

## Use of Force Community Meeting 01-24-17

Person 1 - Person 1, Colorado Latino Forum. Um, so Chief White, you are talking about some of these innovative changes. Mayor Hancock has also talked about DPD being a model program. But the truth of the matter is that DPD is actually just catching up where other jurisdictions have already made substantive changes. So, shooting into moving vehicles and stopping that process, um, actually, was something that other jurisdictions have been doing and it wasn't until the community push, and the death of Jessie Hernandez, that you all made that change. So, it wasn't the goodwill of DPD. It's paid for by our blood. The second point is that the community engagement piece that you highlighted up there has been exclusive of the community. Going around to community meetings isn't the same as creating a table for the community to participate in. So, that's the second point. The third point is, 60% of those killed by the DPD in the last five years have been Latinos. And, yet, you have refused to meet with Colorado Latino Forum leadership to discuss the concerns. There's not one of these meetings that have happened in the Latino community. Um, and so, what are you gonna do to start building bridges to start healing and repairing the harm caused by officers who are killing our people. And, yet, there's no plan for how you're going to build community trust.

Chief White: Um, yeah, well. Number one, I'm not (Audience Clapping). First of all, I'm not going to get in a debate with you. You and I have had this conversation. But I do want to address two things: I explained to you, obviously, you don't believe that, why we came to that policy, and I also want tell you, uh, that as a member of an executive board that has national responsibility, we look at that policy. So, I will assure you, our policies, there were a couple... for what it's worth, there might have been a couple of departments that might have had a couple of the policies before us, and maybe some of them..., most of them didn't. That could be for debate. But as it relates to me not responding to CLF meetings, I, as you all well know, I have attended numerous CLF meetings. The reason I rejected coming to the last one you asked me was because you wanted me to hash over how come I was having a community to recreate the policy. I told you no more than four or five times, prior before you even requesting me to come to the meeting, that I wasn't gonna rehash that. So, that's why i didn't come to the meeting. The other issues, and by the way, one of the meetings is in a Latino church, in District 1, in a Latino community. Now, maybe you don't consider that to be a Latino community, it's two blocks away from the North West [Lady interrupts - "The West side, we're not over there."] school where 90% of the student of that school are Latino. So, again Lisa, we can debate whether it is what you consider the heart of the Latino community or whether it's on the the outskirts of the Latino Community, um, we purposely put that meeting in that church, it has a Latino pastor and most of the kids, that are Latino, 90% of them go to school that's two blocks away, so. Uh, again. I don't particularly want to have those kinds of conversations because I think it's unfair to everyone else.

Meeting Organizer - Next question. Okay I'm going to go here, back there, then over here.

Person 2 - I don't know ya. I'm a Vietnam Veteran, uh, two-time winner of the purple heart. Was willing to give my life for the things that was not right in America when I left. I'm 78 years old, now. When people came to Denver, this wasn't an open territory with nobody here. It's kind of like we've been overlooked. We've been living here, 35 years. So, we have some concerns about this. Thanks again. Police Chief White for the things that I've seen. Some good policemen in Montbello, but we're having some things done we've been overloaded with. As we talk a lot of time about the jails being filled with Black, and then next Hispanic. Well, I got a good answer for that. And I seen this happen when I was in [unknown], when we first, I went in in '57. We fought like dogs and cats until we could come together. What we, and the more. We got more blacks in, then we had better things would happen. When there was just a few in we were screwed over. If we got 50% blacks in jail, how about 50% blacks to work the system. And you would see some better things change. If this is the case, if you got 20% Hispanic, alright 20% Hispanic. But, don't [unknown] because somebody's gonna get left out. And that's what I've seen. So, I can't speak evidently stronger, I've worked with the system in Denver, over and repeatedly, in things that has happened, I have been able to get something done about them. I worked with Chris Martinez, I worked with [unknown] your dad. In fact, I was the state coordinator for Jesse Jackson when he ran. So, there was things we came together on and it can be done. Don't forget, there was people living here, when people showed up.

Chief White - I appreciate that. Let me kind of respond. And I appreciate that, and obviously, I don't run the jails. I want to speak about diversity because I think that's very important. I certainly think we have a responsibility to make sure we have a police department that represents the diversity of the community. But I want to talk about diversity in two ways. I want to talk about diversity not just in the color of your skin, but the process you have in your head. We need to make sure we have people that are diverse enough working every part of this community. That are open enough to understand that regardless of your station in life, regardless of my color, everybody is entitled to be treated the same way with the same dignity and respect. So, Not only are we looking for people that are diverse in their race, but we are also looking for people that are diverse in their thought process.

MEETING ORGANIZER - I'm going to go back here, then up here, and then back here.

Person 3 - Thank you. Thank you, Chief, for all of this gathering and for the obvious preparation that went into it. My name is Person 3, I am a former Denver judge and I am a member of the community whose been very concerned about all of these issues. I have two questions. They're related. One is, how does this policy translate into discipline for violations of it? And related to that, is you mentioned that aspects of the community have all been involved. Has that included the union, the police union? And what is their attitude about the policy?

Chief White - Okay, umm, first there is a disciplinary matrix, so for every action that is inappropriate by a police officer there is a matrix that's put in place to say, if you've done this these are the options as it relates to discipline that you are ..... So, this policy is a part of that matrix. So, a violation of this policy, like a violation for every policy we have, there are consequences for those actions, and the matrix speaks to that. Now, as it relates to the police union, just so happened I met with them today. And guess what. They don't like this policy. But they don't like it for a different reason some of you don't like it. You know why they don't like it? They think it's too restrictive. So, so yes. I have met with them. We had a very healthy meeting today. And they expressed some concerns. And I took their concerns like I'm gonna take your concerns. And I told them that I would get back with them. I told them there were some things that I am not going to compromise on. And some of those things, some of those very things that I've heard from you. And their biggest concern was that we're a necessity. See because what has happened, and some of you have heard me say this. One of the biggest challenges we have in policing today, and one of the reasons why many of you are here, you see, and it also gets involved in the deaths and it's a controversial incident. And you're wondering 'how come that person didn't get convicted?' you think he also broke the law. The person doesn't get convicted, the people get worked up about that. And then it comes over to me as a Chief, and I look at it and I say administratively that officer operated within our policy, so you even get more riled up. And then it goes, and then I make recommendations, and then I go to my boss and she says 'you know what, the officer acted within the policy.' So, the question that you're really asking. Most of the time, not all of the times, those actions were legal. The questions that you're asking and the questions I'm asking are, were they necessary? So, the one, when we raised the bar, and we had raised the bar, and to be honest with you the executive board, now I'm not speaking about all the police officers, the executive board of the union has a problem with that word, 'necessity.' I told them that I'm not compromising on that. Because one of the things that we've got to train officers to do is, not only should your actions be legal, but you need to be able to make sure that those actions are absolutely necessary.

[APPLAUSE]

MEETING ORGANIZER - I'm gonna go here, here, and then to these folks in the back there.

Person 4 - Gary, you need to look over on this side.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Okay, I'll get ya. Let's go here.

Person 5 - Thank you, Police Chief White. For meeting with us and continuing the conversation from the action that we had last week at Shorter? As a matter of fact, you and I sat down a couple of years ago with my organization, Together Colorado, and I remember you saying that you want

the police officers to think, nor was it legal, the action they took, but was it necessary. So, it's kind of refreshing that you are continuing on with that. However, I see in your revised policy that a police officer, still allows the police officers to shoot people when there is an immediate threat of death or serious injury. How is that any different from what they're already doing? I don't understand.

Chief White - That's, well, an officer is in a life-threatening s..., so this is when an officer can use deadly force. Let me maybe try to simplify. An officer can use deadly force when his life or somebody else's life is in immediate danger. Immediate danger of losing their life. So, in a nutshell, [unknown], well let me give you a scenario. You are the victim of a crime.

Person 5 - I've been watching it for the past couple of years. And the thing I constantly hear is that the police officer, be it here in Denver, whether it be in Ferguson, or in Chicago, felt like their life was in danger. And that's all they must say. I, I felt my life was in danger. So, even when they shoot someone in the back.

CHIEF WHITE - I, I, listen, I agree with you. That's how come we need to change that culture. Officers need to understand. You can't say, 'my life was in danger' and that's an automatic get out of jail free card. That is...

[Audience Chatter]

CHIEF WHITE - I hear you. That's why we need to change the culture. That's why we're holding all of these meetings. That's why you have some opportunity to give some input to that. But, I can't take away, and I don't think you want me to take away, if somebody's life, the police officer, or somebody else's life, is in immediate deadly danger you want that officer to take an action. You don't want somebody to lose their life because the officer didn't act, but the officer has to be able to articulate that that action was deadly and that action was necessary. Now, there's a supreme court decision Conner V. Graham, says officer's action has to be reasonable and, uh.

Person 6 - Objectively reasonable.

CHIEF WHITE - Objectively reasonable. We have raised the bar. Not only do they have to be objectively reasonable, and there are unions that have an issue with it, it has to be objectively reasonable and it has to be necessary also. That's raising the bar higher than the standard of the Supreme Court. That's where we are and and and, hopefully, through this change, that message will resonate, and you will see that as a citizen in our community.

Person 5 - Okay, and just one last thing. Personally. I know that you say that your police officers are going to undergo training. So, that they are going to learn how not to escalate a scenario, um. My Brother, I live in Montbello, and I swear every routine police stop, traffic stop, brings on, what I call, the Montbello swat team. District 8. So, I hope that's going to be, definitely, one of the precincts that you begin training.

CHIEF WHITE - It's going to be department wide, and I would encourage you, and if you want to give me information, the commander of that district who does an outstanding job. I'll personally reach out to you, and you have some examples of that occurring, I would really ask you to share that with him or share that with me.

MEETING ORGANIZER - So let me get a process check here. You're gonna have the last question. And we go around. Because I want to get you into the small groups. The Chief will be here as a resource to go around for the other questions. So, let's go here, here, here, here, and then here.

Person 7 - My concern is about the response time that we get when somebody puts in a complaint. I put in more than 20 complaints about officers' behaviors and I never did anything wrong. My house was ransacked, different things like that. I still never really got a good response other than an apology from district two. Didn't hear anything else about what happened to the other officers over this given period where the 20 complaints went in. Only about two or three of them got answered.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, again. It's hard for me to go back and correct something unless I have the facts. I can tell you what the protocol is. If you make a complaint, we have a responsibility to address that complaint and we have a responsibility to get back with you. If you have some instances that you want to share with me that had happened, I will follow up on that. So, before you leave, you make sure you give me that information. And my commitment to you is, I'm not going to say you're going to get the answer you want, but I am going to say that I am going to follow up with it and I will tell you what happened.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Here, here, here.

Person 8 - I would like to say, I'm tired of the willy nitch(??) bill. You write a summons and you tell a lie. And you welcome them in your home. You know, when you call 911, they're welcome. Now they're writing out summons that tell lies. I'm down with that. I want them out of my neighborhood, immediately. Because they're not practicing a fair policy. And this is nationwide. I've been thrown down at Wells Fargo, for what reason. And I'm going after you. I'm shuttin down every fraternal house. The Wilinance (??)is gonna stop tonight, alright!?! [Unknown] Out with the Klu Klux Klan, and they goddamn policy. There's mothers and fathers in these homes.

Raise your children. We don't need your help. We don't need your help. With guns. Guns kill. And when you have a motive, you shoot down our children! Go shoot down your crazy ass kids. Stay out of my neighborhood.

[Audience Applause]

MEETING ORGANIZER - We'll go up here. Go ahead.

Person 9 - I guess I don't need no microphone. My questions were around mental health. And some of those things. I have and I've seen some of the ways they've treated people with special needs. And it concerns me greatly. Uh, my youngest child, it's not on [referring to the microphone]. My youngest child has special needs. And what concerns me most is that I know and understand that everyone has a trigger from a psychological standpoint. And I'm wondering in your training and policy what're you doing around psychological training? Because you got people that are out on the streets policing, and I understand policing, but I also understand having care and consideration for people with mental health issues, and special needs. And if we're not looking at that from a perspective of, how do we deal with people psychologically, I don't think that this so called, police force, is doing their job effectively. And like i said, that concerns me a lot because if something were to happen with my child, I don't feel comfortable in calling law enforcement because I'm afraid that something may happen and they may hurt or injure or even kill my child.

CHIEF WHITE - I hear you. And that is a concern, I think, that many of us have. In an effort to address that we require every officer we've changed the training for dealing with individuals that are in crisis to eight hours to forty hours. Everybody in the department has to get that kind of training. And the training is done by professionals. It's not done by police officers. It's done by mental health professionals.

Person 9 - No I hear what you're saying. I'm talking about the de-escalation piece because when you're dealing with de-escalation and you're talking about somebody with mental health issues or someone with special needs, it looks completely different. It's completely different. You can't just come and grab somebody that's having a mental health meltdown. You have to deal with it in a certain way.

CHIEF WHITE - I agree, and that policy speaks to being able to do that. Plus we have eight, where is she, eight

Person 10 - Talking about the co-responders.

CHIEF WHITE - We actually have eight professional co-responders. And those are not police officers. Those are individuals that are experts in dealing with mental health. Those individuals are assigned to the police department. So, in addition to the hours of training that the officers get, and in addition, to how the policy specifically speaks to, that you will come in contact with individuals that are more a challenge than what that call is. And in addition to that, and in addition to the training, we all have hired mental health experts that respond to the scene with those police officers in those scenarios, also. So, we're trying to do everything we can to avoid that becoming something that is catastrophic.

Person 9 - Yea cause there was a young man, his last name was Fairchild, that was killed a few years ago, since we moved here and you know, I just don't want to see that happen to another child, or even a young adult with special needs.

CHIEF WHITE - I know and I agree.

MEETING ORGANIZER - We're gonna do two more questions and the Chief will be here if you have other ones, you can ask him. But I want to get you into your smaller groups. So we'll go her and then here.

Person 11 - I am the mother of [inaudible], who was shot three times in the torso and laid on top of and bled out by [inaudible]. And, I am here because I woke up at 6 o'clock in the morning to my son's crime scene on the police reform commercial, and so I was wondering what this was about, and contacted my attorney about why are you guys using my son's crime scene for your guys' police reform when I have not even been contacted or had a formal apology for my son's death. This is what I got back. I burned the clothes, you guys give back bloody clothes, full of bullet holes, and you know, I have to bury this, according to our tradition. But I had to burn the other clothes. And my questions are that, my son held a, he was mental health, and held a knife to his neck. And uh, my question is, is it your policy to shoot someone at close range, that is suicidal, in front of children? And if so, why? My second question is, after being shot, he was handcuffed and sat on and bled out. Is that necessary, is that your policy? And if so, why? Third question, I was a victim, then became a secondary victim, and then was held in the interrogation room for about three hours and it seemed forever. By myself. Then, I was told that my son was gone and victim assistance was standing there and watching me cry and shocked and everything. And, um, when I did ask them if my son was alive, they lied to me and told me that they're working on it. And all that time I'm sittin in the homicide unit and I said, 'why am I in the homicide unit? You guys shot him and he's in the ambulance. Why am I sitting in the homicide unit?' You guys lied to me. I asked if he was alive, they lied to me. And all I saw was the kids staring at me in shock and fear, with the youngest child maybe being about four and the oldest 15. One kid had to go to the hospital because he fainted. And then after that. I was being harassed by district 4. Sitting outside of my apartment. Down my alley outside in the alley. And

that's harassing. And if you do that why do you do that? I mean, That's another questions. And my question is, why traumatize the children? You know, is that necessary? You've ruined multiple lives by being judge, jury, and executioner on the spot. When is this going to change? When are you going to start charging a cop?

CHIEF WHITE - First, I am not in a position to get into the details of the loss of your son, but certainly, and I hope that we have, whether we have or we haven't. I am certainly sorry that your son, regardless of the circumstances your son or anybody else who has lost their lives at the hands of a police officer. I am sorry for those mothers and fathers. I have three children, and I have, I think you've heard me, if anything ever happened to my kids, regardless of the circumstances, that is a pain that I'm not so sure I could recover from. So certainly, my condolences, as it relates to that. Now, as it relates to police officers sitting in front of your house, monitoring your house, we need to address that, we will, i will, I will, deal with that tomorrow morning. I will make sure I get with the commander of that district and figure out why that's happening and if it's happening, unless that person has extraordinary reasons, I will correct that. But as it relates to all those other particulars, given pending litigation and other things, wouldn't really be appropriate, it wouldn't be fair to the city, nor would it be fair to you, for me to get into a big explanation as it relates to that. And I'm sure all those questions will be answered for you in due time.

Person 11 - 15 children. 15 children, all of them were all lined up in the homicide unit. Waiting to be interrogated with their parents. The cop was yelling and cussing at the child, children as he, before he shot and killed my son.

CHIEF WHITE - You know, I hear you. And again I'm sure there will be an appropriate time, when this matter continue to be adjudicated in the process it will be an opportunity for all those questions to be answered.

Person 11 - I just demand justice for my son and all those that have been killed by police.

[Audience applause.]

MEETING ORGANIZER - We really need time for you to provide input.

Person 12 - My name is ... Person 12. A member of Colorado Black Political Action. And this has to do directly with the policy, because I've read the policy, front to back, so how are you going to eliminate ambiguity in the policy, because at the end of the day, just as Chief White said, if there is an incident you go back to the policy. The policy has loopholes and it contradicts itself. It is not concrete, it leaves the officer to their interpretation of the policy. If you want to reign in killings of the police department and to make sure you have community support, how are you going to reign this is? Example, you talk about the use of force continuum, but you don't



use the language of the use of force continuum. The use of force continuum is police academy 101. But it's not used in here. It's used in,... example, when you have the types of resistance, psychological intimidation, non-verbal compliance, passive resistance, defensive resistance, that's on page two of ten. But when you go over to and it talks about, umm, reasonable force and when it talks about unlawful, well, that means you can use force or chemical sprays on a non-violent peaceful protest. But it's a violation of this, but it's okay because they use it for their own interpretation.

