



CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING

JANUARY 18, 2023

3:00 PM

SULLIVAN CHAMBER

~MINUTES~

MEETING

Wednesday, January 18, 2023

TIME

3:00 PM

PRESIDING OFFICER

Mayor Sumbul Siddiqui

**THE CITY COUNCIL WILL HOLD A SPECIAL MEETING TO DISCUSS
PROTOCOLS, PROCESSES, AND TRAINING OF THE CAMBRIDGE
POLICE DEPARTMENT RELATED TO THE FATAL-OFFICER
INVOLVED SHOOTING OF SAYED FAISAL THERE WILL BE PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Attendee Name	Present	Absent	Late	Arrived
Burhan Azeem	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dennis J. Carlone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Alanna Mallon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Marc C. McGovern	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Patricia Nolan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E. Denise Simmons	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Paul F. Toner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Quinton Zondervan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sumbul Siddiqui	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING,

JANUARY 18, 2023

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI, CHAIR

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Note: This Special Meeting was Recessed on
January 18, 2023 and Reconvened on January
25, 2023.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Good afternoon, everyone. A quorum of the City Council being present, I'm going to call today's January 18th, 2023 Special Meeting to order.

The first order of business is a roll call of members present. Clerk LeBlanc.

City Clerk Diane P. LeBlanc called the roll:

Councillor Burhan Azeem - Present

Councillor Dennis J. Carlone - Present

Vice Mayor Alanna M. Mallon - Present

Councillor Marc C. McGovern - Present

Councillor Patricia M. Nolan - Absent

Councillor E. Denise Simmons - Present

Councillor Paul F. Toner - Present

Councillor Quinton Y. Zondervan - Present

Mayor Sumbul Siddiqui - Present

Present-8, Absent-1. Quorum established.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: The Call of tonight's Special Meeting is to discuss protocols, processes and training of the Cambridge Police Department related to the shooting of Sayed Faisal.

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2022, adopted by the Massachusetts General Assembly and approved by the

Governor, the City is authorized to use remote participation at meetings of the Cambridge City Council.

In addition to having Members of the Council participate remotely, we've set up Zoom teleconference for public comment.

To watch the meeting, please tune into Channel 22 or visit the Open Meeting portal on the City's website.

If you'd like to provide public comment, please go to www.cambridgema.gov/publiccomment.

Public comment sign-up for this meeting was opened on January 10th, 2023. We will not allow any additional public comment sign up after 3:30 p.m.

You can also email written comments for the record to the City Clerk at cityclerk@cambridgema.gov.

We will, tonight we're all in person so we can do voice votes if--when necessary.

So just so everyone knows the order of operations, we will move to public comment first, which will be two minutes each, pursuant to Rule 24(c)(1), in the event that there are 20 or more speakers signed up, the amount of time allocated will be two minutes.

And so after that, we will go ahead and hear from our

City Manager and Police Commissioner. After--and after that, we will go ahead and start our questions.

I reviewed questions that most of our City Councillors put forward through our executive assistant, and I organized them in the following categories: incident specific; policies, procedures and protocols; equipment specific; Office of Community Safety and the HEART program; and other.

And my goal is to really get the factual information about the police department on the table and for the Council to discuss what next steps we should take.

While the District Attorney moves forward with our investigation, it's still incumbent on the Council to look at all the processes and procedures that led to this incident, as well as larger systematic questions about policing in Cambridge.

The conclusion of today's meeting will by--be no means an end of the discussion. Going forward, the Council will continue to hold meetings, gather community input and move forward on policy changes that are necessary.

We may not get through all our questions today that the Council had. In that event, we will recess this meeting

and I will call another special meeting to go through any remaining questions, but my hope is that we can get through as many of the questions that all of us, uh, submitted.

So with that, we'll start with public comment. The first person who has signed up is Amber Moulton.

CITY CLERK DIANE P. LEBLANC: Councillor Nolan.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Nolan is present.
Amber Moulton.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Amber Moulton has left the Zoom. Pat Madey, please go ahead.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes, Pat, will you come up? And just make sure the green light is on. And I apologize for those who I do have to cut off. It's two minutes.

Right over there, behind the podium. Yes. You can just press that button in front of you.

PAT MADEY: First, okay. I just want to say I know that a lot of people are making assumptions about the shooting of Mr. Faisal. And I'm sure that the toxicology report, if there is one, hasn't come back.

First I mean to bring up two incidents. There was a young man in New York and three--he went after three police officers with a machete, and thankfully they'll be fine.

They shot and killed him.

And last week in Colorado, a man approached an officer on the highway with a very large weapon, a knife. They kept telling him to put it down. He did not put it down. And people, they shot him and people didn't protest because they were both justified.

It's my opinion Mr. Faisal was either having a mental episode, on drugs, or suicidal. They kept saying, "Put the knife down! Put the knife down!" He would not put the very large weapon, which is also called an Army combat machete, used for very effective fighting in wartime.

He kept advancing toward the officers, they used a non-lethal shot which did not stop him. The officers gave him plenty of time to do what he was told. He was approached the officer and the officer shot him to protect himself, his fellow officers and the public.

I'm sure everybody has heard about suicide by cop and this is maybe what he wanted. Please do not use this officer who was protecting his fellow officers and the public to be used as a scapegoat for a situation that does not deserve one.

