training.

[01:10:42] Okay. No, I think that sounds great. I mean, it's going to really help the panel members be able to do their jobs more effectively, so fully supportive. And then my last question is when I looked at the annual report by numbers, slide 7, I was looking at the last category, number of initial complaints in progress.

[01:11:06] And you've got NA, NA for years 20, 21, and 22. Then you have 23 with 9, and then you have 24 with 4. But all years, it says 9. So I was wondering if that should be 13. I just couldn't reconcile that one when I looked at it myself.

[01:11:25] So just wanted to maybe get clarification in terms of what that number nine for all years represents. So, yeah, that's a title. And the NA is because I don't think that was tracked before we got here?

[01:11:43] Yep, just making sure I understood what happened. Thank you. Okay, so with that, I will conclude. I will start on the other end of the line, which I did before. Okay, just trying to be fair. I appreciate that, Supervisor Lusk.

[01:12:01] I want to be totally clear that I do not believe that the panel should have investigative powers. We heard the former chair of the panel talk about how much time it takes. We are in a situation where we are looking at how we serve the public with our local government.

[01:12:19] We are reducing positions. We have a police department that can do investigations. We have our auditor that I appreciate all the work he does. I think we have to be very careful when we expand work and look at what we're expecting of our volunteers.

[01:12:35] So I am firmly against investigative powers for the panel. Thank you. So I can appreciate that. We redid our subcommittee review report, and I requested that we add a section called Missing Information.

[01:12:55] Is there any indication that there may be missing information from the investigative file? If so, please describe it here. Because I was troubled that we are at the mercy of what the IAB chooses to give us. So if, I'm not saying this has happened, but if there was a smoking gun and they chose not to give it to us, we would not know.

[01:13:19] And so at least this gives us an idea of, well, we might be missing, like why wasn't the school bus driver questioned? You know, where's the body-worn camera of this officer? Where was he during the investigation? I agree with you, and that's why I said earlier I think it would have to be a paid position because it really would take up a lot of time.

[01:13:42] Have I driven by scenes of incidents? Of course I have. Is that investigative? I mean, minor, I guess, but, I mean, it's very helpful to go and see exactly where the incident occurred.

[01:13:58] But all these things do take a lot of time, but you are at the mercy of what the IAB chooses to put in the file. Okay, thank you. I would like a staff response back about that comment because one of the things that I know our police have to do is be truthful.

[01:14:17] Like that's top of the list. And so I would like a response. Yes, ma'am, I can cover that. I think that, as we know, the police department have greatly expanded the roles of IAB and the compliance division and several personnel into that section. And so to date, I believe there's been one report that the panel did not agree with that it was accurate, thorough, or complete in the history of the panel.

[01:14:40] And even with that finding, there wasn't any recommendations on what should be different. As we look at the bylaws and recommendations that we've been reviewing with Supervisor Lusk through the panel that they submitted for consideration, one of those aspects is to be able to provide follow-up information asking for clarification.

[01:14:57] And I know specifically there was a case involved at the ADC where the panel felt that there should have been other personnel interviewed from the Sheriff's Office. They provided that information and that occurred. And so I think that to Supervisor Smith's point, the Internal Affairs Bureau has the utmost respect, trust, and they realize that the public trust that they behold is number one.

[01:15:24] There's nothing more important than that, and we have no indication that that's ever occurred, and so that will always be the case. And so I think that utilizing and citing the fact that there could be a

lack of trust in the information that's provided in the report has never occurred and factually untrue and will never occur.

[01:15:43] I will clarify that I did say that I don't believe that it's occurring, but it's possible. And I did compliment the police department or the IAB that we did have a case where the panel had many questions that were unanswered.

[01:16:00] And the IAB independently went ahead and did additional investigations that the panel reviewed. Okay, I'll just make the point we're not making a decision today. This is something that will be decided at some future point. And that's where I made my statement earlier around.

[01:16:17] At this point, Supervisor Bierman. Thank you. To clarify, there were two cases in the history of the panel where the panel ended up disagreeing with the conclusions of the IAB. Not one. Sorry.

[01:16:33] Small thing. One of those two cases was this past year, and as can be seen by the reports given by the panel, there were actually two reports. In the first report, the panel, without any real explanation, said that they didn't believe that the investigation was complete.

[01:16:56] Then there was a second report that highlighted why some of the issues that they had with the panel in terms of things they felt were missing in the file, but ultimately the panel didn't disagree with the conclusion. You know, I used to serve on the police civilian review panel.

[01:17:16] worked with the iab for many many years um i think that for lack of a better way of putting it uh everybody has said things that are right here um you know deputy county executive arnold's absolutely right uh the iab is is ship shop shape in many many ways we uh there's a lot of trust in a lot of positive interactions that the panel has with the internal affairs bureau moreover Quite often what the panel does or has done in the past is spot something that maybe someone

[01:17:53] else wouldn't have seen or wouldn't have thought of and gone back to the Internal Affairs Bureau to say, could you look into that further? And they have, and that's offered more information to the panel. In fact, a part of the actio, the C is complete. So obviously the panel is always considering whether or not what they are receiving is complete.