CHIEF WHITE - Okay, I hear you, that's why you're here. I suggest that at some point,

Person 12 - But this is your revised copy.

Multiple people - It's a draft.

CHIEF WHITE - That's why it's a draft.

MEETING ORGANIZER - That's why those points are what we're looking for.

CHIEF WHITE - They're good points.

Person 12 - [Garbled] ...done this for this draft. This is an entire print.

CHIEF WHITE - Let me say that, the continuum is obsolete for most of the part. It is obsolete, so there's other things that we do. But...

PERSON 12 - No no, it's not obsolete, because the force, the continuum, is in the national ..... of justice. It's how you bring a person under control. You use a little bit more force to bring that person under control. You're talking about lethal force, officers use least lethal weapon to gain control of a situation. Should only be used if the suspect poses a serious threat to the officer or another individual. And here [the policy] is there own interpretation. So, it can't be, oh well this is just a draft because it should already have been done.

CHIEF WHITE - I am sure that there is an explanation for that. However,...

PERSON 12 - I'd like to hear it.

CHIEF WHITE - Let me, okay, I've heard you. Let me finish. You are here to make those comments. You made those comments. Those comments are going to come to me. We're gonna look at that, and, if in fact you were right and we muzzled it up we will change it, if in fact you're right. But I gotta be honest with you. I would have to take the time to f..., because I don't

know the policy by heart, I've read it a dozen times, but I still can't tell you anything by heart. I will take the time to listen to what you said and I will address those issue, I will tell you, "Hey you're right. We're gonna correct that." Or I'll tell you, "Guess what. You're not right, and this is why you're not right." That's what we're gonna do. So, I've heard you and I'm assuming, I'm hoping, we should have said this, we should have recorded this entire.

MEETING ORGANIZER - We did.

CHIEF WHITE - The entire meeting is recorded. So, .... I'm not talking about the media.

[Laughter]

CHIEF WHITE - What the media says versus what I say sometimes get a little fuzzy. But we recorded this entire meeting and everything that each of you have said has been recorded, and we are going to view everything that is said tonight, as it relates to the policy and everything else that is said. So, you're on record as saying that, but I'm not telling you that I'm changing that right now. I gotta take the time to look at that, I've gotta take the time to see what everybody else is saying.

MEETING ORGANIZER. -- So what I want to do....

[Cut off - moved to Person 13.]

Person 13 - [Missing].....the uh, de-escalation has to be, um, part of the de-escalation policy. Um, we also would like to find out and see how the information on the use of um, when, when there is a use of force, how can we find out that information? How can we have access to that information? How can we as everyday citizens read the same things you guys as police, as police chiefs, find out? I know that there is a lot of things within legal circumstances that you can't talk about, but we would like to um, to see that information, at some point, published. So that we could review it. Um and also we would like to see a lot more of the co-responders. There's 300 police officers and there's eight responders. [clapping cuts out audible statements]. How are they gonna be deployed? Are they gonna be available every instance? Are they just going to be training police officers? We need clarification on how that process is gonna be. And also, we like to see a ban on chokeholds and strangle holds.

Person 10- They're banned.

Person 10 - It's in there.

Person 13 - And we would like there to be a registry on police officers that have committed violations of the policy which have been found, um, to be uh,

Man- to prevent ...

Person 13- Yeah to prevent officers from going from one police officer to another so they're not shuffled and before they are disciplined, basically. And if there's something I forgot...

Person 14 - I think we also talked about the need to start this thing over from scratch.

PERSON 13 - Mark was telling us at the beginning that he also agreed with what they had said, that um., he felt that um., there should have been people from the community...

Person 14 - and the Independent Monitor should have been involved. From the beginning.

Person 15 - We also wanted to talk about, briefly, the definition of being proactive. And that those definitions might vary for a lot of us, and that we could be, if you wanted to be considered proactive in your policy, that addressing the discipline matrix at the same time should be... otherwise there's no way to .....[]

Person 10 - Very good. Very good.

Person 10 - Go ahead in the back. I saw your hand.

Person 16 - We agree, we talked about creating a task force that had policy makers of anybody that's involved on the table. So we agreed a lot with what you had said. I think one thing that we thought missing was just personal development for the police officers. We want to know that training was happening around social justice issues, mental health and trauma, vicarious trauma, cognitive dissonance and [.....], listed on the slide, but not on the actual ... manual. Really understanding what that curriculum looks like and what is holding police officers accountable to that curriculum, so that they understand what is being taught to them. And I don't exactly know what that might look like. We don't have the specifics, but we think that could be addressed in a task force or scratching it and going from the beginning. We talked about having the Independent Monitor be a part of it.

Person 17 - Well, to go back to the training for a minute, we think that the curriculum and who provides the training should be published because to say that the training is provided by professionals doesn't really give us peace of mind. But to know which professionals are providing it and what is in their curriculum, that would be fantastic to be published on a website, or facebook update, whatever.

Person 16 - Yeah I think a lot of some of the things that happened are, we're just not informed of what's going on and so it seems like maybe that officers are apathetic to the issues that groups like Black Lives Matter are bringing up. And so, hopefully, there's some accountability for that moving forward.

Person 10 - Very good. Okay go ahead.

Person 18 - Just on the accountability piece, on use of force review. We weren't sure who these groups were, so a use of force review board, so we don't know who that is or who's on that, [[.....]] review board... , we didn't know that the OIM wasn't included in that. What we were also interested in seeing is a part of the accountability structure built into this, is something that the citizens advisory board, so that there is a review coming back to the community about the implementation policy, and then how it's actually being handled when there are transgressions.

Person 17 - Can I add just one more thing? So, as part of the process, asking us for specific language revision in a session is again something that needs to be addressed more by a task force. Then just sort of a group of people on a night when we haven't had time or didn't realize there was an expectation, that we would be intimately familiar enough to revise the language. But something that we noticed, specifically, throughout was that any definitions within this need to be clarified in layman's terms. Every instance where there's a definition..... [Video cuts]

Person 18 - One thing we talked about... So, basically, what's talked about is that this policy not being thorough enough, but also, how do we function with people with mental health issues. You know, I've been here for about 17 years now, and some things I've seen work well, but as it pertains to people with mental health issues, especially needs, I haven't seen that. It's not to say that it won't or can't happen, but I haven't seen it. And as a parent with a child with special needs, it's really important and vital that I see these policies change in terms of how we approach and function with our children and adults with special needs, but also with people with mental health issues. Um, we talked about use of force being a last resort. De-escalating upon arrival. The thing of it is, a lot of people don't truly understand what de-escalation really is. Instead of jumping into a situation sometimes you have to talk to a person. Find out what's going on with him. As opposed to just coming in and just grabbing somebody. Being ready to be forceful with them, and that might not be what works for them and could trigger them to melt down even quicker. We talked about reducing people from feeling powerless, especially in their homes. How to empower and give choices when possible. No need for home search when people are looking for help. If you're called, not coming in looking for a problem, but seeing if you can help them find a solution when they're looking for help. Learn cultural awareness. Community competency training. Know your neighborhoods. And talking about implicit biases because I find that being a person of color, when often times officers come into communities of color, which, in

Denver, they're kind of fragmented so there's not as cohesive as I'd like to see them be, but when they come in they come in with this ideology and vilifying and criminalizing people without giving them the opportunity for a chance. You know, umm. The policies need to contain all of the new languages and training required to be an officer. Other mentality versus knowing community. Meetings, community center, and some police living, even, in the communities they police. I've got a lot of stuff. Psychological profiles of police officers and psychological evaluations on a regular basis. Not just... [Crowd Applause] [...] in the first year, but people that have been on the force for a while because burnout is real. Using excessive force without enough information, that's where training comes into play, as well. Understanding what the communities need around them, what the neighborhoods need. Um. The last couple of things. Someone had mentioned some things about homelessness. How is this addressed in policy related to mental illness and behavior? Because, I don't know if you all know this or not, but the data shows that more than half of the people that are homeless either have mental health issues or they may have drug issues. And dealing with that from a space of treatment and seeing what we can do to find solutions to help them.

Person 10 - And the sweeps. [Crowd - Sweeps - applause]

Person 18 - And also looking at how we deal with domestic violence. Giving the victim assistance and not vilifying them because they called and said "I need help." Instead of making them the villain let's look at what the issue of the situation really is and dealing with it from that perspective. And the last thing I have here says. Training must include: race, ethnicity, gender identity and expression, sexuality, disability, among other things.

Person 19 - Hi my names Person 19 and I worked for a community based state wide organization called Dove. And so I'm going to be focused on domestic violence and sexual assault victims who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf/blind. And a lot for you have talked about what our group has already discussed and so I would like to just voice that we concur with a lot of the statements we've heard. I just want to add a few things that our group talked about. I feel like the recruitment of people of color and having them be a part of the police force needs to be increase, which means we need to improve the image of the department among communities of people of color and have some more transparency along the lines of discipline matrix. So, that the community can look at and refer to the discipline matrix and see when there is an incident that happens and be able to hold officers accountable. Now when people file grievances about a case or against an officer DPD must respond in writing. No one should ever be ignored for the inquiry of grievance that they filed. There's also some concerns about hiring veterans to be on the police force and that kind of talks about the psychological evaluations. Making sure they would be ready to become officers after potentially having a lot of traumatic experience from serving overseas. To make sure that if they do have PTSD or those kinds of things that those are being addressed and to see if they're actually a good fit to be in the work force. Also when a dispatch

receives calls, we suggest that there is a routine type of list of questions asked if possible, obviously, to see who is the person that is needing help in that situation, is that a person with a disability, are they deaf, do they need an interpreter? If it's a domestic violence situation, should there be a victim advocate that is sent on the way, as well. And the co-responders with mental health, having that as an issue or as a solution, that's a great idea. But I think that could be something that you could address other arenas through dispatch, if that's possible. And also, adding to what some people have already mentioned there needs to be a lot of educational training on how to respond to people in the community who have multiple, intersectional identities. For example, a person who is deaf and blind and a person of color, we had a situation in our community actually a few years ago, here, in Denver, where there was an individual who was born deaf and blind and were assaulted by an officer because they didn't respond to the officer's command. So there needs to be more training and understanding that not everybody is not going to respond to a command. They may seem like they're ignoring you but they might be deaf or they might also have some kind of vision loss or blindness. And they're not able to respond to you. Instead of automatically taking down that person, utilize other tactics. And then last thing we suggested, that body cameras should be on at all times. During their shift, they should never have specific times when it could be off and when it could be on. It needs to be on all the time while they're working.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Yea you.

Person 20 - I just want to speak on behalf of five points, Denver, and we appreciate the Police Chief. I was raised up with Mayor Hancock. And I'm a business owner, and Dec. 2011, I was leaving my shop and my van ran out of gas and I reached out on the curb and parked my car where i could park it and when police approached me, they said "are you drinking, are you drunk, are you on meth, are you on this and that." And I said, "No, I'm [...] Person 21. I'm just leaving my shop. I live a couple blocks away. I'm waiting on someone to come and help me out with my gas. So I can go home. The police officer said, "I don't know you. I don't give an F about you." And as I explained to him, and I said "I stay two blocks from here and I just left my shop, and as they opened the back door of my van, it was like, they had four, five, six, seven, a hundred toys, that we give away for the kids. And he said, "I don't care about you." The more and more he said that, the more I got angry on my intelligence. I've been telling the truth all my life. Especially when it comes down to a police officer. You tell them the truth, you tell them what's going on. And if there's a pass, there's a pass. Especially, when they protect and serve. But on that night, they treated me like I was just something that I could not conceive I was. And now, after 25 years. It's like, I have to turn myself in Friday, it's the third DUI, it's like okay. But at that same time, if the officer would have respected the service of the community, if they would like, get out and talk to the people of the community and get to know the community they'll understand that everybody that they see ain't no blood, ain't no Crip. 99% of us are

decent respectable people. So, with that being said, I'm just gonna read this. I wrote a letter to the mayor Hancock, and the new Chief.

I, Person 21, and the Denver community ask that this tool be implemented to produce simple and positive communication between citizens and law enforcement. This tool will create community relationships to all who comply.

And the reason I'm saying that is by me being a business owner, and I deal with people every day in the neighborhood, all types of people. And I deal with young people, my son's 21. His people, his friends, and they say to me they say. I've been pulled over like 45 times. The same officer been affecting me 25 times.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Mr. Person 21 I'm gonna ask you to wrap it up. Please finish.

Person 21 - So they put my son with a backpack and he was coming from East high school, and his cousin was with him. And they circled the block, and they made him unloose his backpack and threw it all in the car, and all this, and I said, police officer, I told my son, I said, if you ever in contact tell them to call me. I'm your father. And he told the PO time after time, would you please call my dad? Would you please call my dad? And they didn't. It's like, why? All I'm saying is, when you in the presence of 98% of the kids that are in this neighborhood, and they're good kids, and they say, "call my momma, call my grandma, please officer I ain't doing nothing wrong." It's like, what's the protocol to that as opposed to, why are the officers pulling over the same kid 10-15 times, as they, excuse me, and they know who they are... [inaudible]

CHIEF WHITE - Mr. Person 21 I'm going to unfortunately, if it's okay, we want to let everybody talk. Before you leave we will stay here, and I'll have somebody entertain everything that you have to say. But I kinda want to give everyone else an opportunity. I don't want to dismiss you. I'm gonna make sure that we're still here after everybody talks and anything that you want to share with us, we will to get that, but, if it's alright with you, i need to let the other people because they need to go home also, how about we give them the opportunity to talk.

Person 21 - I'm just sayin sir. All I'm saying what is the protocol to an officer to cruise up on a young man or a young woman and they say, "wassup, little [inaudible]."

MEETING ORGANIZER - Mr. Person 21, we will have the Chief talk with you afterwards. I'm gonna go here, I'm gonna go in the back. And this table here we have not heard from.

Person 22 - My name is [inaudible] last election, and I'm the chairman for [Inaudible] for self-defense. So, uh. Couple of things. Thanks, everyone for sharing what they shared and thank the folks, Chief, and uh, there she is. My sister, in charge of public safety. Uh for being here and allowing us to share. Now, what we got out of these documents were the thought processes of the police. That's what we thought we was listening to. This is what yawl think. And then the

process of what we think needs to be blended into a policy. That we all can live by. And one of the things that we stressed was that when we leave our home and we leave this meeting we need boots on the ground. You act like you got some sense and I act like I got some sense. So, any process, we demand that there be a zero-tolerance of the police of using force excessively, or deadly, against unarmed citizens. And then on the question process, we think that this process is a beginning. It's the beginning. And it's a new beginning. I was born and raised in five-points here. And the years that I've been here, we ain't never had no meeting like this, with the police. [audience applause] [inaudible statements] We see some changes happen at the top. But they're not trickling down to the bottom yet. Because you're talking about the evolution of a culture. You're talking about the evolution of the code of conduct. You're talking about folks starting in kindergarten. And expecting them to act like adults. So there has to be police, and because they work for us, we have to parent them, alright. And you gotta realize, they working hard every day. And I'll tell you right now, I ain't no particular fan of the police. Ain't no sense in talking. So, when you talk about this process, we're heading there. We goin get there, alright. But now we need boots on the ground. So when I leave out of here, alright, with the police that's in here, and the chief in here, we need to have a meeting with the police tonight and tell them, No killing of unarmed citizens today or ever again. Period. There's no excuse for that. So, we getting there. Second things. On the second question, We have this document here that's called the National Institute of Justice. Where it outlines across this how you do this with some sanity. Changing the culture, how do you apply this, there's no ambiguity, there ain't no wooly wooly wop wop. Interpretation. It is what it is, you do this. You do that. You do the other. Period. You don't do that there's consequences you've got to pay. For real consequences. Alright, uh. Including death penalty. You get what you give up in this. You don't wanna get shot, we don't want to shoot you. Don't you be shootin me. If I shoot you, I go to jail forever. You shoot me, you get a slap on the hand, you're back on duty in six weeks. That ain't goin to work. I'm not paying for that. If that's the best you can do, we might as well have open carry up in the city and county of Denver. And then everybody check yourself from the neck up. For real. We can go back to the wild wild west, what you give is what you get. [inaudible] and that's it. Ain't got to go through no more of this explaining nothing. The language, the language of this, that you guys are bringing, you've gotta make this thing plain and simple. Make it plain and simple, so that we can be educated on your mindset. We need to know how you thinking. So, that I can share that with my community, with my kids, with my brothers and sisters in the neighborhood. So, that they know how to deal with you and your job, what kind of stresses you under. Look at you. He got so much stress he can't even grow hair no more. [Inaudible laughter] I'm not trying to marginalize this or nothing like that. This is real serious business, but you also have scared me up in here. Cuz y'all real serious and this is a serious thing. But we're gonna have to work together on this thing. We have to work together. So, the last thing. The code of conduct. It's call unity. It's called unity. And I'm talking about an undying, no matter what, love for each other. Knowing that nobody is perfect in this. We're all gonna make mistakes in this. This is about the sanctity of life. And how we act, as human beings. And the one thing we should be striving for for this city, is that we are



the attraction for all humanity for ... people who want to be dealt with in a sense of justice. We don't have to worry about the police because we have a lot of worrying already to do. For real. We about to go through some serious stress. I mean stress for real. And they getting ready to go through some serious stress. For real. So we gotta take the air out the balloon. And everybody have a brain fart to let the air out the balloon before it busts. Because the last thing I want to experience is a bunch of chaos and confusion. Do you understand me. I ain't doin that. I'm not doin that. And it don't have to be about the law. There's a moral code that we have to live by and we know what that is. And the number one law is treat people the way you want to be treated. That's it. And if you can't live by that than you need to out of my town for real, for real. That's [inaudible]. Cause this is not the place for that. This isn't it. This ain't it. So, in closing. Thank you everybody for being here.