Don't let the anti-police people sway your decision. I

know one of the City Council Members did not want body cameras because he said it invaded people's privacy. Well, if you have a cell phone or social media, you don't have any privacy.

And I took a picture of this, this is a combat knife used by the Army and the Marines, which is what he used, a combat knife for fighting. God bless our police, they did the right thing.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: The next person who is signed up is Alexandra Orsino, followed by Ernest Arky Solomon.

Alexandra Orsan--Orsino, are--are you there?

We'll move to Earnest Arky Solomon.

EARNEST ARKY SOLOMAN: Hi, my name's Ernest. I live at 38 Lawn Street. Um, so we know that with the Cambridge Police budget growing and the lack of funding and investment in HEART and the Community Safety Department, that incidents of police violence will continue.

I'm going to share an incident that I witnessed in Cambridge, um, that is difficult. In 2021. I was in my apartment on Walden Street and I woke up to a really loud banging noise. And when I looked out the window, there was

a Cambridge Police Officer pointing a gun at a car window.

Um, they were banging on the car and used a crowbar eventually to break the window. They dragged the driver, who wasn't moving, out of the car and five officers pinned the man down. And they were mocking him when he asked to not be on the cold floor.

And after he was arrested, arrested and removed, the officers were re-enacting the scene and laughing and patting each other on the back, which was very intense to witness Cambridge Police Officers behaving in that way.

Um, So I filed a report and there weren't consequences. But as City Council knows, through the endorsement of HEART, this model of policing is not safe for Cambridge residents and certainly not in mental health crises when other public safety measures and care providers would provide solutions, and support and not create more harm.

Instead of increasing the Police Department budget, the funds need to be invested into alternative responses for mental health crises and to address the housing crisis.

The groundwork of HEART and years of organizing are here. Please take meaningful steps so we don't continue

down this path of increased militarization and funding of police.

[Applause]

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Mike Prince, and I know folks want to clap but we have to--we have some decorum rules in here, so I really ask you not to engage in that. Thank you so much.

We'll go to Mike Prince and then Jordan Ahmed. Mike Prince. Jordan Ahmed, followed by Batham Ahmed.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Mayor Siddiqui, Mike Prince is on via Zoom.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: He's on Zoom? Okay, sorry, it said in person. My apologies. We'll go to Mike and then we'll go--

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Mike Prince, please unmute yourself. You have the floor. Mike Prince, please go ahead.

Jordan Ahmed, please go ahead.

JORDAN AHMED: Hello, my name is Jordan Jamil Ahmed, and I live here in Cambridgeport on Putnam Ave. As a Cambridge community member, a South Asian Muslim, a person living with severe mental illness and an organizer, I am

tired, I am scared, I am mourning and I am livid.

The people of Cambridge have spoken clearly and frequently that we must divest from policing and invest in our mental health and in our access to housing and in our education, in the resources that actually increase our safety. Why then has the police budget increased?

In my work as an organizer with Muslim Justice League, I can say with confidence that body cameras or any other funding for the police will not solve or prevent police violence. They will only add to their capacity for surveillance and provide more resources for the same people who murdered one of our own.

The police murder of Sayed Arif Faisal is devastating and unconscionable. We shouldn't have to lose someone in our community, a child, a friend, a student, to convince you to defund the police.

So I ask each of you with the power to change things in this city, am I next? Or will I lose another neighbor on your watch? Will you reduce the police budget? What can you offer the people you represent but beyond platitudes about investigations?

I ask you not if you will defund the police but

instead when? When will you demilitarize--demilitarize our police force? When will you fund alternative responses to mental health crises? When will you listen to us?

There is no justice for Faisal without these answers, and it is beyond time for you to get on board with your constituents.

Change cannot be abstract. Justice demands action. I know that. We know that. Do you? Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Fatema Ahmad, followed by Jacqueline Kung.

FATEMA AHMAD: Hi, I'm Fatema Ahmad, I'm Executive Director of Muslim Justice League. Well, I'm not a Cambridge resident, many of our members are.

And what I know about Cambridge as you imagine this city to be very progressive, but I know as an expert on policing, from your police budget, your police inventory and your policies that you're truly not. We can see that quite, quite clearly from the lack of action that has been taken by this city.

And in fact, in the past couple of weeks, Cambridge Police is among, you know many police departments across the country that have recently killed people.

While some are asking for the individual officer's name to be released on this, I want to emphasize that all of you are responsible. The City Manager, the entire police department, the Commissioner and the City Council are all responsible for what has happened here and should be questioning yourselves on your lack of action.

To actually address this and be the progressive beacon that your residents want you to be, you have to think beyond current responses or even old responses like body cameras, for example, which we know police departments implemented across the country in the past few years, and then killed more people last year than ever. We know that body cameras are not a solution and any common sense would show you that's not an answer to actually preventing what happened here.

We have to look at both creating true alternatives across the board, not just to address mental health, which is clear here. But housing, traffic, and so much more. Some of these things you've discussed and again, not moved on.

And, we have to talk about actually taking away violent response from the police, because every aspect of this from chasing him to shooting him with a sponge

grenade, uh, and then actually using firearms was violent.