[01:18:18] And to the point, again, W County Executive Arnold made, in all but two cases, the panel has said that it was in the panel's estimation complete. Now, many years ago, it really is kind of many years ago now at this point, the panel I sat on made a recommendation that it be considered that in certain very limited circumstances and only with a super majority of the panel voting to do so, the panel could essentially

[01:18:53] conduct up to three interviews that were panel-driven rather than driven by the IAB. So that was the very limited investigative authority that was proposed, I believe, in 2001 or 2002. The years all blend together.

[01:19:08] I'm getting older. But that has obviously not gone anywhere. And there I agree again with what Supervisor Smith said and what Deputy County Executive Arnold said and what Sherry said, that there's really – sorry, Ms. Belkowitz has said – Chair Belkowitz, former Chair Belkowitz has said, which is that there's no way to be engaged in that level of investigation or investigative authority without more staff and potentially significantly more staff, though Mr. Miles is a huge addition here. And the existence

[01:19:48] of the panel liaison did not exist when that proposal was even made. So I think that kind of brings a number of the threads together here. I did want to ask a question, though, about one of your, I wanted to ask two questions. The first was about one of your panel findings in which you write, and you touched on this briefly, the FCPD should review its investigative questioning of its officers to better discern if racial bias occurred during the interaction. Only asking if

[01:20:23] the officer used racial slurs or acted in a racially biased manner is not likely to capture racial bias. Now, in past years, the panel proposed, and I think actually the IAB has largely implemented two potentially prophylactic measures to try and figure out whether racial bias might be at play. And those measures, which are highly imperfect, were a social media search of the officers who were accused of racial bias, and also a look at the officers' arrest statistics just to determine if there was anything clearly disparate.

[01:20:58] But here you suggest that there may be investigative questioning that could be different. Could you summarize the discussion from that meeting and let us know if there are any specific questions that you think should be asked differently?

[01:21:18] Well, I'm older than you, and so I don't exactly remember the discussion at that meeting. But I will tell you that I did contact other police departments and review panels to ask for suggestions of questions.

[01:21:34] And I believe we discussed it with the IAB as well. And nobody really, what I recall, nobody had a way of asking, essentially, are you a racist? I mean, it's not, it's very difficult to ask.

[01:21:51] So I do know that they review social media. We do get statistics of the arrest records of the officer in question, but it's the interview that seemed to be lacking a little bit.

[01:22:08] Maybe Mr. Miles has something else. If I can, I've had discussions as a liaison with Deputy Chief Leib and IAB, and they are reviewing the questions they ask, and there will be further conversation between the liaison and the panel and augmenting their questions.

[01:22:24] I think the discussion was they asked maybe two questions about bias of the officers. So there's an ongoing conversation about augmenting those questions between the liaison representing the panel and IAB, and we will come together and come to some understanding and have input from panel members, their receptive to input on more questioning or more detailed questioning.

[01:22:49] I will add that when I was at the NACOL conference, I learned that other departments transcribe the body-worn camera footage. And the last file that I reviewed in Fairfax did have transcription.

[01:23:07] And so that would be an easier way to search for words, certain words, if it's transcribed. So I don't know if that was a one-off or if that's the plan from this point forward.

[01:23:23] But the last file I reviewed had the body-worn cameras transcribed. So then you can search for terms easily. And we have been using technology that transcribes body-worn cameras. My follow-up question is, what's the status of the recommendations matrix that we use to utilize to demonstrate an interaction between the police department and the panel.

[01:23:50] I know this year the big recommendation was over the magistrate, and it sounds like there were some changes implemented, but have we updated the recommendations matrix, and is there a plan

to do so? So to be honest, we didn't have a lot of recommendations this year.

[01:24:10] I think we had maybe one, was it two, official recommendations. A lot of the comments I gave today were, as I said, my personal belief. I do have a copy of the last matrix that was given to us by Deputy Chief Lieb.

[01:24:30] And there's five, it's been updated. So the one I have, all the actions were under review, but I'm just being told that it has been updated.

[01:24:47] Terrific. If it's been updated, great. That document's public, so we should be able to see it with the updated, and I just thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Bierman. Supervisor Palchek. Thank you. Very briefly, I don't know if they've been involved, but I would recommend as this is being reviewed and we have different groups and agencies, that the chief equity officers group be involved as well to help us.

[01:25:15] I don't feel that I'm an expert in ensuring that the policy we're trying to improve and the processes we're trying to improve are following best practices. So that's just my one recommendation and request. Thank you. No problem. Supervisor Stewart.

[01:25:31] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is on a little bit different subject, but something that Ms. Belkwitchi brought up that I've gotten a number of questions and concerns over the years, and you were mentioning it today, was kind of a reminder to me that maybe we should do something more with it.

[01:25:48] So this only may be something the chair wants to think about for a future meeting, but magistrates have a lot of misunderstandings about what magistrates do, how they work, who appoints them, what the role is, what you need to have when you have an issue that you think should go to the magistrate.

[01:26:04] And I just, I guess, think maybe we can do something around that and particularly something for community education. But I know for myself, I would appreciate maybe a little bit more education about that process as well and urge us to consider it.

[01:26:20] So thank you, Mr. Chairman. We can certainly look at that. I'll talk to Tom Arnold and we can see if we can get it scheduled sometime this year or early next year. Any other questions? Okay. That concludes our meeting items for today.

[01:26:37] So I'll thank Ms. Belkiewicz for her presentation and comments and points. And I'll say our next meeting is scheduled for May 20th, 2025 at 1.30 p.m. Thank you very much for attending.

[01:26:53] Sojourned.