

Panel Notes for the Public Safety Citizens' Review Panel Aug. 10, 2020

Meeting Called to Order: Emily Stacey @ 4:06

1. Unanimous approval of the minutes for the following meetings: 6-29, 7-8, 7-13, 7-27.
2. Filling the Vice-Chair: no motion to remove the item from the table; tabled until next meeting.
3. Discussion of the Survey questions

Maxine: questions the need to ask about SNAP benefits and subsidized housing

Elizabeth: Amanda and I thought it would be a good idea to get the information to make sure we are getting feedback from all demographics in the community.

Emily: asking questions about housing and benefits may be offensive to people.

Michelle: we need questions that are an intersection between people's experiences and their backgrounds.

Maxine: wants to know what we are trying to accomplish with asking these questions.

Emily: we need to determine the needs of socio-economic disadvantaged people.

Michelle: create a range of income instead.

Maxine: we should have an income bracket only.

Wil: the question that asks "do you agree with this statement" should have positive and negative, fill in the blank, too.

Hilary: needs to be some negative options, not just positive options.

Maxine: doesn't like the question on education level.

Hilary: thinks the question on education level is okay.

Maxine: doesn't like the gender identify question.

Michelle: thinks there should be a gender question to help us understand interactions with police; suggests a question "Have you ever been misgendered by the police".

Jaime: should be a question "Have you ever been discriminated by the police".

Bob: questions the length of the survey.

Elizabeth: we should table the survey because the suggested changes are extensive.

Hilary: suggests we make changes on the floor to get the survey completed.

Wil: suggests we remove the question on Section 8 housing.

Jaime: suggests we elaborate on discrimination by the police.

Michelle: wonders if we should include a question about discrimination from the community.

Hilary: could have been discriminated against, whether you did something right or wrong.

Chief Ritter: we need to parse that out.

Michelle: it's important to look at how we get the data.

Maxine: wants more brevity; feels the survey is too long.

Caprice: should be a place for comments at the end.

Hilary: there should be a character limit on the comments at the end.

Michelle: who is going to collate the information?

Elizabeth: the working group (Elizabeth, Emily, Amanda).

Emily: suggests the question on the appearance of officers is not important.

Caprice: states relationships and communications are more important.

Maxine: doesn't see the importance of the question.

Wil: instead of "look" the question should be about "being" professional.

Chief Ritter: suggests adding "do you think the officer communicates well".

Michelle: we need to determine if the officers are empathetic.

Wil: suggests questions that determine if the officers act professional and show concern and compassion.

Suggestion: create a question that states "Plattsburgh Police Officer (check all that apply):

--were understanding, compassionate, empathetic

--were not understanding, compassionate, empathetic

Hilary: there needs to be numbers on the questionnaire.

Agenda Item 3 was tabled: first by Maxine, second by Wil—all in favor/none opposed.

#### Old Business

1. Discussion of Existing Use of Force Policy will keep as Old Business for the next agenda.
2. Discuss deadlines for surveys: agreed that we will impose a 4-week deadline for completion of surveys after we approve the survey in the committee; Maxine suggested we circulate surveys to tenants and clients, possibly ask for volunteers to help us; Elizabeth suggested we combine all of our knowledge and resources to distribute widely.

--we also discussed the deadline for filling the panel vacancy and decided on August 14<sup>th</sup> @ midnight as the deadline for submission; Emily will communicate that to the Mayor.

#### New Business

1. Survey the Police Department: Emily wants to get their perspectives, too.
2. Making an official statement regarding our panel's mission and goals: Emily wanted to clarify for the public that we are not trying to de-fund the police; Maxine suggested we wait on making a

formal statement because we are being tasked with the Governor's Executive Order. Discussion that officers are more concerned with training and not enough money to get the training they need.

Public Comment:

Sarah Martin: she explained she is the one who made the statement to "defund the police"; she suggests there needs to be money allotted elsewhere in the budget for other services in the community to address needs; she states she is an advocate for low income communities and people of color; she suggests that if we do paper surveys, to please enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope for people; she states that upper-level income people have also been victims of discrimination; she expressed concern over hostility directed towards her comments.

Brianna House: states the discussion of the survey is impersonal and sounds as though we don't care about the community; she doesn't feel as though we are taking the right approach towards people; we need to connect more and she is concerned that the survey will not get the right information; feels it is not okay to create a survey about something so important.

Aubrey Eldridge: she is looking at the Open Meetings Law; states any business that is done outside the group is subject to Open Meetings Law.

Patrick McFarlin: happy the panel is put together; wants to discuss SROs (School Resource Officers) in schools; wants to get the panel's perspective on SROs; he is asking the panel to review the roles of SROs in schools and make recommendations.

End of Public Comment

Motion to Adjourn: first by Emily, second by Wil

Meeting Adjourned at 5:29

Next Meeting: Monday August 17<sup>th</sup> @ 4-5:15