We want to see change and want to see what will you

actually do on this?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We move to Jacqueline Kung,
followed by Mason Kortz.

JACQUELINE KUNG: Hi, I'm Jacqueline. Um, I live here
in Central and, um, I heard since we're talking about
police training, I heard the Police Commissioner say that
our Cambridge Police have actually a lot of training in
mental health response and de-escalation. And I think
actually saw information that--that is true that compared
to other police departments in the US, our police
department has more training. But still this happened.

I think the police are just the wrong tool for this
situation. Um, I think it would be wrong for us to ask the
police to run a fire truck or transport a patient having a
heart attack to the hospital, which is actually what we
used to ask the police to do in the 60s and 70s. But now we
can look back and say, well, obviously that's not the best
solution.

You know, and I think we'll look back to this time and
say, why did we ask the police to respond to mental health

calls? They aren't trained to know the difference between somebody with a knife whose main purpose is to kill people versus someone who's having a mental health crisis who's cutting himself, you know, who is not a danger to me or the rest of the community here.

So I'm asking the City Council to help us. I know a lot of you want to help us. I appreciate that, to kind of divert some of these funds that we're giving to the police to instead fund the HEART program, mental health dedicated response team, just like we would give separate funds to the fire department, you know, separate funds to a hospital. You know, it's, so thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go ahead to Mason Kortz, followed by Andy Nash.

MASON KORTZ: Hello, everyone. My name is Mason Kortz. I live in Central and since moving to Cambridge about 12 years ago, I've consistently heard people say, the Cambridge Police is different, the Cambridge Police better trained.

Um, and I think what I've really learned over the last 12 years, um, and I think many people have, is that no matter how much you train, no matter how much you try to

reform the police, the core function of--of a police department is to use force to try to control situations.

And I think we really need to think about what are the--what are the circumstances in which it really is appropriate, if any, to have someone respond, whose primary training whose primary mode of dealing with something, is the use of force?

I think that if we wanted police to be effective mental health responders, we would not just have to train them in de-escalation, we'd have to un-train a lot of what they are already taught about their primary role as law enforcement.

And if you're going to do that, at that point, you really have, you know, kind of transformed the police into social workers. And you know, we already have social workers who are willing and ready to respond to mental health crises. We already have an entire program, well thought out, that is intending to do that.

And so I think, you know, now is the time to say, this isn't about more training. This isn't about reforming the police. This is about alternatives to the police.

And I think we're really fortunate here in Cambridge,

to have a proposal for just that on the table to have dedicated people at HEART who have worked really hard on that. All they need now is the support and the funding from the community and from the City Council, and I think we should give that to them. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We're going to go to Andy Nash and then Mike Prince once more.

ANDY NASH: Okay, can you hear me?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes.

ANDY NASH: Thank you. I live in Central Square and I want to echo what the last three speakers have said. I'm struck by the focus of today's hearing on police protocols, processes and training, because it reminds me of the gun rights movement.

In that movement, they focus on how guns are stored or carried or the training required, rather than the fact that the presence of guns results in countless deaths and household terror.

The travesty of Arif Faisal's killing is not a matter of protocols or training. We know from example after example, that well-trained police kill people who are in distress regularly.

So let's stop with this focus on more refined policies. The threat of violence and lethal force is the problem.

And as others have said, what we need to do is demilitarize our police and redirect funds to organizations that actually excel at community safety. \$3 million dedicated to that work via the new Community Safety Department isn't enough. We need more than that dedicated to contract with HEART and other community providers that are rooted in our neighborhoods and rooted in community care.

Police are used to control situations. They're ill-suited to address mental health crises and should be replaced by those who can. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And excuse me, I meant Mike Prince, not Pence. We will go to Peggy Wang after Mike Prince.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Mayor Siddiqui, it looks like Mike Prince has left the Zoom again. Peggy Wang, please go ahead. You have the floor.

PEGGY WANG: Hi, my name, oh. My name is Peggy Wang. I'm a member of the Independent Socialist Group and I've

also been living in Cambridge now for almost 10 years.

Um, so this is not the first time we've been having this conversation. Three years ago, in the middle of the George Floyd protests, 400 members of our community signed up to speak at a Cambridge City Council meeting, many of them demanding the defunding and militarization of the police. Yeah, What's happened?

Cambridge City Council has continuously increased police funding, and that's why we're demanding that Faisal's death should be investigated transparently. Those involved should be held accountable to the fullest extent. Killer cops, past and present, should be prosecuted.

But the systemic problem of police brutality, it needs to be addressed systemically. That means police should be removed from our schools. We should be massively cutting the bloated police budget and fully funding social services.

Things like education health services, including mental health, transportation, quality public housing, things that would actually improve community safety. We need actual living wages in a city that continues to become astronomically more unaffordable and pushes many residents

out.

The police need to be demilitarized. Why do they have an armored tank, that was gifted to them by Homeland Security in 2015, and have been found to be in possession of tear gas?

There needs to be community control over the police, including the hiring, firing, training priorities and budgets of the police.

But this won't happen unless we're out in the streets, mobilizing and organizing, protesting and putting pressure on until we see this, these systemic changes made.

Those interested in seeing real accountability and justice, we need to get organized. We should be forming our own democratically elected community committees to organize this effort. We should be coordinating protests, medical treatment, legal responses, community self-defense efforts, and responses to police and right-wing escalation.