[Audience applause]

Person 23 - First of all, I would like to thank the police chief for what he's doing. Secondly, I grew up in California, so it's a whole different atmosphere. But I commend what you're doing here. Definitely different from... [inaudible]. .... We have to tell the truth. The thing that happens is that two sides get angry because no one's telling the truth. [inaudible] There needs to be a program put in place for the kids and the police, the mentally ill and the police, the poor and the police, because this is classism. There needs to be cultural sensitivity training because the white man can shoot the president and walk away with no bruises. So we need some sensitivity, cultural training because if a white man can shoot the president and get up not shot with no bruises. The same thing should... Well I'm not saying shoot the president. [Inaudible]

[inaudible]

Person 3 - Just things that haven't been mentioned because much has been mentioned but this table right here we got right down to it. We said one of the ways to change police force culture so that it can become a caring force for the community, so that it can be the kind of love that they're talking about at these last two tables. So, we said, has the police looked, we have to look to other countries to see how policing is done in other places and see what can be used here to have non-violent options available. We talked about officers in Britain, they don't have, they may not carry guns. We may be able to learn something even though people here do carry guns. We talked about Canada where PO in some places are actually doing meditation before they go out on their shift. So, that they can clear their minds and approach alarming situations with presence of mind to have an array of options to choose from. Um, we talked about crisis intervention training. A lot of the training we talked about here, uh the Chief mentioned a resilience program that the force already has, we'd like to know more about that. We talked about the police schedule may be adjusted in a way that somewhere like the fire department where there's more blocks of time off so officers can decompress. We wanted there to be officers

evaluated, it was talked about before, evaluated for their mental and emotional health on a regular basis. Or on a basis that's not completely reactive, but that we have a culture of a healthy, of mental health in the police force, so that uh, and we want police sergeants who monitor all that. Police sergeants who can actually work with their officers from a position themselves of having a healthy mental state. So, those were the main ideas, did I leave anything important out?

MEETING ORGANIZER - Okay. Let's go here and then we'll go here.

Person 24 - Hi, My names Person 24. And uh, I'm not sure what hasn't really been mentioned. For started, this needs to go to everybody in the public. Just no put on your websites, maybe you can do something to get it out to everybody because nobody's really seen it. I got to see it, I've got some special privileges. But, it needs to go out to everybody. As far as what has been mentioned and what hasn't been mentioned, we talked about the language. We talked about improvement in the language. One of the main funny things here is we want to get away from the weasel words that you use. The weasel language. Uh, just too broad. In the area of what needs to be added. Uhm. The UoF against the homeless. Now, how does the homeless know about this policy? How do they know about this policy? You need to get this information out. Pretty glossy stuff. That's all it is right now. Um, what else did we say? We talked about the use of action as it harms the homeless, so you know, you need to incorporate the homeless into your policy. What needs to be done? As far as consequences, uh. We were concerned about things that uh, most important things to know. Consequences, concerns about shooting. Somebody at our table mentioned that they consider a lot of the shootings as murders, and uh they're concerned about harassment of the homeless, again, and harassment of the activists. And some of these things need to be discussed with your department and on an ongoing basis. Another thing on the consequences and that is uh, one second, well let's go past that, I can't read my notes right now. We would like to know are we gonna get to see what the union has to say? We understand what the chief is saying, but we'd like to see what the union has to say and are they gonna be providing, what input are they gonna be providing to this policy. We talked about no charges against the police in the past 23 years, I couldn't verify that statement but i just wanna throw it out there. We also want to know, again, about the Office of the Independent Monitor, is he really independent? Because he also works for somebody in the city. But I'm not sure who. And so another person thought that uh, maybe another person other than the office of the independent monitor there needs to be another independent review. And would you consider doing that? It needs to be more transparent, there needs to be more accountability. What needs to be changed? Uh, .. individual rights, clearly require officers to attempt to provide lifesaving first-aid to people that have been shot. First, I mean, I understand that you don't want to put yourself in, policemen don't want to put themselves in harm's way, but you know, while you're standing there waiting on your supervisor, people are dying. People are dying on the scene. Explicitly, require officers to attempt exhaust all other remaining less severe alternatives before resorting to deadly force. And I definitely agree with Chairman Setu. Hey, if you're not armed, right now, it's just not

good situation for anybody out there. We also talked about the discipline matrix. Um, more disciplinary action, internal records that should follow officers at all times. To allow them, to stop them being able to skip from town to town, from force to force. Uh, in closing, stop the harassment, stop killing.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Last one.

Person 25 - My name is Person 25 Widener and I'm reporting on behalf of this table. We talked primarily about police accountability. What we're seeing is police officers who're being investigated are going through this system that ultimately lead them back out into the field and those POs continue to be [inaudible] systems. So, we'd really like to see a fresh set of eyes in holding the POs accountable.

Man - Internal investigations, No more paid vacations. If you're under investigation you should not be paid.

Person 25 - Yes, and we also, we suggested that in any instance of UoF, a police officer should be monitored during the time that the UoF is being investigated to hold them personally accountable for their actions. We also said that we think there should be no use of chemical weapons on citizens. It's a violation of human rights. And one last thing we touched on is encouraging officers to step into a situation where they see another officer violating a human rights act, or acting inappropriately. Even in the threat of danger because if they don't do that that is essentially saying that that officer's life is more valuable than that citizen's life.

[Inaudible]

MEETING ORGANIZER - Thank you very much.

Person 26 - My name is Person 26 and we actually discussed a lot of the same things that have been echoed this evening. So, I'll read through these relatively quickly. Explicitly require officers to attempt to exhaust all other forms of force that are less severe alternative, prior to resorting to lethal force or force that will inflict serious bodily harm. Explicitly ban force as a form of punishment, meaning if an officer has to chase somebody down, when you finally, if you finally catch that person, do not exhibit force on this person simply because you're angry. Let's see, again we need more site collaboration, uh, i believe you reference it was 8, maybe 11 individuals who accompany officers as trained individuals who are not in the uniform capacity. There're 1400 officers in the department and out of these officers you're not gonna always know when you make contact with an individual, whether they have a behavioral challenge. So, if there would be a way to increase the amount of people who are responding to scenes, overall. Whether it's behavioral or whether you don't know at the time, I think, would encourage alternative measure being exercised. We really believe that, and we talked about the uh, defining the

objective standard. It's too discretionary, we're not entirely sure what an objective standard looks like, it seems like that is open to interpretation to any officer that is policing the street. And we've seen now, time and time again, how that can play out. Expand explicit bias training, a lot of people spoke about that this evening. It sounded like there was a, I don't know if this was for CIT or if this was for implicit bias, but an increase in hours from 8-40, so I would encourage just to continue down that path. If that is something you've already started to expand that should be expanded even further. In this entire policy, the Independent Monitor was not included in its development, the independent monitor is Denver's only independent entity, who is responsible for making recommendations on how uniform personnel are disciplined and he got this policy two hours before the general public did. And when we had a similar policy being developed at the Sheriff's department, the Independent Monitor was included throughout the entire process. It took us roughly 8 months to come to a developed policy, but he was there and he was speaking on behalf of people in the community who had been directly impacted. Plus, there were open seats to the community and community members at this development, in this process. In the disciplinary matrix does not correspond with violations of this policy. I'm all for community input in this policy, but you know as well as I do Chief White, Sheriff Pat Firman, Executive Director Stephanie O'Malley, that if we don't have a matrix that allows you to fire police or sheriffs, this policy is almost ineffective. Cause you can fire them, or you can suspend them, demote them, do, administer any kind of discipline you want, but we all know, through their unions they will appeal this time and time again. And they can do that all the way up to the Colorado supreme court. So, it makes it less effective. And it really means that we are in danger as a community when this is possible. And I have little kids coming up to me, asking me, "how do I feel safe? What can I do to feel safe in Northeast Park Hill?" And I don't know. I don't know what to tell a 14 year old young man coming up to me and asks me that question. And I'm hoping that we can continue this collaborative process, so maybe we can one day have an answer for him.

## Use of Force Community Meeting 01-28-17

CHIEF WHITE- Young lady.

Person 1 - Um, I'd like to start out with your um info to the media. What about giving the families of, (clears throat), excuse me, the people involved in these shooting incidents more information um then having to hear it over the media.

CHIEF WHITE - Uh, actually, um, we [inaudible] to families prior to the media. And on a, and on a regular basis. As a matter of fact, I think uh, the executive director in the back there, uh, actually under current leadership we actually have an entire protocol. Now, we have not, we have not been as, um, effective in doing that in the past, but I will tell you that as of late, probably meaning in the last four or five months, we have an entirely new protocol as it relates to that. Now, I really don't see any reason, incidentally [inaudible] we can't actually release what that protocol is.

PERSON 1 - That's okay. I just want to say, in an event that my family was involved in. Um, I was sitting in the street down the road. And I heard, hours after the press conference you gave, from a friend. The media, uh, channel 9 news, a link was sent, stating that the suspect was dead. But yet, not one officer had come down and spoke to any of our family. Left us sitting there for hours.

CHIEF WHITE - That, that absolutely, again, I don't know about that particular scenario, but not to even get into a debate with you about that.

PERSON 1 - I'm not, I'm just...

CHIEF WHITE - But whether or not, it should not have happened, so. Which is, for the very reason why, uh, again the direction of, uh, the executive director. We've changed that entire protocol.

Person 2 - I have one question.

MEETING ORGANIZER - I'll go here, then in the back.

PERSON 2 - Uh, what percentage of officers wear bodycams?

CHIEF WHITE - What percentage of officers,... Every officer that is out in the community patrolling wears bodycam.

PERSON 2 - Okay. So even if it was a direct call, say something was called in, they go out, they're suited up with a bodycam.

CHIEF WHITE - Yes. Yes. Every officer that's in a patrol capacity. That means the six police districts, all of you who live or work, if you're living or working in Denver, in one of the six police districts. That also means the traffic division. That also means the gang unit. Um, who else? And the officers that work at the airport are actually in the process of getting their body cams.

PERSON 2 - I don't mean to follow....

Person 3 - With all due respect, that's incorrect, absolutely incorrect.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, correct me. Tell me how I'm wrong.

PERSON 3 - Okay because my home was raided. I'm a civil rights activist. I have 23 years of activism. I've investigated fire and police departments. Including Chicago, which is, probably, one of the worst in the country. [Inaudible] just came out and denounced denounced Chicago Police Department. But, um, my house was raided.

CHIEF WHITE - When was your house raided?

PERSON 3 - Uh, seven months ago?

CHIEF WHITE - Okay, and what do you ...

PERSON 3 - For my activism.

CHIEF WHITE - What area do you live in?

PERSON 3 - Uh... Denver, Wadsworth, Quincy area.

Officer blocking camera (OBC) - That's district four. Raided by who, sir?

PERSON 3 - Um, the Denver District Four Police Department.

CHIEF WHITE - Uniform officers.

PERSON 3 - Uniform, white shirt, and a detective. None of em, I don't believe any of them had body cameras. And we have video.

CHIEF WHITE - We can verify that. I can pretty much assure you that uniforms [inaudible] bodycams. You give us your information so we don't take everybody's time...

PERSON 3 - Well, there's a federal lawsuit gonna be happening. It's gonna be huge, so.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, obviously, we'll address it as a resulting lawsuit. But I'll also let you know, before the lawsuit, if in fact the officer had the uniform, had the bodycam.

PERSON 3 - How does this message, this is all great, it's all wonderful, great dialogue. How does it get passed down to the officers that are above the law, and the culture of corruption, and those that are mentoring the new officers that are corrupt. How do you clean all that up? How does it all get trickled down and cleaned up?

CHIEF WHITE - The officers, the officers that are above the law shouldn't be police officers. That's getting addressed because we [inaudible].....

PERSON 3 - Well, 70% of them are above the law.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, that's kind of a ...

PERSON 3 - I have the evidence. I have a lot of work, 23 years of work.

CHIEF WHITE - Okay, thank you. Uh, who wants to go?

MEETING ORGANIZER - Okay let's see. I'm going to the back and then over here, and then right here. Then, right there. Okay.

Person 4 - My name is Person 4. I'm an educator. And so, when I think of making changes I think of where you start, and what progress you're making towards the end result. So, think about de-escalation for example. Studies have shown, that people of color receive, maybe, non-lethal de-escalation, so more like kicks, choke-holds, shoves, like more physical acts of violence to suppress and contain. So, do we have a starting metric on what Denver has done using non-lethal force for people of color? As we're making changes to increase transparency and equity, where you're moving towards, are there levels to that intervention?

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah, yeah, absolutely. [inaudible]. We have actual policies that specifically speak to those and say when and where and how they should be done. But uh, but we first kinda have to have these foundations, kind of.... say, this is what we value based on what we've heard. Uh, and once this policy's in place we'll go back to all those other policies that have, that uh, that

is somehow connected, uh, to this particular policy to make sure they are consistent with the foundation that we are trying to create. [inaudible] huh? And also, as it relates to, we also have a uh, an effort underway in communities involved in that. As it relates to data collection. Are we profiling? Are we treating individuals different than another group? So, we're actually in the process of doing data collection.

Person 4 - Okay well that may be, will there be updates in public to release those numbers, as they go down or go up or don't change, at all?

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah, As it relates to, almost anything that's attached to this policy as it's pertaining to the weapons or the strategies that the officers have to use, all of those are in our email. Everything that we do as it relates to policies you can review on a, you go to, you go on a computer and you can actually get a copy of it. By simply going to Denver.gov, uh, whatever the, I don't know it by heart. Denver.gov.

DEPUTY CHIEF - Denvergov.org/police.

CHIEF WHITE - Right. We can, ... if it's not in there, we're actually writing it on [inaudible]

Person 4 - Thank you.

CHIEF WHITE - Thank you.

MEETING ORGANIZER - I'll go here, here, here, and then here.

Person 5 - Okay, so my question is about the body cameras. So, you're saying all your police officers have body cameras? Are the body cameras just always on or do the police officers turn them on and off?

CHIEF WHITE - Obviously, we have a policy, you can see that policy also, that speaks to when the body cams are on and when they're not on. Sometimes it's not appropriate. You're going into a hospital, you're going into a juvenile... just times where you're going to the restroom. Times where it's not appropriate to have the body cams on. But we have a policy that speaks to that, and the other part of that is, if there is a violation, there are consequences for the violation. So, in other words, if an officer doesn't have it on and he also should have it on, uh, there are consequences for not having it on. And our bodycam policy is relatively new, by the way. Maybe within the last year we finally got everybody body cams on that needs to have them. And also, that's happened with discipline as it relates to violating that policy.



MEETING ORGANIZER - Go here, here, and then here.

Person 6 - Well, Chief. I was a fan of Hill Street Blues also, wonderful program. [dropped mic] The other part of that quote is, the sergeant gets up and says, "Let's get them before they get us." Which you might want to rethink. Initially.

CHIEF WHITE - No. I... I purposely did not show that. Because that's not where we're trying to go.

PERSON 6 - Well I understand that sir. I'm just mentioning that if you look it up. It's not a good model, maybe. Um. The question I have has to do with um. Have you, two questions... having to do with this use of force policy. One have, how much have you, did you work with Beth McCann, with this use of force policy? And then, like you, I'm frustrated also, but what I see in videos. I mean, especially from the, being uh, not a person of color. But a white person, you know, I've always kind of thought. I've always given the police the benefit of the doubt. And then when I see some of these videos, I'm just appalled. Understanding that I don't have, necessarily have the context of this. So, with your new policy, Use of Force policy, will it be easier to discipline officers? Will it be easier to, when necessary, uh charge them criminally because under the current policy that was always the issue. You would always say, not you sir. But other people would say, "under the current policy that's not really a problem."

CHIEF WHITE - Well, we think, great points. And, um, I mean, it's part of that concern that you're expressing is part of the reason why we changed the policy. As it relates to Beth McCann, obviously, she's going through a metamorphosis for maybe, since the first of January. So, less than a month, but I will also tell you that Beth McCann has a copy of it. Uh, uh, the Monitor, in case the people want to ask, has a copy of it. We've gotten feedback from the monitor, we've offered to meet with him weeks ago. Uh, after he gave us his feedback he agreed to meet with us. So, I believe this week we'll have a meeting with the monitor as it relates to his perspective of the policy. And, uh, Beth has been in office for maybe three weeks and I'll tell you we've probably interacted six or seven times already in that short period of time. So, she will absolutely have an opportunity to um... to um... to respond to it. I'll also tell you. This past week, uh, in Beth's old position, the executive director and I, actually, met with the Denver and the Aurora body legislators. And made a presentation to them and sort of got their feedback... and they also got a copy of that policy. And we've gotten their also.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Go here, here, and then here.

Person 7 - So, uh, do you think your policy meets the national best standards?

CHIEF WHITE - I think, contrary to some who thinks otherwise, I will tell you. First of all, you've got to understand, this is a draft. It's only a draft. I'm going to be candor with you. There are very very few departments in the country that would go with this degree and have this kind of communication regarding policies. There are hundreds and hundreds of policies. But, but, hear me out. When it's all said and done, I feel very comfortable that this will probably be one of the more restrictive use of force policies in the country. Is it there? No. It's a foundation, it's a draft. I need your input as it relates to that. But no, it's not there yet. So, why don't you make a point and we interact between each other. {inaudible} Raise that question. Then we can have that conversation. And then if it's not you can tell me why. If it is, I'll tell you why. If it's not, I'll tell you why it's not. We're not there yet, so I don't want to say that it is, uh, but I'll just simply say that's why we're trying to get feedback. But I'm going to talk about it, when I'm finished with these questions before [inaudible]. I'm going to talk about how this became a draft. Contrary to what I think a lot of people think how it became a draft.

PERSON 7 - So, it can be improved is what you're saying?

CHIEF WHITE - Absolutely.

PERSON 7 - Okay. Well, I think, we're going to need more than three meeting to get that all together, you know. And also, why haven't you met with Colorado Latino Forum, Denver chapter?