We also need an Independent Workers Party so we can offer alternatives to the racist policing practices and austerity measures of both the Democrats and Republicans. If you want to find out more about Independent Socialist Group, check us out, independentsocialistgroup.org.

Thanks.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Ashley Rogers.

ASHLEY ROGERS: Hi, my name is Ashley. I live in Cambridge. I'm also a member of the Independent Socialist Group. I'm calling also in regards to the murder of Sayed Faisal.

Um, as usual, I think in these cases, the focus of the City and the police department doesn't seem to be on bringing, uh, Faisal's killer to justice. It mostly seems to be on kind of, uh, sweeping it under the rug, right? Hoping everyone goes home.

I mean, if any of us did what this police officer did, we wouldn't get paid leave, right? We'd lose our jobs and we'd be put in jail. We wouldn't get anonymity. Our names would be all over the news in every headline.

So why should this killer be treated any different? Well, because he's working for the government, right? The government that is not working for us.

Uh, while we, the community that is subjected to this brutality, um, I--I--I think we should demand that the officers involved, be arrested, removed from their positions without pay, um, with an immediate criminal

investigation, like with any other murder.

And this can't be the police investigating themselves, because we know from experience that, you know, they'll find themselves innocent regardless of the evidence. Um, this investigation needs to be overseen by the community.

And as, you know, the--the George Floyd protests in 2020 taught us, the only way to hold killer cops accountable is with a--a movement. A movement big enough, um, and with the pressure to make the people in charge worried about what's going to happen if they don't do what's right.

Um, you know, the City isn't going to fix this. You know, these--these--these politicians, Democrat or Republican, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter how progressive they claim to be. These politicians are there to keep the system going and to keep us from stopping these abuses.

Um, if--if you want to join in this fight against this look us up, independentsocialistgroup.org. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: For those of you coming in, there are seats available in the balcony, um, so feel free to move up to the balcony.

Next up, we'll go to Nick Oviedo-Torres.

NICK OVIEDO-TORRES: Hi, I'm Nick Oviedo-Torres. I'm a Cambridge resident. And I'm here because I want to be safe in this community. And the police have shown time and time again, specifically the Cambridge Police, that they are a direct threat to that.

Um, if you're fortunate enough not to have personal experience with that like me, let me help you out. There's books about this. It's no secret that the police are a tool for violence.

The police were created to catch enslaved people who had run away. The police were created to stop labor strikes, and the police were created to prevent indigenous folks in the west from getting into towns.

So after knowing all that context, when I use my remote at home and it turns on the TV, I'm not surprised. So why would I be surprised when a tool that was created to brutalize Black and Brown working-class people does exactly that in my community?

It's pretty outrageous that just this past year, this Council provided that exact tool for violence \$73 million, and then provided an alternative response that this

community has asked for, for about three years now, \$300,000 and hasn't even given those folks a penny of that money. Has just said that that's going to happen through ARPA funding, which that's a temporary solution, right? That's a one-time payment.

Are you really committing to my safety as a Cambridge community member? You're not. So I need you to stop investing in this tool for violence and take that money away from that \$73 million budget and give to programs that actually invest in the mental health crisis like Cambridge HEART, or the housing crisis, like Map. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Kelly Geddes followed by Susan Ringler.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Kelly Geddes, please unmute yourself. You have the floor.

Kelly Geddes seems to be unable to unmute themselves. Susan Ringler, please go ahead.

SUSAN RINGLER: Hi, my name is Susan Ringler. I live at 82 Kinnaird Street in Cambridge. I'm here again speaking to you just a few days later.

We are here today because a young man was shot and killed by Cambridge Police and we need to make changes in

our city. I'll make just a few brief points.

The first is transparency. We need more transparency. We need to make those police protocols public. What are the police allowed and required to do? The community wants to know. City officials need to work with HEART and others to inform the public about police protocols and to improve those protocols.

Funding. We don't need more police funding. The police fund budget is already huge. Somerville has about 80,000 people and a 2021 police budget of just over \$15 million. That's one-five. Cambridge has about 118,000 people and a 2021 police budget of over \$73 million. Per capita, that's over three times as much as our neighbors in Somerville. That's crazy.

We need to reduce funding for the Cambridge Police. We need to invest in HEART. We need to stop using police for mental health calls, homelessness calls, traffic calls, none of these need guns.

Timeliness, quit stalling. We need to invest in HEART now. We need community-based responses to people in distress. People in crisis should be met with services, not bullets.

In June of 2021, the City Council passed Resolution 114 to fund HEART. It's a year-and-a-half later and HEART has yet to receive any funds from the City. Meanwhile, the police budget has increased each year. Enough. Give HEART city contracts, a million in funding for HEART now. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Cathy Hoffman.

CATHY HOFFMAN: Hi, good afternoon. Thank you. I'm reiterating some thoughts expressed by others. The need for accelerating funds to and inclusion of unarmed independent public safety officers and an independent investigation.

The specifics? Funds for HEART and the speedy hiring for a Director for the City's Public Safety Department. While unarmed alternatives may not have been called in this situation, they could have offered known de-escalating presences where there seemed to have been time.

And support for HEART is those already quietly doing the work, who are made up of community members who don't look like me.

An investigation which does not involve police. Any police interviewing neighbor witnesses adds tension and fear to an already fearful situation. Will their words

which challenge official reports be recorded? Will they face police pushback? Will they feel worried about their own safety?

And isn't it the case that any police interview of friends of Mr. Faisal are designed to discredit an already dead young man?

It doesn't matter if any of the answers to these is no, they are relevant because the shooter is a police officer, a member of the community of fellow police officers.

Real concern from police, which I'm really calling for, would support and independent investigation. And in the same vein, I asked the City to add their voice to the grassroots groups informing people of their right not to speak to the police.

I also hope there will be community-led opportunities for debriefs, which are led not by City police or police surrogates. We once had a community crisis team that does that. Um, we could do it now outside of public meetings, which without answers, only served for greater fury. Another reason for HEART.

This is a huge and painful moment for Cambridge, a

non-exceptional city in a country with deep current and historic attachments to supremacy and violence.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Cathy, for your testimony. You'll have to email the remainder of the rest.

CATHY HOFFMAN: In a half sentence, in the spirit of--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Cathy, your time's up. Sorry. We have to go to Mirage Gill and then Samuel Sandeen.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Mirage Gill is not on the Zoom. Samuel Sandeen, please go ahead.

SAMUEL SANDEEN: Yes, hello. Um, I would like to just continue to reinforce the same things that have been said several times already.

Um, I've very much enjoyed my time living in Cambridge and I care a lot about this city and I, I want this city to be better. I want this city to be so much better.

Uh, I find it unacceptable that we continue to increase the police budget. I don't understand why we're doing them. I don't understand what possible motivation there is for doing that.

I would love to see more funding for HEART. I would love to see more funding for other social services. I genuinely don't think that police should be involved in

mental health situations or in, you know, dealing with homeless people. And I also think that, I don't think that police are very useful for many tasks, honestly.

But even smaller actions would be useful in making a positive difference for our community.

Um, and as was said before, like the Cambridge City Council supposedly voted to fund HEART over a year-and-a-half ago, and that funding has not materialized. I don't understand how that's acceptable.

Either what's happening is the City Manager is disobeying the directives of the City Council, in which case they should be removed or replaced, or else the City Council is falling on--failing to actually enforce the directives that they have, which is also unacceptable.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Samuel, are you finished?

Okay, well, if Samuel comes back we can go to him, but it seems like he's done. We'll go to Corrine followed by Amanda R.

CORRINE: Thank you. There is a difference between law and policy. I urge this Council, the Commissioner and the City Manager to listen to the community voices asking for police policy changes. Please do not reject calls for

change with answers like "This has been a long-time policy."

Please instead, honor the community members who are telling you we want a deep dive into Cambridge Police policies and procedures. If we start from scratch and imagine what does community safety mean, we would start with the outcomes we want. 100% of the humans in the city feeling safe, thriving, living.

Starting from that point the desired outcome, let's look at this question. First make Cambridge Police protocols public. When are police allowed and required to shoot a person in crisis? We would like to know.

When police and paramedics respond together, who decides who leads the response? In the response to Sayed Faisal's distress, did paramedics ask police to step in? Or did police decide that?

It is not a point of pride that on-duty police in Cambridge have only killed one person in 20 years. It should be zero, ever.

Killing us isn't the only kind of harm our community has experienced from the police. Surveillance, harassment, assault, emotional harm, refusal to ask--refusal to help

when asked. These are all harms that are frequently reported by our community.

In the past when some of us have reported these harms to the City, we've been told Cambridge Police are leaders in the nation. We train other police departments. It's felt that we're not believed and not heard. Please listen.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Amanda R. followed by Eleanor Craig.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Amanda R. has not joined. Eleanor Craig, you have the floor. Please go ahead.

ELEANOR CRAIG: My name's is Eleanor Craig. I work in Cambridge at Harvard University. I was a Cambridge resident for over four years.

Um, a few weeks ago, I was in one of these meetings recounting a time this past summer that I saw Cambridge Police swarming an individual who was experiencing mental health issues. Officers were responding nervously to a person who was far outnumbered and was not posing any immediate threat.

One officer was repeatedly reaching for his gun whenever this, again clearly non-violent person, shifted his seating position.

And when I last spoke here, I said that the police response I witnessed that day was not compassionate, and clearly unsafe. And when Cambridge Police killed a young person, Faisal, who was clearly experiencing a mental health crisis, it was a chillingly familiar and believable picture.

I'm not going to restate the many important things that have already been said by other speakers. But I do want to echo the way that a lot of the time police violence is used as--as an occasion to funnel even more money into the police for training or equipment or supposed enhancements.

And having seen the Cambridge budget for policing rise over the past several years, that seems a strong possibility here.

The City of Cambridge has promised HEART its support and investment, but that has not materialized. We need to de-police our approach to community safety. As Fatema said, it is past time for this change. The Cambridge community has endorsed her over and over and it needs the city's real investment to become fully operational, not just the ARPA funds, which are needed and are overdue, but long-term and

committed funding to sustainably support this work. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Dara Bayer, followed by Betzy Otero.