CHIEF WHITE - I have met with the Colorado Latino Forum, in the short time that I've been here, probably more than five or six times. But let me tell you why I did not, and I don't [inaudible], but I will explain to you why I didn't meet with them based on their last request. Because number one we went out to these public meetings. And number two, the co-chair of the Colorado Latino Forum wrote me a letter stating she wanted me to have a meeting with their executive board to explain how come I did not have people from the community and from the forum sit down and rewrite the draft policy. And I have already explained to that person, no less than three or four times at other public meetings that we've had. Next question.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Here, here, and then here, then there.

Person 8 - I appreciate the community forums, but I'm just wondering, and maybe you addressed it a little bit in the last question, but the optics just weren't good about getting to this point that people wanted to be involved before the draft came out. And the fact that you didn't want to do that. Then, after that you had these. Just what was your thinking. Because the optics weren't good. I have to say.

CHIEF WHITE - Right, so this is, this is. Thanks for asking. Over there, I'll respond to this question also. That policy is not the words of Robert White. Chief. That policy is the result of me, personally, going to hundreds of meetings since I've been here. Listening to the voices of the entire community. My staff going to thousands of meetings over the last couple of years. And having interaction, listening to the voices of the community. Traveling around the country. Looking at what other police departments are doing. Uh, speaking around the country about transformational change. Looking at the incidents that have been occurring around this country. Whether it's New York, whether it's Ferguson, whether it's Baltimore, whether it's Chicago. Factoring in your voices, factoring in what else is going around the country. Uh. That's what that policy is. I didn't want the input necessarily from just a group of people who represented a group of people. I wanted the input from the entire community, uh, putting it in a draft. And it's still a draft. So, that is why, and I'm going to say I cause, I'll say we [inaudible] That is why I decided the best way to present a draft policy, to give people a chance to comment on it, was to get the voices of the entire community.

MEETING ORGANIZER - [inaudible] Here, here, here, here, and here.

Person 9 - Good morning Chief White and everyone. So, you know that I and so many people are dissatisfied with the level of community input that you've refused to allow, and that these are probably are insufficient. My question uh, I have several, but the one I want to ask the most is why,... when we are done with this community input forum and you go back to making these changes, there's already been so many criticisms of the vagueness of what "reasonable" or "appropriate" means in this policy and the lack of reporting requirements, but how are we going to hear about what you've taken into these community forums and applied into this? And where will we find out, will we ever have the opportunity to know what you did or did not accept as input into this policy before it becomes not a draft anymore? How will we know that you're actually listening to us?

CHIEF WHITE - Well, I'm sure, again, Shaun [inaudible], I'm sure that that policy and you can take the current policy and use your own eyes, along with your constituents will say, "this looks like the exact same that we had." Or, "here are the changes." You, simply put, all you would have to do is take that draft, and then take the sheet with the final policy is, and you can see for yourself or you can make your own assessment of what the changes were. And we are going to publish it, by the way. Just like all the other policies, so it will be published. And we will send something out that says, "as a result of these feelings this is the final copy of that particular policy."

PERSON 9 - Do you have any plans to extend the community input process?

CHIEF WHITE - Not as I speak, but if we think it's necessary to do that we'll set the amount appropriate.

Guy - We think you should.

Other guy - Yeah you should bro.

Person 10 - How many meetings do you guys want to have? How many meetings do you think are appropriate? [Talking to the audience]

PERSON 9 - I think that one is app... one in every district of the city that's covered by the policy at a minimum. And probably two or three in the ones that are most impacted by police violence.

PERSON 10 - How do you know that that's not perfect?

PERSON 9 - Because there's three.

Guy - Yeah there's only three.

PERSON 9 - There's six districts, there's more than six districts.

PERSON 10 - I'm saying, I'm saying besides these small meetings, and by the way I'm Sean Bradley I'm the president of the Urban Leader Metropolitan Denver. And so beside a lot of these meetings, there's been a host of meetings that have taken place with a lot of people across the city. Including a lot of people who are in these rooms. And so, this is, and so I want to make sure everyone in this room really understands that there is a lot of work that is taking place and that there are a lot of wonderful things that are happening. And so, I don't want you all to leave here as if somehow the police department has not been meeting with people in our respective communities. That is absolutely not the case. And so, I think Chief White has said that if it's necessary for additional meetings that that will actually occur. So, let's not, let's not get focused on how many meetings we should be having in this community, in our city. But let's focus on the work that needs to be done today and how this is gonna help the police department get better and improve to do what's best on behalf of the citizens in Denver. And the last question I have, how many of you in this room live in Denver? And that's the beauty of it, is that the majority of us in this room live in this city. And so you have an opportunity to be impactful today and look at these drafts. Work through it, work with the police department. Let's not focus on how many meetings we're gonna have and who he's bet with. Let's focus on right now, how we can make this policy better for everyone in the city.

[Applause]

Person 11 - Sorry, sorry, I just want to make clear what he said. He said that he's been involved with the community. I come from southwest Denver, [inaudible] church. We don't have meetings talking about this. We've been meeting with district 4 about how to engage with the police department but not talking about this. So, I just wanna make sure that you're, ...

Person 10 - But you met with the District 4 police department.

PERSON 11 - But not based on this, not based on this, not based on policy. So, I want to make it clear...

Person 10 - I don't get into an argument.

PERSON 11 - I just want to make sure that you're talking about use of force policy, not... that's different.

Person 10 - If I meet with my U.S. Senator, If I meet with my city council member. I'm going to bring up issues in that meeting that are very important to me. And it doesn't have to be in these specific arenas. You can talk about anything you want to

PERSON 11 - ...issues that concern the use of force policy, so...

MEETING ORGANIZER - I want to get through these questions so that we can get through to the small groups. So, here, here, here, here, and then we'll get into the small groups. Does that work?

Person 12 - So in the policy, with an, let's say an officer that's involved in more than one shooting throughout a time period, what, I mean, how about protecting, I mean, not just that officer but like other people that are maybe, you know, on the street or something at that point. What's the policy of getting him off the street and maybe into a different job at that point if, you know, he's been involved in more than one shooting at a, over a period of time.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, again, it depends on the scenario. Let me say this. With officers involved in a shooting there is a process where they're screened before the officer can go back to the street. If there's an investigation, we talked about that. He also has to go through a psychological examination, uh we have a psychologist on hand that to that. And then we kind of look at, and we have new officers, uh not that they were at fault, if there were at fault then we'd have done something different, there have been officers that have been involved in critical scenarios that work in a particular part of town that made the decision that is not in the best interest of the officer or that community to have that officer continue to work there. So, we have relocated

officers, again it's just sort of a scenario by scenario situation that we've examined. But I want you to know, first of all, it has to be justified. Uh, and secondly, as soon as that occurs that officer is taken off line. And has to go through a process that certainly would include going through a psychological evaluation to make sure the officer is fit enough to go back and perform his services and depending on the totality of what occurred a decision is made to send the officer back into that particular district with that particular assignment or do we need to relocate them someplace else.

Unknown lady - Can I add on to that? I know one officer in district 4 was involved in a shooting resulting in death in 2010, again in 2011 where he paralyzed a man, and again this year where another one was killed. That's three shootings in six years.

CHIEF WHITE - Again I told you. It depends on the scenario.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Here, then over here, back here, back there, and then right there. You're going to close us out.

Person 13 - Thank you Chief White for being here and listening to us, first of all. Second of all, my name is Person 13? And I am biochemically depressed, if I stay on my meds I'm good, but I also live in district 6 in, near Cheesman Park, and there's a lot of homeless people, a lot of people in those populations, vulnerable populations that are mentally ill. The de-escalation is wonderful, but how are you dealing with, cause I've seen with my own eyes, what I would consider extreme force for those populations of vulnerability.

CHIEF WHITE - Right, and I believe. I believe it's in that particular policy that speaks to, and you would have to go through it, it speaks to we can better respond to individuals that in crisis vs. how we've been doing it in the past.

Person 13 - I didn't see that in the short version, I'm sorry.

CHIEF WHITE - And if not, we will make sure, when we come around the table we'll point it out to you.

Person 13 - Okay.

MEETING ORGANIZER - You. Go ahead.

PERSON 11 - [inaudible] How are we going to know, the inputs from us, are going to be used in the new policy? I know it's just a draft. But how do I know in my community, I'm a Latino/Hispanic, whatever you want to call it. How are we going to be involved in this process,

to build a new use of force policy, if we don't have meetings in my community? My community, let me finish, let me finish, please. In my community, you said we can send an email to you. Some of us, ... I have access to the internet and computers, but some of my community they don't have access. So, are you going to say, "go to library and use an email?" We don't have access to technology in our community. And I'm trying to change that culture. I want to push my community to be involved in the change. I want to be involved in these issues. And be part of that that change the culture. But if we don't include them or we don't include the homeless people, we don't include the mental health issues, how are we going to change the culture?

CHIEF WHITE - Again, I appreciate you. That's why we decided to send you something through email, to have these three public meetings, and again, I've had several other meetings that weren't open to the entire public, I mean strategically we decided that we wanted to have three public meetings. We tried to put them in the best locations. And back to my earlier comment. If it's necessary to hold them other places, we will certainly reevaluate that and we will do that. But I will also tell you, I just recently received an email from my supervisor that she and I, along with the sheriff, are gonna kinda go on a tour, I think is the terminology that we use. Where we are going to different locations around the city. Just the three of us making these prese..., me making my presentation. The sheriff's talking about some of the things going on in the sheriff's department. But again, obviously, we wanted to start out with these three meetings, uh, along with all the other things that we've done as Person 10 has stated. And the meetings have been open for everybody. And we try to put them in what we considered strategic locations. But if the need arises for us to do something addition. We're not opposed to doing it.

DEPUTY CHIEF - Chief, can I make a real quick point too. One of the things people need to know about our policy, is that the chief is in power, by the city, to make policy. It's his second obligation. If you look at the duties and responsibilities of the Chief of Police. If in August you come to the chief with some really good idea that should be changed in the policy. He can change it the next day. I mean, just because we end up with a final draft doesn't mean that it's forever final. It's always a work in progress and he's always gonna listen to the community and make changes. So, it's important to know that you will always have a voice in this process. And that the policy will always evolve.

Person 14 - Is there a schedule that's agreed on having this policy set as actually policy?

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah. Originally, our goal was to have these meetings concluded on, the next meeting is on February 4th. Take all of that information, and I will tell you it is a litany of information. Do an assessment of it to see where we are. Look at that policy, uh, to see how we can enhance that policy. And over the course of the next couple weeks, early March, end of February, come up with a final. But if something occurs to, I mean, we're not 100% locked in saying, "this is an absolute or that's an absolute." So, if something occurs where we need to

extend that for good reasons, we're certainly not above doing that. But the initial goal is to try to have a final policy out, early, very early in March. But again, if it's necessary to rethink that, obviously I'm not opposed to doing that. And actually, this is my immediate supervisor, the Executive Director of Safety, Stephanie O'Malley.

Exec. Dir. O'Malley - I just wanted to comment on this whole issue of community engagement for a minute. Um, let me share this. We recognize the Department of Safety, which includes all of safety construct: police department, sheriff's department, fire, our 911 call center, the gang initiative resistance of Denver, our youth services and community corrections. We need to do a better job of engaging with our community. There's no dispute about that. In recognition in trying to get to doing that, we convened with the community, along with members from the safety department, to talk about this issue. There have been people in a room, from the community, making suggestions as to how we can do better with our engagement with our community. What we learned in our experience, is that community engagement means different things to different people and it comes in different forms to different people. So communicating out via written resources, social media, press releases, that is one form of community engagement of which some people are accepting. At the other end of the spectrum, community engagement means sitting at the table While policies are being formulated and having participation from community members, in those experiences. And everything in-between. One of the recommendations that we're getting to right now, as we speak, coming from the collective conversation, was to convene advisory commissions for both the sheriff's department and the police department that includes community members. We are in the midst of convening those commissions, we've already put out for public information and consumption the application for the Denver Sheriff's Department. We'll be doing the same for the Denver Police Department, relative to convening those commissions. Because it is important to have a continued consistent body for which issues that involve law enforcement are brought to the table. And there is a medium by which we can have collective discussions about those things and get to solutions about them. Now, that's aside from other sub-groups, and there was one mentioned earlier, we're working on the data collection initiative. The community has spoken and we have listened. We need to have some information about context from our officers into this community and what that looks like. We're in the midst, with community members, of developing a framework for getting that initiative up and off the ground. So, I just wanted you all to hear that we try to be responsive to your concerns about this issue of community engagement. The Chief mentioned that we want to make ourselves available a lot more and go out and talk to our communities on police and law enforcement related issues. To not only just, you know, the people that we hear from quite often, and we welcome that, I want you to hear that. But there are other groups that we need to touch also that want a voice in all the things that we do in the safety department. So, we're working at it. That's all I wanted to say.



MEETING ORGANIZER - So we're gonna do these last three questions and then we're gonna get into the meat of the discussion at the tables. So here, and then in the back, and then here, okay.

PERSON 3 - Yes, going back to this whole, the overall discussion here. The forum that we have here, as far as the use of force. But how does all this, it's all wonderful, it's great, I love it, I respect you, Chief, but how, when you have such a deep cultural corruption within the police department, with the police officers, okay... what you say, and what we're all doing, and the dialogue here, how do you change the culture of the corruption with these police officers that are living above the law, and playing both sides of the law, it happens every single day, from basic speeding to not using their blinkers, buying food at King Soopers, parking in a no parking zone, and going in to get their food, from shooting people to beating people, the whole gamut. You have corrupt officers, you've gotta clean that up. And until that happens, this is really, in all due respect, for nothing.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, ...

PERSON 3 - And I know, for the record, I know you said, there are no corrupt police officers...

CHIEF WHITE - I did not say that. So, don't misquote me. I did not ...

PERSON 3 - Okay, Is there a culture of corruption in the Denver Police Department?

CHIEF WHITE - No, I don't believe there is a systemic problem of corruption in the Denver Police Department.

PERSON 3 - You don't?

CHIEF WHITE - No.

PERSON 3 - Well we have to disagree there.

CHIEF WHITE - I think I already gave you the benefit of...

PERSON 3 - Within 23 years of investigating five police departments, I think I have facts, evidence, videos, tape, to prove that.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, sure, if you, if you'd be, I'd be more than willing to receive any information that you have that could speak to any corrupt police officer on the police department. So, you can share that, I will...

PERSON 3 - We're gonna spend a lot of time together.

CHIEF WHITE - I think we might have to do it through the internet. So, you can share that information with me and my commitment to you is that I will investigate every piece of information you give me making an allegation on the police officers.

PERSON 3 - But will they always, will they be held with impunity, like they always are?

CHIEF WHITE - And I will give you the outcome, I will give you... let me finish. And I will give you the outcome of the information that you give me.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Let's start with two more questions. Let's go here, here. Then, go into our small groups. [inaudible].

Person 15 - First of all, I want to thank you, Chief, for being here. uh, my role here is that I've been a part of the criminal justice system, retired administrator for the Colorado division of youth corrections. I worked on reform. And what I hear here is a matter of trust. And what bothers me here, is because I see an African American male attempting to change a police department, and I've been in that position. Some people who aren't giving him support, which is what we really needs to change the culture. I don't hear that. And I hear too many people talking about a policy. Have you ever written a policy? Have you ever been involved in a use of force? Have you tried to change the culture of something? And if you haven't been that, please don't keep talking about what he ought to be doing. Maybe we ought to be supporting him and asking him, how can he do it and how can we help.

MEETING ORGANIZER - We'll go into groups. I'll explain the groups.

Person 16 - I just wanted clarification on a statistic you provided.

CHIEF WHITE - I'm sorry. Could you speak up?

PERSON 16 - Okay. I wanted clarification on a statistic you provided. You said that bodycams are settling situations where the discrepancy between what an officer said occurred and what a civilian said occurred. And that 15% of the time, officers are cleared due to bodycams. So, what's the other 85%?

CHIEF WHITE - Right, so, and again, hopefully I told you. That was kind of a best guess number off the top of my head. So, she was asking for clarification as it relates to the body cams. And you all might recall, I might have mentioned, several advantages of the bodycam. One that

is relevant to uh, most of our citizens. Citizens, sometimes, will make a complaint on an officer, okay. And they get frustrated because the complaint is not substantiated in their favor because sometimes when there's nothing else besides the citizen's word against the officer's word, I mean, we can't say the officer's guilty and we can't say the citizens are right or wrong. So, it falls in this category which we call "not-sustained" we can't sustain the allegation. As a result of the bodycams, that has mitigated that category of not sustained. We've come to learn that some complaints that citizens make have been substantiated because the bodycam validates that. We've also come to learn that some complaints that citizens make have not been substantiated because the bodycam validated that. So, that's what I was talking about.

PERSON 16 - So, then what's the statistical breakdown?

CHIEF WHITE - Again, I should have been more concise. So before you leave I'm gonna give you my information and we're gonna send you out the statistics, as it relates to that.

PERSON 16 - [inaudible]

CHIEF WHITE - So, the 15% was a guess off the top of my head. But I want to give you, disregard that, I want to give you an exact number.

MEETING ORGANIZER - We're gonna get into our small groups.

Person 17 - If he could post that to the public, not just to ...

DEPUTY CHIEF - We don't really track that, per se. Because there's no way to really do that. Now you have evidence that you didn't have before, how would you know if it was not sustained. What we can tell you is, we have found things on bodycam that aren't even complained about. And the Chief has filed cases on them and Director O'Malley has disciplined them. I think we have three cases like that so far. We also have cases that now there's a resolution that we wouldn't have had before because the bodycam supports one side. We don't do a tally, like, whoop this was in the officer's favor. This was in the citizen's favor. There's not really a number that we can...

PERSON 16 - So there's no data for that

CHIEF WHITE - So, we'll give you what we have. So, we don't prolong this. We'll give you and you'll have my email. And you say, 'you know what, this is not answering my question.'