DARA BAYER: Good afternoon, my name is Dara Bayer. Uh, I grew up in Cambridge, and I am the co-Director of Cambridge HEART. I'm heartbroken to be here today, because I don't think we need to be here today.

Three years ago, in the summer of 2020, people came together and demanded we have an alternative response and demanded that we reallocate funding from the police to other community efforts to keep our community safe.

We have been fighting for that for the last three years and we don't have what we need to make that a reality from this City.

I want to ask for a couple of things that have not materialized from this Council.

One, I want to hear from the Council questions about police protocol. We as a community demand and need to see these protocols to make sure that we have informed, we can make informed decisions about whether or not we want police responses, um, to our domestic issues or any kind of issue

in our community.

We also have seen the increase in the police budget over the last three years, despite our, us organizing, creating an alternative response that we have developed outside of any kind of City support and despite almost full support from the City Council in 2021 voting to fund HEART.

And so I ask, where is your reallocation of funding to actually make it a reality for us to have a true ecosystem of community support and safety that keeps us safe? That doesn't involve guns? That doesn't involve racist practices that hurt us?

I also want us to consider, um, how we can come together, how the City can actually concretely come together and offer support for the communities most impacted by what has happened. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Betzy Otero, followed by Elizabeth Post.

BETZY OTERO: Hi, are you able to hear me?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes, go ahead.

BETZY OTERO: Um, hi, my name is Betzy Otero. I'm one of the Cambridge HEART responders. You know, I'm just gonna echo what everyone else is saying. Obviously this is

something we've been fighting for, for a long time. I agree with Dara, this is something that shouldn't have happened. We shouldn't be here today discussing this. It could have been avoided.

And we just, we just need funds to make it a reality. We are unable to do what we want to do because we don't have the funds to make it happen, unfortunately. And the community is asking for it. The community's asking for an alternative response, so we need to give the community what they want.

Me being a long, a Cambridge resident my entire 39 years of my life, I--I've raised three children here. And I'm fearful from, especially my son's life being a young Black male. And it just, it's not okay. We're demanding for change. And it has to happen today, and now.

Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thanks, Betzy. We will go to Elizabeth Post and then Lorenzo Bradford.

ELIZABETH POST: Good afternoon. It's been just two weeks since this--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Can you make sure that light's on. Sorry to interrupt. Just speak right into the mic.

ELIZABETH POST: Good afternoon. It's been just two weeks since this tragedy and every time I think of it, I think there but for the grace of God go I. For individuals with a serious mental illness in their families, the possibility of a police shooting during a mental health crisis is very real.

Whether emergency service are summoned to assist with accessing medical care, or the individual is behaving bizarrely in the community, the risk is real. The Faisal family is not alone.

At last week's community meeting, so many people asked why the police shot to kill rather than aiming for his hand or leg.

Last year, the Middlesex DA's Office completed its inquest into the January 5th, 2020 police shooting of Michael Conlon in Newton Highlands outside of his apartment. Like Faisal, Conlon was in the midst of a psychiatric crisis and had a knife. The DA's process ended with a certification of no process--no prosecution against the Newton Police.

Of note in the written report of the inquest is a summary of the use of force expert testimony. I'll quote a

line from the report.

"Number one, police are trained for center mass, to aim for center mass, chest/torso, because it is easier to hit the target. The police are not trained to aim for limbs because it is easier to miss and more likely that they may hit a bystander."

Number seven, "Officers are trained to shoot to stop." The Washington Post maintains a database of police shootings with an indicator of whether or not the shooting was mental illness related. It indicates that in Massachusetts there have been 17 police killings of mentally ill individuals since 2015.

While this is a horrific number, it is a dramatic undercount. Two families at last week's community meetings bravely spoke about their own son's being killed during a mental health crisis. However, the Post database inaccurately codes those shootings as not mental health related. Deep systemic changes are needed.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Lorenzo Bradford, followed by Skyler J.

LORENZO BRADFORD: So hello, my name is Lorenzo and I'm a resident of North Cambridge. Like Faisal, I'm also a

student and I'm someone that has struggled with mental health in the past.

Seeing the murder of Faisal angers and saddens me, and makes clear to me that the City of Cambridge is a dangerous place for people facing a mental health crisis. It is a place where someone in need of care and support will receive armed men and bullets in his chest.

This is a city that prides itself on a progressive image, on symbolic gestures to progress but it's failing to do the hard work of committing to real, transformative action that would make sure that future families will not have to endure what Faisal is en--Faisal's family is enduring.

I'm struck by the irony of us having a discussion about training for the Cambridge Police Department right after the City put on celebrations and honored Martin Luther King Jr. It makes me wonder whether the City Council was actually interested in following King's words and legacy or just in performative gestures.

If they really cared, they would know that King reminds us that budgets are moral documents that reflect the values of a society. And in one of his last speeches,

he said of people that spend more money year after year on militarize forces than on social programs are approaching "a spiritual death".

What would King think of Cambridge's \$70 million police budget? What should we all think of a people that continue to pour money into police rather than community?

I'm calling on City Council to move beyond sentimental statements and expensive, ineffective reforms like body cameras, and have the courage and moral backbone to really transform how we care for one another in this city.

HEART points to one way forward. HEART is a product of the community and it offers a way out of the seemingly never-ending cycle of police violence, followed by empty gestures and hearings with nothing fundamentally changing.

If the City Council cares in a meaningful way, it will stop doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. It will start with fully and consistently funding HEART so that Cambridge can respond to mental health crises without men and guns, and so we can have real public safety.

Justice for Faisal must include making sure that this will not happen again. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Skyler J, followed by Sandra Foster.

SKYLER J: Hi, can you hear me?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes, go ahead.

SKYLER J: Hi, my name is Skyler, and I am a Cambridge resident and taxpayer. I hope that this meeting is finally the meeting where the City Council decides to listen to your constituents and to the hundreds of thousands of people who marched for Black lives in summer 2020.

I'm joining with many others here today to demand that the City invest in community-led responses and put an immediate end to any type of police response to people in emotional--emotional distress.

We need to defund the police budget and redirect that money into community safety infrastructure programs such as HEART, the Mass Bail Fund, and Map.

We want--we want alternatives for mental health responses, traffic enforcement and construction details and the housing crisis. Funding for these programs should not come from the education budget, the housing budget or the community maintenance and development category.

Instead, funding for this, for community safety,

should come from the police budget. There should be a marked decrease from this year's budget to next year's budget so that we can all see the true commitment, your true commitment, our true commitment, to shifting from a violent police response team to a community-centered alternative.

Like others have said, Cambridge has roughly twice as many residents as Somerville yet we have a police budget that is four-and-a-half times larger than that of Somerville's. That's \$15 million for Somerville Police versus \$73 million for Cambridge Police.

During the last two weeks, I've talked with many friends and family who live in other cities and states about Arif's murder, and they are pissed. The eyes of this country are watching how you respond to this police murder. It's time to show the country that Cambridge is as progressive as we say we are. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Sandra Foster, followed by Sarah Bayer.

Sandra, could you pull the mic down? Thank you.

SANDRA FOSTER: Oh, thank you. I believe, uh we -- the City should have the police use body cameras. Um, I've

heard the reason that we--they are not in use is because of privacy concerns. Yet since they have been in use in--in other communities, I don't think this has been a problem, or at least I haven't heard it--that it is. So, um, we should definitely do that so when situations like, um, what happened recently to Faisal occur, uh, we will have much more information and understanding of what actually happened.

Um, another thing, uh, that I'm concerned about is I think in this case, the police probably provoked, um, Faisal. First of all, chasing somebody and surrounding them in itself sets up a--a feeling of the person being besieged, or feeling--and then, when something was actually thrown at him that--that was a huge mistake, I think. That is definitely provocative.

Up to that point. He was only from what I've heard, hurting himself and was not at all aggressive, had nothing in his mind about hurting anybody else or defending himself or anything like that.

And uh--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Sandra, for your testimony.

SANDRA FOSTER: Do I have a--a few more minutes.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We have to move on. But feel free to email the remainder. Thank you. Next up is Sarah Bayer, followed by Monica Raymond.

SANDRA FOSTER: Is that it? I, could I just--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Sarah Bayer, please go ahead. You have the floor. Sorry, we're out of time.

SANDRA FOSTER: Is that it?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes.

SANDRA FOSTER: Oh, okay.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: We'll go to Sarah Bayer. Sarah Bayer, please unmute yourself. Monica Raymond, please go ahead.

MONICA RAYMOND: Sorry. Good afternoon. Um, yes, fund the HEART program. That's a good idea. It's not going to solve everything.

Um, I've been living in Cambridge over 40 years. I'd like to be able to call the police and have not some--and make sure that no one is going to be dead at the end of that.

I think about the poor person who called the police,

um, thinking that she was doing a good thing and, um, and would help.

Um, I think we have to, we have to face that with all our diversity training and this that and the other, um, police training that we're supposedly doing and we're supposedly avant garde of liberal policing, we have failed. Our, we are totally failing. We are totally failing. We're in a shameful situation, a shameful and embarrassing situation and tragic situation.

And the police have to, you know, the whole thing has to be revised. They have to stop shooting at the chest. They have to stop, um, shooting to stop someone. They have to stop shooting and killing, um, young people who are in mental health crises. This has to stop. We have to commit to stopping it. Not it's a protocol, blah, blah, blah.

Um, and I was stunned by the inability of the Police Chief at the Martin Luther King School, um, to address this, to express any shame or remorse about the situation. And I think we need a deep, deep change in the Cambridge Police Department. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Next up, we have Matthew Kennedy, followed by Phoebe Whitwell.

MATTHEW KENNEDY: Hi, um, my name is Matthew. I'm a community member and neighbor of Sayed Faisal. I watched the Q&A that took place last week and was disappointed by the lack of answers from the Police Commissioner, the DA and the City Manager.

One of the many questions that was not answered was the names of the police officers who killed Sayed Faisal. The response that was given was that it's not current policy to release the names of those police officers. And I'm calling on you today to demand a change to the policy and to name the officer.

Policies are not set in stone. They are created by people and right now, people are not satisfied with this policy. Laws and department policies are created to serve the public and right now, we have a policy that is protecting murderers.

If it was the other way around, and a civilian killed an officer, their name would already be public, the image would be public, and they would have already lost their jobs.

So I'm asking that police officers be treated just like the rest of the public, name the killers and fire them

immediately.