DEPUTY CHIEF - And the Independent Monitor's office is involved in all of those cases, so they track that and can speak to that as well.

PERSON 16 - What office was that?

DEPUTY CHIEF - The Office of the Independent Monitor, Denver. They monitor the discipline of [inaudible]

PERSON 16 - Okay.

PERSON 3 - They're not civil rights attorneys though. So, they kind of work... They bury a lot of things. Although it's great you have them.

{ Cut to Groups }

Person 17 - My name is Person 17. Our highlights were, several different highlights actually. Um, just to answer the first question is, um, do we feel as if the use of force policy draft is on the right track? Um, we kind of disagree that it's not on, uh, we disagree that it's on the right track. Um, due to the fact that it is not easy to understand, for one. We have quite a few questions about the right to record, um, the training when it comes to using the bodycams. Are the bodycams on during, they want to know if the bodycams are live while being worn? Who sees them, who's tracking them?

DEPUTY CHIEF - Can we just answer some of these now? So, ask me one by one and I'll just answer those questions.

Person 17 - Okay, so are the bodycams live?

Guy - So, the bodycams are activated by the officer and there's a whole policy about when, and basically, it's anytime they have a law enforcement interaction with a citizen. The officer can't access the video, can't touch the video, can't do anything to the video. You plug the camera in at the end of the shift and it gets sent up to the cloud, uh, it can't be accessed at any time. Can't be deleted, and that information is stored off-site by another company. And then, can be accessed by internal affairs and an officer's supervisor or a detective assigned to a case.

Person 17 - Okay, so is there anyone watching them as they're physically on, while they're on patrol. Is there someone in the office?

Guy - We don't, we don't watch to see if you don't plug your video in. Because if the video didn't upload, obviously, you didn't upload the video.

Person 17 - As far as, like, for instance, if somebody is physically outside, right now, wearing a body cam, is there somebody at an office somewhere that's viewing what...

Guy - No, it is not a livestream.

Person 17 - That's what we were wondering.

Guy - It's contained inside the bodycam; however, an officer is required to use them anytime they go into a law enforcement interaction with a citizen. So, we know what their calls are, we know what their reactions are, and we have their body cameras. So, it can all be cross-referenced.

Person 18 - When was that policy effective? Because I saw a draft on it, but never saw an actual...

Guy - Bodycams, October... Well ...

CHIEF WHITE - It's uh, it's been implemented [inaudible]. It probably went into effect, maybe between 10 months and 12 months ago. And it's still evolving because we gotta expand officers being able to use bodycams off duty, but right now they're just using them on-duty. But when they work off-duty, we're gonna make that a requirement also.

Guy - Go ahead Person 17.

Person 17 - Um, another question was um, de-escalating situations when it comes to people with any type of mental health, um, I know there's training, so I get that. How extensive is the training? Like how, you guys, for instance, you're in a medical profession, you go out on your clinicals. So, are there any type of scenarios where an officer goes out and actually sees, physically sees a situation with someone with mental health and how to de-escalate that.

CHIEF WHITE - Yes. The answer is yes. Uh remember, every officer has forty hours, every officer has mandated forty hours of crisis intervention training, but in addition to that, we now have what we call, co-responders. These are, these are ex... certified experts, not police officers. Through a relationship we have with Denver Health, that are assigned to the police department. And depending on the type of calls, some of the calls that you're talking about, they will also go with the police officers to those types of calls.

Person 17 - So there is someone with them that can possibly de-escalate the situation.

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah. And the officers are also trained to do that. The officers have a skillset, are trained to do that, but again, we also have those co-responders that can also make, they can do it obviously because that's what they do professionally. But they can also make references, for those particular individuals. So, I hear this, and I think this program has been in place for about six months. And they've responded already to about over 800 calls.

Person 17 - Okay and, let's see. I'll get back on the mental health, cause I'm concerned, that's like my biggest concern when it comes to mental health training. You said, you say that they have 40 hours of mandatory training.

CHIEF WHITE - Of mandatory...

Person 17 - But the people that have had this training how,... I would say how,... do you believe that they're trained appropriately? Do you really believe that this training is working? Because in situations, and I know you know who I am, that my family has been through, with my loved one, as well as Lynn Eagle's brother, her loved one, as well. Who died because of an incident interacting with police officers, due to a mental health illness...

CHIEF WHITE - Yes, you know. I can't, nor can anyone guarantee you that every scenario that officers are responding to is gonna have the outcome that you might think, or we might think, it should have. But what I can tell you is, based on our experiences, [inaudible] we evaluate what we're doing and continue to try to mitigate those scenarios. Regardless of the circumstances, legal, not legal, criminal, not criminal, that has a poor outcome due to training and some of the things that we're doing and some of the stuff I've talked about today. We're trying to mitigate those bad outcomes. But that doesn't mean that I can promise you that there will never be a bad outcome. I mean, that would be preposterous for me to sit here and say that to you. But my commitment to you is that every time something happens, we do any evaluation of it, and we figure out, can we do something better the next time. So, we can mitigate something like this happening in the future.

Person 17 - Okay, and my next questions is, I appreciate you all coming out. And, like, I was talking to Stephanie O'Malley, you guys are coming out and you're committed to coming out. How does these meetings trickle down to the people that's actually on the streets?

CHIEF WHITE - Great, great question. Remember earlier when I told you [inaudible]. There's a lot of ranks between a police officer and the Chief of Police. So, normally, if I were to have a policy that we're talking about today, I give it to the Deputy Chief. He gives it to the Captain, it gets to the Commander, it gets all the way down to the officers. But given the significance of what we're talking about I've eliminated those ranks and had just me and officers talking. To the importance of this and to the importance of how we change the culture. Which is kind of unusual

because normally when you have almost 2000 employees it's kinda hard to have a conversation. But, to that point, I've had a personal dialogue with those officers, and obviously those commanders all down the rank have had personal dialogue with those officers. And again, what is really important and has been asked so many times. There are consequences when these policies are violated.

Person 17 - But then you have [inaudible] that's overturning it and then they're back on the street. And everything else. You know what I mean, so....

CHIEF WHITE - I hear you, but again, I want to...

Person 17 - It's not like they're really held accountable, like with the people involved in my uncle's murder. They're still working.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, I understand...

Person 17 - The people that attacked us, they were getting awards afterwards. So, I mean, I'm not trying to come down on you. I'm just saying, from our perspective...

CHIEF WHITE - I get you. And everybody has a perspective. But I also have to tell you, due process works both ways. Due process works for the person that is involved in the police incident. And it also has to work for the police officers. And sometimes the outcome is not a favorable outcome for the person that was involved in the incident. Sometimes it's not a favorable outcome for the police officers. But all of us have to value due process. Again, we learn from those experiences. Whether an officer is totally legal in his action, but if it's a catastrophic incident, and catastrophic to me is when somebody gets injured, regardless of the circumstances. We've got to take the time to take a look at that and say, "Okay, is there something that we can do better to try to mitigate this in the future?"

Person 17 - Okay.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Give Person 17 a hand. This group over here. Come on up. Give us your name and your input.

Person 19 - I did not want to have to follow Person 17. Okay, first of all, our group wanted to again state that we appreciate the opportunity to participate in this process. Several people at the table had never been to a meeting like this before. So, again we wanted to thank DPD, for just setting this up and making sure that it was known to community members who might not normally participate. Um, so, some things that we noticed that we think should be added or changed or just sort of considered. We would like to see more objective statistical reporting. We

know this happens. We would like to see this more widely distributed. Um, and publicly accessible. Um, we would like to see that done ideally in collaboration with independent organizations, like the Office of the Community Monitor. Um, which we know they're already doing, but again more kind of public knowledge of those statistics. Um, and we would love to see this kind of, we realize that,... thank you for Ofc. Firman for coming to our table and spending a lot of time with us. Um, we realize that this is kind of an ongoing policy development process, but we would love to see there be, kind of, concrete public outreach to do, kind of, six months out, a year out, two years out. Where DPD convenes forums like this for additional community input. Um, not that we don't think that we could continually give you guys input, but just so there's a community forum for doing so. Um, that's convened by DPD. Um, and um, I think that was the main thing. Just, again, to make more transparency, more publicly accessible information about DPD statistics. And again, thank you so much for stopping by our table.

Person 4 - Hello, my name is Person 4. Speaking for my table. I want to start out by saying thank you to the Denver Police Department for being open to hearing community input. That's not always done across the country. So, having even three meetings like this, and previous meetings, setting that precedent for wanting that community approach is really important to us. That being said, we believe that things are not perfect with this policy, but is a step in the right direction. For example, as necessary retraining officers, as technologies and policies change, we appreciate the inputs that biased training that you mentioned earlier. That being...

Guy - [can't hear]

Person 4 - Oh. Sorry. Necessary retraining of officers. As we learn more, we like those things being part of it. Um, number two. Things that we could be changed, we went to the section of accountability. For example, de-escalation and finding what that actually means. Are we talking about you're talking down subjects, are you using use of force more prominently for certain persons or individuals, and how're you tracking those things? Uh, one thing we do have a question to clarify on, in section three, for psychological intimidation you say non-verbal cues and attitude, appearance and demeanor. Thinking back to how we also mentioned for implicit bias how people will perceive a person of color wearing a hoodie. So, in that exact option, in that exact example then, that appearance, although not threatening, is now to us, if I say "person in a hoodie," we all know what I'm talking about. So, the fact that we can name that, in appearance in this as a possible type of resistance, is worrisome to our table. Um, other than that, also being more transparent and clear links to policies. There's a couple footnotes I could look and see, see section 11, see section so and so, that linked throughout this draft. In an online version, will we see hyperlinks to actually see other policies the department has.

DEPUTY CHIEF - We can do that.



CHIEF WHITE - Yeah. That's what we can do.

Person 4 - Okay. And that's it. Thank you very much.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Thank you.

Person 20 - Hey, my names Person 20. Um, there was a lot of debate in our group. I think every time someone suggested something, we also recognized how difficult the police's job is. And how unpopular it is in society, at this time. And we recognize that it is a challenge to... bringing us to better place. Um. One of the things we wanted was more an explicit call for use of de-escalation in the use of force policy, prior to any other option.

DEPUTY CHIEF - We do have a stand-alone de-escalation policy, as reference. So, we might want to point you to that so you can see what the expectation of officers is. It's pretty robust.

Lady - We have it right here.

DEPUTY CHIEF - The de-escalation policy?

Lady - Yes sir.

Person 20 - Um. We also thought that um, having very explicit examples of what is prohibited as use of force, as opposed to the vague ideas of reasonable, I forget the other two, appropriate... like, um we thought that, "hey that's great, that's a great definition, we trust the people making the decision, but I think there will come a time when we have a different Chief, who we'll trust a little less. Um, making decisions. And we want something to fall back for on recourse when that happens. We also just felt like the mechanism for enforcement is vague. It's like the last bullet point. And I'm sure like you'll point me to the twenty other policies about enforcement, but that's really just muddled and I think more clarity breeds more trust. And the final thing we discussed is that we don't think police should at that moment of using force use it as punishment. And we think that that should be explicit in the policy, as well. Thanks.

MEETING ORGANIZER - I just want to say, do not throw away those notes. We need them. We're recording it. [inaudible]

Person 21 - My name is Person 21. Again, thank you for listening to us. In the process of a lot of things I've felt like I've been disregarded, at least with questions or concerns I've had. So I really appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak with you guys. Um, as far as the policy goes, we do feel that it's a step in the right direction. Um, there's a lot of things in there that are described, as far as the de-escalation that would be very beneficial not only to the department,

but the community as well. Um, the only thing that I see on that is de-escalation is listed as a concept, which is a huge loophole that leaves it wide open. It's an idea, but we'd like to see something a little more firm on that. Maybe um, calling it policy. Um, as far as the things that are in there, I think some more clear guidelines, um, of what the reasonable and necessary force is. Um, it is being left up to the officer's judgement for that, and the ethics, which I've read your ethics policy, as well. I think it leaves it a little wide open. Um, I noticed that your old policy book you had a, an internal board that included a couple community members that were police trained. I feel if you were to set some sort of a boundary line on what is and what isn't, and then have a community board that is police trained again, to be able to review those incidences that would be outside of the limits.

DEPUTY CHIEF - The board still does exist. It's operating today and [inaudible]

Person 21 - I did see the internal and the tactical review boards

DEPUTY CHIEF - ... citizen board.

Person 21 - The citizen board is? Okay. That's good. Um, the training. Detail in training, this is a little tough one because what I can find, and from what you had spoke, met up, about nine and a half months, six in the cadet academy and three and a half in field training and evaluation, minus the application process, am I correct? If I wanted to be a project manager for a construction company, it's what I do, it's construction, it would take me four or five years to get a bachelor's degree to be able to be, to sit down and do a project. To put together one of the buildings. I think some more extensive training, or at least continual ongoing training would benefit all the officers. And for us, as the community, um to be able to read into what those training procedures are and to see what you guys are looking at. Umm, when it comes down to determining the use of force, I believe that all less lethal means should be deployed and considered with a plan of action. Um, you have a new section in your policy, section.... Hang on one second. 105.08 that says lease, less lethal force and control options, but it refers to the current operations manual 105.03 which states, the primary duty of the officer is to protect the public, themselves, and other officers, that is understandable. You guys need to protect yourself. But at the end of this there is a disclaimer that states that its neither a requirement nor an expectation that officers utilize or fall back on least, less lethal force options. Um, I feel that needs to be changed. If you guys have sufficient timing, um, strategy, support and backup, to go into a situation, especially on a warrant pickup, those less lethal means should be utilized at all costs. In your current manual, it also states in section 105.084, the less lethal process, that the authorization to carry a less lethal weapon is a privilege and can be revoked. I think all officers should be trained with the less lethal force options and utilize them at all costs. Um, may have saved my son's life. And, again, just how you mentioned how you communicate with the families because it's very disheartening to have a faith or a trust in a system and call for help and just be disregarded and again, left

sitting in the middle of the street. I was so heartbroken and the distrust that I felt was appalling. Um, to not be able to have more information than a, uh, news link sent to me by somebody sitting in Silverthorne, CO. Um, with that being said, I hope that this moves forward and I hope the department is able to step out into the community and present themselves a little better. When I'm at Summit County, the officers come up to you, "how ya doing today, how's it going?" They'd even ask about my son, "How's your son doing, is he doing alright, is he getting himself into any more trouble?" You come down here, you see an officer and I feel very intimidated by it, and it would be nice to have an open level set communication policy where you guys are out there asking us how we're doing and not driving by in circles pointing out your windows.

MEETING ORGANIZER - [inaudible] Come on up. Give us your name. You guys are doing great.

Person 22 - Hi. My name's Person 22. Um, and again, thank you all for being here. Especially you Chief White. So, we have a couple of questions and then we have a few recommendations. Um, so we have questions of accountability. The first one, and I know we've talked about bodycams a lot, but there is significant concern about this ability to turn them off. We're just wondering how you actually track that and when it's not turned on what's the accountability structure looks like. Um, the second question that we have is, when force is used what are the standards of when to stop using force? What's the accountability structure there? And then the third question there is, how can we help hold the Denver PD accountable? In respectful, but appropriate ways. Um, oh sorry one last. While you're updating the ancillary policies, um, which policy will be applied, which one will be precedent? Will it be the use of force policy or will it be the policy that deals directly with tasers or something like that? That's the only one I really want an answer to, right now.

CHIEF WHITE - Right, so, obviously the policy that you're reviewing, as I have stated, is sort of the foundation. And all of those ancillary policies will have to be blended in with the actual policy that you're looking at. So, I mean there'll be no, there'll be no ambiguity between the two policies. So, that Taser policy will absolutely fit into the policy that you're absolutely, that you're reviewing. As it relates to the Tasers, I mean the policy that speaks to those Tasers, when there are violations, and obviously sporadically we find out about those violations, there are consequences for that. So, the officers clearly know, as Matt has stated, when he or she can turn it on and when he or she can't turn it on. Again, I want to reiterate, they have no authority or they don't even have the ability to leak what's being recorded. That's kind of very very very important.

Person 22 - That's helpful. Thank you. And just really quick, a follow up. Based on what Person 20 said earlier. So, we recognize that bureaucracy takes a long time and it can be really difficult

to update policies. So, like with the Taser policy, if it right now doesn't align with the use of force policy, and use of force policy will be implemented first, will that take precedent over what is written in the Taser policy?

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah, my, so, so the goal is, once we send this policy out, and I think I gave you a timeline, barring mitigators, and there's always seems to be mitigators lately, all those other policies will also be in place. Okay. Thank you.

Person 22 - Okay. Thank you. And then um, we have some questions for some definitions, some that you've already heard. So, reasonable and necessary, we recognize that reasonable is often defined by a legal precedent. The reasonable person standard.

CHIEF WHITE - Correct.

Person 22 - Um, we'd like that referenced specifically in there, so that people can be made aware. And then we're wondering if there is any precedent for the word necessary, and we would like to recommend that necessary be more clearly defined, if or if not. And also, what constitutes riot? We'd like to see clearly defined crowd response techniques. And use of force in protests and large gatherings.

CHIEF WHITE - Right. And there are, there are, definitions that are not necessarily Denver, but there are actually law definitions that states what a riot is. Okay and uh, you have to get that from...

DEPUTY CHIEF - I will tell you the crowd control manual will also be rewritten after this is done. But it would be disingenuous for us to do that until after we get all of your input. Right so, so those are on hold pending this process and then all of those things, arrest control, crowd control, use of Tasers, how you report force, all of those things that will come together into this. And somebody back there is gonna have to help write it, so... don't do too much.

CHIEF WHITE - So, they'll be consistent with this particular policy.

Person 22 - Perfect, thank you. Um. Now it's just recommendations so you can sit down if you want to.

CHIEF WHITE - Oh okay. Thank you.

Person 22 - You can stand if you want too. Well, I just figured you've been standing a lot.

CHIEF WHITE - Oh I'm used to taking orders, trust me.

Person 22 - It was a recommendation. Okay. So, the recommendations that we have are to make the trainings public so that the public is aware of how you're talking to officers about things like implicit bias and ethics. To create an incentive, we were thinking about you and how to change culture and how to support you, so we were thinking about strategies like creating an incentive structure um, such as like, a year long competition with bonuses to officers with lowest incident rate. The other side to that could be to use de-incentification of the use of force by requiring officers to take time off and consider financial consequences, such as formal fines. Um, the policy currently states that officers need not go through all of the de-escalation steps, we'd like to reiterate what's already been said, that that be changed to reflect expectations that all other options be exhausted. With accountability framework for clear,... for violations outlined. And the last part is to directly address positional asphyxia. I assume that's probably in another policy, as well. We'd like it placed in here. As well as an anti-discrimination clause, which again is also in another policy, but we'd like it reflected here, especially racism given the current climate and the impetus for these meetings. And then the final thing is reporting on all use of force, um, making that mandatory, even if it's a minor use of force. Anytime force is used. Finding a way to report that so that we have sound data and can adequately respond. Thank you.

DEPUTY CHIEF - Before you sit down. Some of those recommendations, it would be helpful if you would email us at that email address with some proposal, instead of just this concept. What do you mean by that when you say that you would like racial issues addressed? Because we may have a very different interpretation. And so if you can come up with something and send it to us it would be much easier for us to figure out how to fit it in.

Person 22 - I can do that. Yeah.

CHIEF WHITE - And also, why you're here. I know there's been a lot of questions about de-escalation and it goes through all the processes and some people will call that a forced continuum. In other words, the first thing you have to do is talk, and then you have to put hands on, and then you have to use your nightstick, and then you have to use mace, then you have to use Tasers, and if nothing else works, then you use your service weapon. Well, in every scenario, you can't go from A to Z. Because if someone's pointing a gun at you, that might not be the time to have a conversation or to put my hands on you. Because there's,... somebody's life is immediate danger. So, an officer has to take action that can mitigate that immediate danger. That's how come you don't always go through A to Z. But the other thing that I didn't get to, didn't get to mention, that many of you talked about, is changing the culture and how you reward people. We've actually inserted this year for the first time a preservation award. Traditionally, and I'm not gonna speak to Denver, I'm speaking police language across the country. Traditionally, an officer that gets involved in a shooting, and we have award ceremonies, by the way, we do reward individuals. Or an officer makes a thousand arrests, like when I was,... I'm

from Washington D.C., when I was an officer. Brian asked me if I was ever on the street like he was. Yeah, I was Brian. But when I was an officer I made a lot of arrests. I was a really aggressive guy. So, at the awards ceremony guys like me would get an award for making so many arrests. But an officer that was involved in a shooting that was a justified shooting might get an award. So, we're kind of trying to pull away from that. So, we created this award for the preservation of life. The officer that was,... could have been in the shooting wasn't in the shooting because of de-escalation and those other things. That officer gets an award at the award ceremony. Instead of the officer making a thousand arrests, or locking up a whole bunch of people. The officer that worked with the community and worked with his or her co-workers prevented crime from occurring. Those are the officers that we really need to give those awards to. So, and part of that is all part of changing the culture. That doesn't mean that the officers who make the arrests won't ever get awards. And also if it's a justified shooting that amounts to saving somebody's life, that doesn't mean that they won't get awards. But we're kinda trying to raise that bar and were trying to really put an emphasis on,... this is what we prefer. We prefer the preventive action versus having taken action after the fact. Okay. thank you.

Person 22 - Thank you.

MEETING ORGANIZER - As you come off give me your notes. That way ...

DEPUTY CHIEF - Before the next speaker, is P.C. still here? Sunny? Where's P.C.? P.C. runs our citizens' academy and it's ten weeks PC. We have a ten-week citizen academy, and it's three hours a night, a week, that you commit. I will tell you. So many folks go through this and have a much better understanding because you are allowed to ask any question. You can actually see training officers. You can take part in it. The de-escalation, the shoot don't shoot, the driving. All of these things are available and we would offer that to anyone here who has any interest. Please let PC know. We would love to have you. The Chief makes us do ten of these a year, I think, we're close to that, but we will find a spot for you if you're interested.

Unseen lady - There are restrictions. Not anybody here can ...

DEPUTY CHIEF - No, there are some restrictions. But they're not very limited.

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah. We wouldn't let Person 28 in there for example. Other than that, we'll probably let anybody else in the room.

Unseen lady - Well I mean...

DEPUTY CHIEF - Yeah. There's some limitations. There's not very many. Talk to PC. We would love to have you as a guest at the citizen's academy, if you're interested.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Come on. Then this table is next after them.

Person 29 - Thank you. My name is Person 29. Um, first off thank you for taking the time to engage in the community like this. Sometimes I think my job is tough but I'm glad that I have it and not yours. So, I think the first question at our table, is the policy a step in the right direction? And I think we believe it's directionally correct. That it's a more proactive approach rather than reactionary. And there are some at our table who really feel that this is an acknowledgement of past issues and that we are moving forward in a different way. There is an acknowledgement at our table about some of the criticisms that have been leveled about the vagueness in the policy and I understand that there's a lot of policies that relate to specific issues, such as the use of Tasers. It's very difficult, I think, to evaluate this policy in isolation of the other policies and other folks in the room certainly have better, more comprehensive understanding of that, but I think that an understanding of that both on our part, and also an understanding of what your officers understand about the items in the policy, is necessary for us to have confidence in that. In terms of what we thought was a gap in the policy, at this point in time, we really wanted to understand what your plan is for evaluating the policy over time. And what metrics that you intend to use over time. How will you evaluate use of force incidents? Both by district, and even within district by neighborhood. By age, by gender, by ethnicity, and to understand how you're going to communicate those back to the broader community. I think we feel is going to be useful for us. Um, the last point and it came up for me as we were, not specifically at the table, but it came up for me as somebody else was talking about this is, um, your time, I'd like to understand your time frame for review and revision of the ancillary policies. The specificity of the ancillary policies. For example, if you refer me to the ancillary policy for the use of Tasers, um, it makes it difficult for me to understand how this use of force policy is going to take precedent for that policy. Cause the specificity is in that policy. If this policy doesn't speak to those specifics, it's very difficult to understand how this policy is gonna take precedent.

CHIEF WHITE - So, again, our primary purpose is to kind of listen and maybe to only respond when we think it'd be helpful. The monitor, and this young lady here from the monitor's office. They put out regular reports as it relates to the use of force, the complaints, and even do a comparison of what it was and what it is. And I will tell you that I agree with the last young lady that spoke, if you can't measure it I really question the value of doing it. So, we have a whole bunch of analysts that are a lot smarter than, ... a lot smarter than me anyway, in that particular area. Absolutely. And they really look at metrics, that's their full-time job. And so, everything that we do, from crime to discipline, we try to make it a point to measure it to see how successful it is. Because if we put out a policy and we see next year nothing has changed from this year to last year, obviously we need to can that and go in a different direction. I just want you to rest assured that we are evaluating it and we do an analysis of not just that, but pretty much everything we do. And most of that stuff you can get online and actually the Monitor's Office

puts out a report on a... is it a monthly? A biannual report as it relates to what's going on in the police department and the sheriff's department. It pertains to discipline, and it even pertains to certain policies that they have a particular interest in. If they think it's of importance to the community.

MEETING ORGANIZER - So this table.

Person 23 - I'm Person 23. So, in general, our conversation stemmed a lot around just, while this policy is super important, we are supporting the Denver Police Department in making a larger culture change. And recognizing that policies are part of that culture change and then also holding people accountable. The specific items we had regarding the policy, we recognize that it's on the right track. One of the things that we suggested was having a specific force continuum, currently, the policy at the end says it's not a force continuum. And having a force continuum in the policy would be helpful in setting standards and policies for working through situations and de-escalation and escalation. We also want to reiterate our support including the use of force policy that Aurora Police Department currently has. Which specifies and requires officers to report anytime that they use the use of force. And then we also wanted to reiterate that, I think it was section three, having more specific definitions and understanding of what psychological intimidation looks like and the language included there right now seems a little vague. I'm just making sure I have everything. Hold on. And then specific definition of necessary and reasonable, which currently is vague.

CHIEF WHITE - I just wanted to say that we require officers to report every use of force also. Okay. Thank you.

Person 24 - So uh. I hope I cover everything from my group. So, I want to also thank you for being involved with this. I think, my own thought is that um. In the last two or three years since Ferguson and other things, that things have gotten a lot,... this has brought a lot of attention in the community and has put you under a lot of pressure, and not to suggest that you weren't concerned about things before two or three years ago. I also want to thank everybody that's here the comments and stuff, I mean, as they say when we march, "this is what Democracy looks like." and I really appreciate all the comments that people have made. So, a couple of thoughts, and I tried not to repeat what everybody else has said, which is difficult because we've been so thorough here. People, ... the questions,... the right track. I think people thought it was going in the right direction. Someone said barely. And then another comment made by somebody in the group was that this probably would have gone a lot better if public input was done maybe at the time the policy was being developed. As opposed to more after the fact. Not so much that these comments won't be included in your, ... in the policy draft or whatever, but it probably would have been,... enabled more trust in the community if we were involved in the process, ... during the process. The other things mentioned, continuum was mentioned. We don't really know a lot



about that from this policy. That's already been mentioned, the continued use of force policy. There's also a policy scorecard, somebody mentioned that we should have a policy scorecard. I'm not exactly sure what that was or maybe you might want to address it. The use of force, there doesn't seem to be any. Ah. Another thing and assistant chief Murray... talked about this to some degree. Is that a lot of us were getting information,... officers are disciplined or maybe not prosecuted for not following policy, but the public doesn't seem to be aware of that. And somehow that information has to get out because we're not aware of those kinds of things and it builds more distrust. And that's not what we need more of. If it's already been done, then we should be told in specific ways. Not such as, "Oh 64 officers have been discipline." I mean, I think most of us, and I mentioned this before when we look at the videos and other kinds of things and we see officers involved. We kind of go, "so what's gonna happen with those officers?" We don't quite hear those stories at all. And we should be hearing more of them. So, one last comment that I have. And this came out of your comment. Is ... assistant chief Murray... and this was the understanding,... this is the police union. I don't know and we didn't really talk very much about the police union, but I've heard, we discussed from you, that in some ways, maybe, I'm doing a maybe, the police union might not exactly be happy with some of our suggestions. That they come from a different place about all of this stuff. And I think there's.... I have some empathy with the Chief, with... as he takes in... the ... as the community we're your boss. We pay your salary. But you also have to work in... nobody wants this to be a Chicago. As Assistant Chief Murray said. It's hard to say assistant chief all the time.

DEPUTY CHIEF - You can say Matt.

CHIEF WHITE - Just don't say Chief, whatever you do.

Person 24 - Thank you. We don't want this to be a Chicago. We don't want that to happen in terms of police, apparently not being aggressive and not doing their job and what have you. But we wonder about, I wonder about, this back and forth that it goes. And how can you do these kinds of things when you're perhaps faced with a police union, which are an important piece, when you're faced with the police. That might not be interested in following some of those policies. And how do you reconcile that, Chief White? Thank you.

CHIEF WHITE- Thank you. Was that the last one? Thank you. That was the last one. And we do have a relationship, a matter of fact, I think Matt and I met with the executive board of the police union. Obviously, there's a difference of opinion, there's a difference of opinions in this room. But my commitment to you is that we're gonna do, uh, I'm gonna go back to how I was raised by my mother, we're gonna do what we think is the right thing for the right reasons for this community. I can,... that is, that is a commitment that you can absolutely bank on. And again, there a lot of different opinions on how it should relates to how it should have been done, how it's gonna be done, but when it's all said and done, when you have that final policy it will be

formatted so that the voices we've heard, and there will be some differences, that draft is not going to be the exact same thing as the final policy, I can guarantee you that. Based on the,... just based on the two meetings,... the two public meetings that we've had. And all the other meetings that we've attended. So, it will change, but the intent is to move the agency forward in the right direction, to have a department that is responding to the needs of 21st century demands that you have put on us. And to, given the opinion of many of us, we haven't been there. You know, officers have been operating on what we did 10, 15, 20 years ago. That has changed. And we understand that has changed. And that's how come we went through this, this whole conversation about assessing where we are, trying to create the foundation to make the culture changes and do many of the things that requires to make that change which includes those policies. So, I cannot thank you enough for being here. Your information will seriously be taken into consideration. And it will absolutely help format the, as it relates to this particular policy that we have. And we are gonna do something, I think we kind of remiss, we will make,.. We will put on the web all those ancillary policies that are remotely part of this particular policy. We will make sure that when you go to the web, if in fact you decide to do that, it will say, without having to fish through a hundred policies. It will say, "policy number so-and-so is ancillary to this particular policy." And you can click and go directly to that particular policy. And again, this is evolving. Even after we come out with a final policy we have a responsibility to continue to look at what we're doing. To some degree, final is not final. So, if there's some things that we need to do and tweak we are willing to do that. You know we have policies for everything that we do. But I will tell you, they change based on incidents and they change based on time. So, don't think that what you're gonna get will be the gospel because if something comes up or somebody makes a better recommendation even after the final policy, I think we have a responsibility to look it and make the appropriate changes.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Three folks and then we'll wrap up. So here, here, and here.

Person 25 - So before you call it a final policy, will you get with the community and see if we agree that that is a good final policy?

CHIEF WHITE - First of all, there is no way that everybody is going to agree. Okay, again, I am, you know me. I'm not gonna mislead anybody. Everybody's not gonna agree. The purpose of these meetings is to formulate the information you're giving us to create what we think is the final policy. So, I'm not gonna put out the policy and say, "this is the final policy. I need your input." No, I'm not gonna do that. I'm,... we're gonna put out our policy and you have an opportunity, if you feel that there's something that is glaring that is missing you will have the opportunity to send me that information and we will take it into consideration.

Person 26 - Again, thank you Chief White for your time today. I had a question about one of your responses to one of our recommendations from the table. You said that the Denver Police

Department is already required to report use of force. Does that include threats of force, and if an officer points a (weapon?) at a civilian, do they have to report that, and if not, why not?

CHIEF WHITE - No, if an officer points that weapon at a civilian that's not meeting the classification where it is something they have to report. Actually, we've had conversations, or I've had conversations with a couple people in my staff about that. That we need to do that. That's still a conversation piece, so a decision hasn't been made as it relates to that, but I didn't get, I didn't understand what you first, I didn't hear what you said.

PERSON 26 - As far as threats of use of force? Which part didn't you hear?

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah. if somebody is making a threat, if an officer is making a threat on an individual that is something.. [inaudible]

PERSON 26 - Yeah. Or pointing a weapon. And again. My question pertains to the fact that the Aurora PD has already developed that in the department and why Denver has not.

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah. We just haven't gotten to the point where we decided if every time and officer takes out his or her service weapon, does that require, does it meet the definition of the use of force? I will tell you, technically, it doesn't. And that aside, does that require something that they should report. And again, that's actually a conversation that we're actually in the process of having, but a decision has not been made whether or not we're gonna make that a requirement.

PERSON 26 - will the decision be in correlation with the use of force policies?

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah if the decision is made it will be a policy that will speak to that. And again, that decision is also based on these types of conversations also.

PERSON 26 - Thank you.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Here and then here.

Person 27 - Hi my name's Person 27. I'm on the executive committee of the NAACP Denver chapter. Today I'm here as a civil right advocate. I call myself anti-racist. I retired from the active practice of law several years ago in order to devote my time as a volunteer to help communities of color. And I'm here today because, one, this is a great opportunity for all of us to share our thoughts with the Chief, and the other officers. But I am very concerned with what we're not talking about today, as much as what we have discussed. And that really has to do with, as Chief said, the policy is not gonna transform what I would regard as a very poisoned

culture within our police here in Denver. We deploy, not guardians that protect and serve, we tend to deploy warriors who are militarized and they treat all of us as enemies. Not as citizens with rights. And that's worn out by this department's awful awful record, excessive violent scores, Latinos and Blacks. I have handed out a letter that I wrote to the chief on January 7th, and we're not gonna go into that, but I hope you can pour through that. I think a lot of the ideas about suggested changes for the policy, you've captured, but I had some others that also developed called "acknowledgement and pledge." by the city of Denver that sets out the facts about this department's awful history of beating and killing blacks and Latinos. And the Chief took office five years ago, appointed by Mayor Hancock. And at that time, Martin Booker had been killed in the Denver jail. Suffocated, choked, an artery chokehold placed on him. And the Chief was brought in to change the culture then. Now, it's five years later and we're finally getting around to starting to talk about that. I wonder. What's been going on the last five years? What's been going on is continued beatings and killings of our people. The last statistics available for use of excessive force just a few years ago. Shows that Denver was the 6th worst police department in the entire country. And there's one aspect of those statistics, that showed in one category, they were the very worst. So, that's what we're dealing with here. And I'm afraid...

CHIEF WHITE - So Person 27, you're gonna have to,... I don't,... I've got your letter. And I don't want to cut you off because you're saying negative things, but I want to be respectful of everybody's time.

Person 27 - Well,

PERSON 3 - We have time.

Person 27 - I think... [inaudible]. Now listen to this Chief.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Person 27...

Person 27 - You've controlled the whole meeting I would like to say...

CHIEF WHITE - Okay, but again, Person 27 I am not going to sit here and permit you to monopolize everyone's time. I will stay with you. I will stay with you for twenty hours if necessary.

Person 27 - Do you guys think I'm monopolizing your time here?

Crowd - [inaudible]

Person 27 - I was greeted with that initially, you don't have time....

CHIEF WHITE - Okay, I'm telling you I'm gonna cut you off at some point.

Person 27 - Why don't you just arrest me?

PERSON 3 - Arrest him yeah. There you go.

Person 27 - I would say today that Chief White is making a complete mockery of this process. These community meetings because earlier this week he exonerated two killers on his payroll. Officers who murdered Jessie Hernandez. With a hail of bullets into a moving vehicle. And if Sheriff Firman was here, he similarly made a mockery of these meetings. By failing not to fire deputies who suffocated and choked the life out of a homeless mentally ill Michael Marshall. And his niece is here today. And what I have seen in the last five years, it's a shame the mayor's not here. He sent his surrogates in and he should be here. But the mayor and where is Ms. O'Malley, and the Chief, they defend each and every one of these beatings and murders. They force families who've lost people to go to court for five years or more. Martin Booker's case went to trial, a jury found it was a wrongful death committed by these officers and what has happened? Not a damn thing. Those people are still employed. Yeah. Killers on our payroll. And the mayor always defends these murders. And he spews all these empty promises all the time. And he's repeatedly broken all those promises to all of you. He's been in office for five years. And he hasn't turned things around yet. So, we cannot trust you. You have no credibility. Until some of these decisions change. And do you expect that the officers out in the field are gonna change their behavior when they know they can kill and beat with impunity cause you never discipline them. You never terminate them, and you never prosecute them. Thanks.

CHIEF WHITE - Thank you Person 27. Appreciate that. Obviously, that can be disputed, but we're not gonna have that conversation today. And Person 28, I need to correct myself. I was joking when I said you were not welcome to the citizen's academy. Actually, you would be the first person I would recommend to go to the police academy. So, who has the last word?

MEETING ORGANIZER -Person 28.

Person 28 - Maybe I could teach you a thing or two.

CHIEF WHITE - Yeah, I'm sure you could. So, are we done?

Person 28 - Oh I just have a question. Chief White, we talked earlier. I have the greatest respect for you and the new changes. Would you be willing to entertain a conversation with a Chief that I talked to, and I service a lot of things about allegations about the police force? That not only

support the things I've said, but says that I've understated the egregiousness in the culture of corruption. Would you like to that police chief out of Chicago?

CHIEF WHITE - I know the chief in Chicago. I'd rather you talk to him.

Person 28 - No no no. Suburbs in Chicago.

CHIEF WHITE - Sure. You give me the information, I'll have a conversation.

Person 28 - You'll talk?

CHIEF WHITE - Yup. So, again. I greatly appreciate you taking the time out of your lives to spend some time with us and help us formulate what we feel comfortable will be a policy that represents this entire community. So, with that I'm gonna turn you over to Derrick.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Thank you very much for participating. Enjoy the rest of your weekend.

### **Use of Force Public Meeting Three - February 4, 2017**

Person 1 - And it's my opinion that the police officer should not just use that in order to write an African American ....

DEPUTY CHIEF - I understand what you're saying, I'll tell you, the Chief is gonna want to speak to that. I think what you're talking about though is were they appropriate and reasonable. Because he certainly has legal authority to write the ticket if there's a citation. But what you're doing is exactly the conversation that we want to generate through this policy. We want to take behavior, apply these standards, rather than talk about specific things somebody might do. You can't put a hot iron under somebody's fingernail. Why? What you would say is you can't use force that's inappropriate or illegal. So, so what may seem a little vague, actually if you look at it, there was a fairly good community consensus about exactly when that behavior became illegal, unnecessary, unreasonable, and inappropriate. We wanted to give you that exercise to help you understand how this will be applied, and how we're teaching it to our officers.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Let me, I'm gonna go in order here. I'll go here here here.

CHIEF WHITE - Well actually, before we ...

Person 2 - I just have a quick question. Just to ...

CHIEF WHITE - Person 2, I don't think you know how to do a quick question.

[Inaudible]

Person 2 - You have brought two point scenarios up,

CHIEF WHITE - We're gonna get to you.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Person 2, please, please,

Person 2 - how do we know that this example that the officer didn't [inaudible] that pull over

CHIEF WHITE - Well that speaks to her, well we don't do that, so, and obviously there's a video.

Person 2 - So, is it even necessary to pull her over?

CHIEF WHITE - Well, obviously she violated..., we're assuming she violated the law.

Person 2 - And in the second, example, just real quick. When an officer sees someone doing something illegal, they're not supposed to walk away, and then come arrest or ticket, they're supposed to tell them. That's procedure, policy, generally throughout the country. And tell her that she is illegally parked, and to park somewhere else. Just like a DUI. If you're drunk leaving a bar, and the police officer sees you leaving that bar drunk, it's not for him to wait for you to get down the street and then go arrest you. It's for him to tell you that you're drunk and should not be driving that car. That's policy. And I would also like to get all the....

CHIEF WHITE - Person 2, stop. Number one I don't need you to tell me what our policies are, first of all.

Person 2 - Well, I need to see all the policies, first of all.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, you... and that's a great point. You can see every policy that we have. We have hundreds of policies. The entire community is willing, is able to go on our website and review any of our policies and give any input as it relates to that. Now, back to your point. One of the things we're currently doing is data collection. So, and data collection sort of means a couple things to me. So, we're looking to see the number of stops officers are making, where they're making those stops, and more importantly, what do they do when they make those stops. So, I stop Derrick for running a red light and give him a verbal warning. I stop Person 2 for running a red light and he definitely gets a ticket. And let's say Derrick's one race and Person 2's another race. So, then we look at over the course of time, is this officer mistreating or consistently giving individuals of a particular race and action, even though they were violated. And consistently not giving the other individuals who committed the same violations warnings because of their race. We have a problem with that. Disproportionate discipline, disproportionate decisions, we have a problem with that. So, I agree with you a 100%. Now, before we go on, I need to address the draft policy. There's been great....

[cut to Person 3]

Person 3 - Regarding the reasonable, necessary, legal example is that we stopped too soon, and that, I think, there's a lot of agreement on, you know, the first two actions being legal, reasonable, necessary, appropriate, whatever, and the last two we discussed were not. The problem is the fifth one. And not necessarily in the case of Sandra Bland. Because, obviously, we shouldn't have gotten to that place in the first place. But, in other instances where an officer might decide to use a Taser. And I understand Tasers aren't specifically covered in this policy, but the decisions by which an officer decides, is it necessary to use a Taser or other non-lethal force, is it legal, is it reasonable, there very well may not be a consensus on that. And it's important that citizens understand not the easy examples, but the difficult examples, as well. So,



that's my question, in a situation where you're talking about non-lethal force what is reasonable, legal, necessary? Because those situations, very quickly, escalate into lethal force.

CHIEF WHITE - Right. I think in the back of that policy is a model, it talks about, really what we talk about is de-escalation. And remember, a lot of this is training, and is a different sort of approach for,... many of our officers get it and do it without even creating a new policy. But to be honest with you, some of them do not get it. So, everyone's going to be trained. And they're going to talk about de-escalation and we'll give scenarios. But, at some point, you know I think the other thing that was an issue that I've heard, time and time again, is this gives officers too much discretion. Officers are going to have discretion, their actions have to be articulated. Now, as the Chief, as Executive Director, as supervisors, if an officer tells us, "hey this was the scenario and I made the decision that I made." And if that was not a necessary decision, or a reasonable decision, the officer is going to have issues as it relates to that. But even according to the Colorado State law, it says that officers should make decisions that are appropriate and reasonable, that they think are appropriate and reasonable. In other words, there is not absolute defined yes and no. We can tell you what those policies are. We can train you on those policies, but there will always be some discretion as it relates to that. And when you violate that discretion based on what your training has been and what our policies are, what the philosophy of this community is, which is the philosophy of this police department, then you will be held accountable. I am not going to sit here and tell you, and that has been a frustrating point, I think, for some in our community is that they want absolute answers. An officer can never ever do this, or an officer can never ever do that. There is nothing in our policy that says an officer can take this chair and bust you against your head. That is a violation in our policy. And if the officer does that, now the officer has to articulate that. Now, suppose the officer says, "My life was in danger, my gun was taken..." or "somebody else's life was in danger. The only thing I had was that chair." That's pretty articulate-able facts that will mitigate violating particular policies. I'm saying there are always mitigators, and unfortunately in policing, like in life, very few things are absolute. So... that's your challenge, your point, you're right, but I think given the change, given how we're trying to change the culture, given the training that they're gonna get, given the focus of de-escalation as always the first option when it's appropriate, I think that will resonate. I think that will greatly start to mitigate some of those scenarios that we've seen on TV.

[Cut to Person 4]

Person 4 - ... assisted you in drafting this policy?

CHIEF WHITE - No, thousands of people have contributed. It's a high stake, this policy it's a draft, so please help us focus on that. It is the voice of thousand of contributors in this community. Going to hundreds of meetings. That I've gone to, going to meetings that my command staff have gone to, and we didn't, obviously we didn't take the names of everybody

that we talked to, that wouldn't even be practical. Looking at what else is going around the country, traveling around the country, and even traveling outside the country as it relates to, what are some of the departments in Scotland. I just sent this young man to Scotland. Scotland is a country where officers really don't have guns. And how do they de-escalate scenarios that are dangerous scenarios. So, we look at what's going on inside the US, what's going on outside the US, but maybe more importantly, what did you all have to say? At meetings that we attend. Those that are really concerned about our use of force policy. Now, again, it's the voices of thousands rather than the voices of a couple hundred.

Person 4 - Well I'm curious because the Office of the Independent Monitor (IM) noted that the Sheriff's Dept. did have a panel of people, specifically rank and file deputies, community members, the IM himself, Subject matter experts (SME), sat down and helped draft the actual document. I mean it's certainly advisable and commendable that you traveled the country collecting information and opinions and the sense of the community but why couldn't you have very specific people in this community to deal with this policy as it relates to this community.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, first of all, it's a draft. And I ...

Person 4 - I understand that. We're talking about the draft, we're talking about the same document.

CHIEF WHITE - Right and I just told you how I didn't want...

Person 4 - No I asked a question, 'why couldn't you have the same people available...'

CHIEF WHITE - [inaudible] community at large.

Person 4 - But you have that. I'm asking why you couldn't additionally have the people that the Sheriff's department used in drafting their document.

CHIEF WHITE - Well, that's a draft. Sheriff's department's policy's done. And I don't know if I can continue to have the same debate with you because I keep saying the same thing.

Person 4 - Sir, it's not a debate. I'm asking a question. Why you couldn't go take the next step and have SMEs, SME. People who are trained and understand the language and have drafted the document hundreds of times, why they couldn't be at that table. Why the Rank and file deputies or officers couldn't be there. Why wouldn't you have your own officers sitting at tables with you developing this draft document? Don't you want their opinions?

CHIEF WHITE - Okay, obviously, you're not understanding me.

Person 4 - No you're not. I'm asking a question.

CHIEF WHITE - Okay, can I answer, please?

Person 4 - Please do.

CHIEF WHITE - I've gotten expert's opinions. I've gotten professionals opinion. Professor's opinions. I've gotten the community's opinion. I've gotten all these people opinion before we put the draft together. Did I do it in the same format the Sheriff's Dept. did it. No. I did not want to do it that way. I wanted a broader perspective of eyes and ears in this community to do that. So, we have to disagree. I told my opinion.

Person 4 - My question is simple, who is the we that you just referred to? You said we sat down and put this together, who is we?

CHIEF WHITE - My staff put it together based on the voices that we've heard from the entire community that we interacted with. And its thousands of individuals, I can't give you the name of every person that I talked to over the course, or we talked to over the course of the last four to five years. Obviously, we're not going to agree with that, so if you don't mind I'm just going to move on.

Person 4 - Go ahead. You answered the question, thank you.

CHIEF WHITE - Thank you very much for raising it.

MEETING ORGANIZER - I'm gonna go here and then I'll come back.

Person 5 - I have just a quick question. I have not read this, I just received it today. Is there any place that covers recruitment? Background checks and recruit met.... I know you mentioned implicit biases and what have you, earlier.

CHIEF WHITE - So, the purpose of these meetings have been to discuss the reasonable use of force. But, again, we have, so but to answer your question, absolutely. We have a very detailed process as it relates to how we hire police officers. That they have to go through and implicit biases is part of that. So the answer, and that's probably part of, if you look on the website, if you look at our policies, you will probably see a portion that even perhaps talk about recruiting. And if you didn't, if you want to reach out to me, I'll make sure that you get that information.

PERSON 5 - Okay. Thank you so much.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Okay. We're gonna do a few more and then we're gonna go into our small groups so that you can talk about this. I'll go here, and then here.

Person 6 - My question is, do the officers do psychological testing before they get hired, and are they psychologically tested and lie detector tested after a shooting?

CHIEF WHITE - Yes, officers get, go through a psychological [inaudible] testing, prior to being hired. And after they're involved in an incident, a serious incident that you're referring to, before they're cleared to go back on the street, if that's the decision that is made, they have to see a psychologist. Any other questions?

MEETING ORGANIZER - Person 2. Yeah. One more and then we're going to go into small groups.

Person 2 - Is there any addressing of steroid issues that's going on in the police department, which is fairly systemic, has that been addressed at all?

CHIEF WHITE - Again Person 2, we've had these conversations, first of all I will tell you the steroid issue in the Denver PD is not systemic. But I will also tell you that if we determine, through a litany of different ways, and officer has some health challenges, whether they're drugs or whatever, we absolutely address those issues.

Person 2 - And to follow up on [inaudible] comments and questions, and we privately discussed this. There's a lie detector test, there's a process to come in as a cadet or something else, into the police, but there's nothing after the lie detector test, periodically, independently, to test these officers to see if they're lying or covering for other officers, or living above the law, breaking the law, or playing both sides of the law. There's nothing, there's no independent test, lie detector tests on these officers, which I think really needs to be applied, or at least addressed. Because this testing them before they come in, well what afterwards? Because what they do is they get in, they adhere to this environment, this culture of rogue police officers, and, which they end up turning into bad police officers. The good officers have to turn a blind eye, but why can't we have lie detector tests? Independent lie detector tests to screen these people out. And obviously, naturally they're not admissible in court, but lie detector tests have come down to a science almost. And in ten twenty years they probably will be admissible in court. So, why can't we have lie detector tests? Independently. Not by internal affairs. But independently, by the community, and working with the PD, to have independent lie detector tests on officers periodically, to see if they're still qualified and fit, to meet the level and the standards to follow through with policies. Not cover police officers and lie wit... lie to police officers.

CHIEF WHITE - You and I have discussed that privately, and I've kind of articulated to you why that doesn't happen. But as you well know, prior to coming on the PD, officers have a litany of things they have to do which includes a lie detector....

Person 2 - We're talking after...

CHIEF WHITE - I got it. And also a psychological evaluation. If something occurs during the course of their career that triggers a need for us to do something, as it relates to seeing a shrink or them having a medical evaluation that occurs. As it relates to a lie detector test, that does not occur. And part of the reason it does not occur, for number one that's not an absolute, and number two, as you all know, that's, part of that is a contractual agreement that the city has made with the officers also, and that on its own does not validate necessary if an officer's actions were appropriate or inappropriate. That's just one of many tools that are used.

Person 2 - So you're opposed to policy?

CHIEF WHITE - No, I didn't say I was opposed to policy. Just ....

Person 2 - Because when we tried to get it on the state ballot...

MEETING ORGANIZER - We can have uh... one more and then I want to get the ....

CHIEF WHITE - Yes sir,

Person 15 - I just, first of all, as a long-time resident in the community, and a stakeholder, want to thank you guys for having this. I know a few months ago we had had the same thing over at St. Charles. We know there's a problem. We know there's some issues. I'm just asking that everyone here in this room, that the keywords that coach, um Chief used, draft. So, it's not nothing written in stone. Let's take time in these small groups, let's voice our opinion, let's talk about it is that we want to see changed, and let's be a part and be the change we want to see. Keep arguing about, keep fussing about what is, is not gonna help do nothing. You know, as I said, as an equity holder in this community, in NE Denver in Parkhill, as a coach, as a mentor, I just want to be able to have a voice and have a part of this draft policy as we move forward to make our community to be a better community. So, let's stop talking about what was, let's sit down and take this and dissect it, and figure out how we can make it the best and appropriate and a good piece of work for our community.

[Crowd Applause]

[Skip to Person 7]

Person 7 - Even if you don't have an incident, this job can take a toll on you. So I'm just asking, are they annually tested or do they, ...

DEPUTY CHIEF - No we don't have annual tests for psychology, however, if an issue arises, we do have what's called "fit for duty," where an officer is examined and they're not allowed to come back until a psychologist clears them for duty. We probably have a dozen of those a year that come to our attention. But it has to be based on behavior that the officer's exhibiting. We don't just randomly pick people for a fitness review.

[Skip to Person 8]

Person 8 - .... not only speak English and Spanish, but other languages as well. The police officers need to come from the community that they are actually policing. They also, we also need to have a variety of languages, like I said. Not everybody speaks English, not everybody speaks Spanish, so when you go up to somebody and they don't understand you they're not going to give you the appropriate response that you're trying to get from them. So, variety of languages, community policing. We also, we like the idea of the terms legal, appropriate, but we also did feel like there needs to be consequences when you,... you may act legally, but you may not act appropriately. And so, there needs to be consequences that, you can't just have consequences when people break the law, but also in this job, in particular, if you're changing the culture, you have to have consequences for not creating the culture that we want from the police officers. So, we had some stuff around that. We also think that that has a lot to do with discretion. And really, when do you use lethal force? If you are not in danger and the people around you are not in danger, there's no need to use lethal force. If you steal a package of M&Ms, it doesn't make you a criminal worthy of getting killed. So, you should have appropriate responses to property being stolen. It's ironic that property theft can only work one way because we have our people who are experiencing homelessness, here in Denver, whose property is stolen regularly. And without a moral compass. And we don't, that's not appropriate behavior. Maybe these folks are breaking the camping ban, but if you take away their blankets and their property in freezing cold weather, you have lost your moral compass with me. You have moved beyond legality to improper, to immoral. And you want us to trust you and have warm fuzzies with you and come and have coffee and cookies with you, I don't feel I want to sit even ten feet from you if you're not being morally righteous in your actions. Sorry I got on my soapbox. Does that cover it?

Male - Generally on the right track...

Person 8 - We feel that the system of having that step through, the legal, the appropriate, all that stuff we did with the Sandra Bland incident, we felt that that was very useful. And we feel that

that needs to happen like regularly, that training needs to happen. They also need to have regular training and psychological evaluation. Not just after an incident, but compl.... I mean... mental health is something that we don't understand in our culture. And we are horrible at it. So, we really do need to continually monitor our police officers. I'm a college professor, if I'm having a bad day my students' papers don't get graded. That's about all that happens. If a Police officer is having a bad day folks get killed. So, the standard needs to be higher for police officers than even the regular population. You're welcome.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Oh yeah. Your notes. Please come on up. Give us your name and ...

Person 15 - Hi. Came everyone hear me okay. I don't want to list all of these, but some of the things that we thought were very important, you mentioned, actually, psychological, sort of support ongoing, monitoring and evaluation for officers. We suggested, I don't know if this already happens, but police officers carrying their own individual insurance. In addition for the city paying for this, and then the individual policy would be the first-payer in any incidents. We really really want to see more of the best practices from the National Consensus Policy on the UOF involved in this. Um, always always de-escalate before using any level of force. We felt like the whole policy is skewed more towards using violence and force rather than de-escalation. So, increasing the skillsets involved in de-escalation. Um,... anything, overall, you all feel like... [pointing towards her table]. Um... yeah. Immediately after any critical incident, toxicology being done on the officer. And psychological sorts of evaluation, as well. Um,... I also, oh bodycam footage. Retention and access needs to be much more explained. Where is it? How can we access it? Who has the power to see it? And we would like a full transparency, and immediate release to the public after any critical incident.

[Skip to Person 9]

Person 9 - ... So many other impacts on those children that last with them for a long time. And we have a lot of discussion about the liability policy. A lot of professions require you carry a liability insurance policy that they pay for themselves, and we think, we don't know if police officers have to do this right now, but we think they should have to because it would be a way to weed out violent cops. Because eventually their premiums would get so high that they couldn't pay them, and they wouldn't be able to work for the Denver Police Force. So, that was our thinking on the liability issue.

[Skip to Person 10]

PERSON 10 - And thank you for letting us come today to give you our opinions. I had a lot of questions I didn't get to finish asking you last week because there was a lot going on. At our table, again, the fact that you're here, I'm sorry, the fact that you're here again and letting us do

this does show that we are on the right direction. Um, but we do have a couple things that we'd like to see. The policy is called the UOF policy. Which, in my opinion and the opinion of our table here, leads us to believe that this is what your intentions are still. This UOF. So, we'd like to see, maybe something along the lines of, the de-escalation that we're talking about be included in that, and again the de-escalation is listed as a concept. So we need to get that a little dialed in a little tighter. Um, the UOF, we'd like to see it implemented that the concept, protection of the entire community. I'm sorry I didn't understand that one, can... I'm gonna skip that. Um, the chemical agents and what they're being used as far as the non-lethal means, just making sure that when children are present, April of 2016 incidents where they were pepper sprayed along with the crowd. And again, the protection of any children that are going to be around during any of these UOF. I want to go back to the point where it says that it is a privilege for your officers to have these non-lethal means. How many of your officers are "non-lethal" officers? Hundreds? Okay, you know it's a privilege to carry a Taser, but it's not a privilege to carry a gun, um, I definitely think this piece on when and how to use the non...

DEPUTY CHIEF - Every patrol officer has an individually given Taser. Every patrol officer has mace CS gas, so we're talking about... in that policy you're talking about a pepper ball gun. The 40mm projectile and... is there another one? So, that's specifically talking about those two weapon platforms. We don't have enough of those for every officer that we have. And they have to be specially trained, and when we say it's a privilege we say, you know, we'll take it away if it's not used appropriately. That's the purpose of that line.

PERSON 10 - Okay. I just wanted to make sure because when I see it as a privilege, the way it sounds to me is it's a privilege to go out and use less lethal means,... okay.

DEPUTY CHIEF - Every officer has access to less lethal means.

MEETING ORGANIZER - That's good input as far as language, making an effort...

PERSON 10 - Yeah so let's clean up that language. And again, the decision on when and how you guys are gonna choose to send out those less lethal means. You know, again, if you have the support, the backup, and all of that stuff, these means should be exhausted. Now I know there are circumstances where you're gonna get into a situation and there's not that option, but when you're going out on a warrant call, or you're going out to pick somebody up and there's several officers dispatched you have plenty of support, you have plenty of backup, these means should be exhausted, at all costs. Um, sorry the officers... okay the psychological evaluations that are taking place after an involved shooting, we'd like to know a little bit more on the details of what that entails. Um and what the outcome of that's gonna be. So, um, again some basic guidelines that we're seeing that this is it. And I, of course there's gonna be those gray areas, but if us as a community knows that this is what we can expect, and if it's outside of those guidelines, you



guys are gonna do an internal investigation on that. And it's not just, again, at the discretion of the ethics policy. That leaves a big gray area and a lot of loopholes. Um, again the disciplinary actions that will be taken, we'd like to kind of have an idea, I did notice in your bodycam policy that it says the first offense is gonna be a verbal warning, the second offense is gonna be a written warning, the third offense, and so on and so forth. So going into these policies, seeing what we can expect if the policy's not being followed. And then my last question is what is the department gonna do to ensure that these policies are enforced and the biggest piece is accountability. Us as a community are accountable for what we do. If you show up and I'm robbing a bank I'm gonna go to jail and I'm gonna go through the whole process and the court costs and all of that stuff, and we would like to see that same thing coming across. Because these things are happening, we're not hearing about anything happening in the department to these officers which leaves us again to believe that we're covering each other's backs. The blue stick with the blue and the community is the community. And you want the integration, again, just the um, the interactions with that community and how you guys are acting towards us, intimidation factors. And again, I'm gonna go back to Summit County. These guys come up to me and they ask me, "How are you doing today Toby? How's your kid doing today, Toby?" And I feel comfortable with them. When I call them up and I need to talk to the for anything, I feel a respect level between us all. And again with my incident, I felt completely disregarded and disrespected. And uh, you had said in your first interview, Chief White, that you wanted the community's trust. Trust is gained, trust is earned, and it's not a given. So, show us that we can trust you. Thank you.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Okay let's go in the back ...

Person 11 - Hi my name's Person 11. First, I want to say we had a lot of varying opinions, um I'm speaking to bullet points we could nail down, but it's not encapsulated of our entire discussion. Uh, the first thing we saw was insufficient definitions. Um, there's no definition here in this section for excessive force. Where there's a definition for deadly force and reasonable and necessary force. Seems almost intentional that there isn't a definition of excessive force. There's also not a definition of reasonable care, although it's mentioned in the document. We had some serious concerns with the chemical agent section saying there's a legalization of using chemical agents against what was called, "unlawful crowds." Uh, what is an unlawful crowd, are those just protestors? Um, there's not really any explanation on what that is. Um, there's, this maybe is out of the scope of the document, but something that we felt worth bringing up is there's no policy on dealing with undocumented immigrants and information sharing regarding the federal government and I.C.E.. Given the recent turn of events we feel that that is absolutely necessary. And uh, there, this has been touched on but um, mandatory health evaluation should be done on a regular basis. It shouldn't be done after whatever is deemed necessary by officers without any sort of policy. It should be something that is continual throughout an officer's career. Uh, I believe that was it.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Very good.

Person 12 - My name is Person 12. I'm just gonna touch on some things that I have not heard yet. The first is actually just kind of a question, that 40 hours of training. Is that an ongoing thing? Is that just a one-time training? Um, what is, um, I guess the ethics training, there were two different trainings there that yeah. It's ongoing, okay. So is that 40 hours a year, or

CHIEF WHITE - It's 40 hours specifically. In one session, you get 40 hours. We kind of evaluate where we are for the next year and if we need to reinforce it we reinforce it. Or move on to something else. It's potentially ongoing. Depending on the needs.

Person 12 - Okay. So, the one recommendation there is just that, if possible, to make that an ongoing training program that's kind of consistent and the community knows when that is going to happen. And just so there's that expectation. Another thing was that new officers, and this may already happened, but that all of their actions would be reviewed. So, that after each incident that it would actually go through that four-step process. To look at, is it legal, is it ethical, er... not ethical, but you know, to just go through that process. The other thing is to create an ethics board that's a combination of the community and law enforcement officers who have actually been through difficult situations so that when there's a scenario that comes up that needs review that there are people that understand the difficulty of being in that situation. But then also people that can, just from the community that have an outside perspective that could review that. And then, the last thing was just, and I don't know, if I'm missing anything please let me know, but the last thing was they, uh, how, is there some sort of plan in place just to change the culture. Because, obviously, this is a policy. Policies are there to set guidelines, but they don't change things necessarily. So, just to, if there is some sort of plan, if that can be a public thing, as well. I think that was it. Thank you.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Good job.

Person 13 - My name is Person 13, and I think I'm gonna take my time on this because I have a lot more than this. Well, our group that the concerns of the community not being part of the draft process is a valid and valid concern. And this is one method of being part of the draft process, but it still needs to be ongoing through the continuation of this draft. And before it's released. The community has to be involved. And the community, our recommendation is that the community stays involved in this. Beyond just these events. And while we admire your intention to move away from traditional, towards this new type of policing, de-escalation needs to be more emphasized. Concurring with the group that, just titling this as UOF instead of changing the culture towards de-escalation. Maybe seeing how this could be reoriented towards it. What was missing, our group was concerned about section five which states that there's this list of different

lev... things that an officer could be mindful of, but it doesn't explicitly ask them to exhaust the possibilities. That's a concern for not just our group, but we've heard from other community members. And so, we thought that was important. But a lot of what we talked about was implicit bias, and how was that incorporated into this draft. And we talked with the Deputy, and he said that the implicit bias training was a part of another document. But I don't see how, when someone else mentioned that, where are the experts that are key for explicit bias involved in the drafting of this? How can they be made part of this process so the community can actually be assured that experts are a part of identifying where in the draft implicit bias is an important point in the draft. So, how can those people be part of this draft process? And how can they be identified so that the community is actually reassured, and it's not just part of this nameless thousand people that you talked about. And that was one of the other things, how can you identify the institutions that are,... you may not want to identify the thousands of people you talked to, but what institutions are part of the drafting of this? And who has the most stake? You mentioned the Police Union, uhh, I think they should be identified as stakeholders for the drafting of this. The other question was video capture. You mention it in your report but there's no rules on if UOF is used, what are the rules for that information being public? In your PowerPoint, you say that you're going to talk within two hours of an incident, but it doesn't have anything that allows the community to be, to have any recourse over that data. So, where is that in this document? Uh, I would think it would be part of the UOF document. When it's captured. So, what is the public access, what is the protection from erasure and destruction? What are the rules for when officers disable the devices? Which happened in all other kinds of cities. That's not in this document. And similarly, the training and accountability aren't in this document either. This is just about UOF, it's toothless, in a way, if there isn't accountability. Finally, how do we strengthen this draft in the face of federal changes to policing? How can the community be reassured that this won't change if the federal government changes UOF? What experts are involved in the draft that can help us understand how we'll be affected by the government's changes in governance?

CHIEF WHITE - We don't do, let me put a hold on, we don't do I.C.E. work. We don't do immigration work. We don't do I.C.E. work, we don't ask for green cards. It didn't happen before the current administration, before the prior administration, it's not gonna happen in the current administration. That's an absolute.

Person 11 - I think we were also thinking about how Trump has delivered on a lot of his promises and one of his big things was "Stop and Frisk." And I think "Stop and Frisk," can escalate into a lot of force if the situation calls for it. So, making this document really strong so that if something like that happened and Stop and Frisk became a thing again, we have things in place on our local city level in Denver that will mitigate some of the negative consequences of something like that.

Person 12 - So, Stop and Frisk is a civil rights violation, quite frankly. I have one more point.

CHIEF WHITE - You don't want me to answer that question?

Person 12 - No, no, no. I would like you to answer that question.

CHIEF WHITE - Simply put. This new administration does not impact how we police as it relates to asking us to do things that we haven't done before. As I stated, we're not gonna do immigration work. That's a federal responsibility. We're not gonna do green cards. As it relates to Stop and Frisk, there is a legal time, I didn't really want to get into this, but there is a legal time when an officer has reasonable suspicion to stop somebody for committing, or potentially committing a crime. And the officer has to have a reasonable suspicion why they frisk that individual. But doing it randomly for the sake of, this is a high-crime area and there's no activity going on and there's people standing in the corner, we don't do that and we will not do that. That's, I think the mayor spoke to that. I've spoken to that, the executive director has spoken to that. For those that are worried about the new administration and how that is gonna change how we police, I would say that it's not gonna be a concern. And as it relates to discipline, we have a matrix that speaks to discipline. So, every action an officer has that is remotely inappropriate there is accountability attached to that. Remember I mentioned we have these hundreds of policies that some of them speak to this particular policy. Many of them speak to immigration. We have an immigration policy, by the way, that tells the officers what they can do and what they can't do. And, obviously, a lot of this is a trust issue. I certainly get that. And part of what I would say is, judge us on what you would see us do as we move forward. And a lot of people want to know, what are you gonna do, what are you gonna do? I think we can articulate all we can, all we want, but I think the best judgement is to judge us on our actions as we move forward. I'm sorry I didn't mean to take...

Person 12 - No no. That's okay. And a lot of it was, how can we make whatever that comes out of this draft resilient to any kind of changes at the federal level? So, whatever is happening now and whatever assurances you give us, how can we make sure the document itself is resilient? And that includes, I guess, getting stakeholders that are maybe experts on that part of law. Um, and the very last thing is that, as far as community participation, I think community participation has to be included in implicit bias training. And I think the community is a stakeholder in that. It's not enough to require officers to spend 35% of their time on the beat. That helps, but it helps even more if officers are involved with dialogue, with community. That helps overcome implicit bias.

CHIEF WHITE - That's part of the 35%. They should be doing that.

Person 12 - I'm saying the community can be part of a program that becomes formalized. As part of helping implicit bias.

Person 14 - Hi. I'm Person 14 and I feel like we're probably gonna reiterate a lot of what's been said, but hopefully, that just drives home that these are important to us. So, we were also talking about, like, accountability and what happens afterward. Like, the guys that didn't get brought, like the whole Jesse Hernandez thing, nobody was, I don't know. Like, it's a trust issue like you said. So, we have to see more, like, accountability, more people getting in trouble for violence. We think the UOF policy is mostly on the right track, but then there's some other things, like, we need to see people using Tasers appropriately. Like Ruth was talking about people using Tasers for too long. I think what we really want to see is, like, a spectrum or continuum of different events and sorts of forces that might be appropriate for those things because we know it's not all cut and dry, but maybe there could be some sort of, like, spectrum. Like, for instance, how many cops does it take to subdue one human being? And the bodycams should just be on, like, all the time. Like, why can't it always just be on? And we're just curious about the whole recruitment and background checks thing. We were talking about the ethics training, and we want to see more trainings for implicit biases put in there. And we're curious about who's writing the curriculum for these things. We want to see more community member being involved in the actual building of curricula. And, other than that, we were also thinking that it's, um, just that it's probably never appropriate to shoot into a moving vehicle. We don't want to see that in there at all. Like you can drive behind them and wait until they run out of gas or something. And, other than that, we just wanted to request a follow-up meeting once this draft has been revised. To see what the revisions look like. Thank you.

MEETING ORGANIZER - Can I have your notes?

[Skip to PERSON 10]

PERSON 10 - Which is the old policy stating that it is not a requirement, nor an expectation to use less lethal means. There, I want to see something in that policy that's just saying, like, something to that effect in not giving those officers the immediate go ahead to pull that gun. That there are these less lethal means that they should look at. And I understand that they can't always be exhausted level by level, but going into situations with sufficient backup and support that these less lethal means are used. And that there's not an expectation for these officers to use them to be removed from that because, I think, that still gives them the green light that if they're scared for my life, "Oh my God," they're gonna shoot. And I think that's a really big key piece. And I can give you the detailed section out of it if you'd like, but you know where it's at.

CHIEF WHITE - Yes. I appreciate that. Again, I appreciate everyone taking...

[skip to DEPUTY CHIEF and CHIEF WHITE again]

DEPUTY CHIEF - [denvergov.org/police](http://denvergov.org/police)

CHIEF WHITE - Look at any of those policies that are of any relevance to you and, certainly, feel to make comments as it relates to that. You can forward us those comments. Again, thank you very much and have a great weekend.

Person 2 - I have a question. It will be quick. Trust me.

CHIEF WHITE - Yes, Person 2.

Person 2 - Can we get a copy of all of everything that's been submitted from all the groups by all the meetings that's been submitted to you? How do we get a copy?

CHIEF WHITE - Everything that was submitted to us will be available to the entire community.

Person 2 - How do we get that?

Crowd - Where?

DEPUTY CHIEF - You have my card Person 2 just email me, we'll get it to you.

Person 2 - A lot of people would like that.

DEPUTY CHIEF - Can, folks, can I just answer real quick that, so everything that was asked here today, all of you who put emails...

Person 2 - The entire meetings, as well.

DEPUTY CHIEF - Everyone who asked questions today and put an email there, you'll get that. You can ask, you can write back and say you'd like all the meetings. We'll get you that. We have people transcribing all of this and we're answering each one of those points. We also have all of the stuff that's coming in on email. We're happy to share that with anybody.

Person 2 - When are we gonna get a copy of what everyone submitted?

CHIEF WHITE - You'll be able to go electronically and get it, but we're not gonna give you...

Person 2 - So, you're going to dictate what you think people presented here?

CHIEF WHITE - Thank you very much.

DEPUTY CHIEF - Everything is available.