Secondly, it's time for us to disarm our police. As long as cops have guns on them, there will always be the possibility for people such as Sayed Faisal, who have not been violent, to be wrongly--wrongfully killed by police.

It should not be the norm for every police officer to have a gun on them. On average, three people are killed by police nationwide every day. Every year, this adds up to around 1,000 people, and most of these people had not shot anyone.

We should not be placing the lives of police officers above regular people. If an officer feels unsafe doing their job without a gun on them at all time, then they should not be on the police force. Thanks.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Phoebe Whitwell, followed by L. Elliot Brill.

PHOEBE WHITWELL: Hi, my name is Phoebe. Until recently I lived at 934 Mass Ave, just up the road. I want to share about an incident that happened in front of my building in summer 2020.

Uh, there were two young men walking around on a summer night, at a time when there were very few places

open for them to be. Um, thank you.

They were hanging out on a patio that a restaurant had set up. A police officer came by, told them you can't be here. When they did not immediately comply, they were very quickly and many more police vehicles there, police officers there. Um, the police were not de escalating the situation, they were drastically escalating it. They were not protecting community safety. They were making that situation unsafe for the two young men who were community members that were there. They're protecting property, which is what we see in so many police incidents.

In the 10 years that I've lived in this area I've heard over and over again Cambridge is a leader in progressive policies like gay marriage.

Um, today I want to call on Cambridge City Council to be a leader in progressive policies to live up to that reputation by demilitarizing, de-arming and defunding the Cambridge Police. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to L. Elliot Brill followed by Sue Hale.

L. ELLIOT BRILL: Hi, I'm Elliot. I'm a Cambridge resident. I wanted to echo the question of why are armed

police the default response for every type of call and incident?

The question itself points to two clear pathways for actually serving and protecting Cambridge residents. Police do not need to be armed and police do not need to be the responders to incidents in the first place.

A large and still growing body of research and data, from a wide variety of communities strongly supports the conclusion that unarmed police or even unarmed civilian staff are able to respond safely and successfully to a wide variety of calls, especially calls related to mental health.

A lot of people have called today for disarming the police. But few have mentioned that other countries and other cities have successfully done this.

Doesn't Cambridge claim to believe in research and innovation? Why are we not looking to examples of success in disarming the police and using civilian staff such as Cambridge HEART?

Why is Cambridge still relying on armed police when we have other options so easily and readily available, like Cambridge HEART, as people have mentioned several times

today? There are better options. Let's just follow through on them.

Full transparency of police policies is the bare minimum. Fully funding and supporting Cambridge HEART is the bare minimum. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll move to Suhail, followed by Lee Farris.

SUHAIL: Peace, everyone. My name is Suhail. I live on Hudson Street. I was at the community meeting at the MLK School a few days ago, and was deeply disappointed by the non-answers received from the officials from the City, the Police Commissioner and the DA's Office.

You know, just in the past two years, multiple police officers have left the Cambridge City Police as a result of racist and discriminatory words that were posted. In the last two decades, we've had multiple nationwide instance-- sorry, nationwide famous instances of Cambridge City Police detaining world-famous Harvard, Black Harvard professors.

My question is, why is it that we can't know the names of the police officers that were involved in Arif Sayed Faisal's murder, so that the community can actually know whether these officers have a history of racism, whether

they have a history of abuse of force and police brutality?

The second part is why can't we have the unredacted police report so that we can know where Faisal was actually murdered, and what were the actual circumstances of his murder?

When you refuse to be transparent, when you refuse to offer the details, it really shows to us that the City and the Police Department has something to hide.

As others have stated already, if any of the rest of us, right, civilians, members of the community were to murder somebody else, we would be fired from our jobs immediately, and we would be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

So why is that not the exact same case for these killer cops?

What we really need, as others have said, is to defund, demilitarize and disarm the city police which has this gigantic criminal \$73 million budget and rising. Thank you very much.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Lee Farris, followed by Julia Lee Papastavros.

LEE FARRIS: Good afternoon. I am so horrified and

saddened by the police shooting of Arif Sayed Faisal. We really need to figure out changes so this won't happen again.

I'd like the City to create an independent assessment of police protocols and to plan for meaningful protocol change--changes that reduce the police response to crises like this. I think the police shooting of Faisal shows that the current protocol really needs to change.

Furthermore, after all these meetings, I still don't understand why police feel they need to be armed, particularly in cases like this. I'd like to see more rapid investment in community safety. The current pace is so slow, far too slow.

I think the City needs to fund HEART first with ARPA funds and as soon as possible with a contract that specifies the calls that they will be handling.

I would like the community's, uh, City's Community Safety Program to focus on supervision of contracted community providers, rather than doing the alternative community safety work itself.

Um, this--the program would grant contracts, collect data, facilitate communications and ensure that the goals

are met.

Lastly, I'd like the City to allocate funding to community organizations so they can do independent investigations in cases where there are concerns about police actions. I think this would go a long way to improving public trust in the accountability of the police.

Thank you, and I hope you take action.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Next up, we have Julia Lee-Papastavros.

JULIE LEE-PAPASTAVROS: Papastavros. Thank you. Um, hi, I'm Julia. I'm a Cambridge resident and I live near Porter Square. I also grew up in the area and I'm also UMass Boston student.

When I was 16 and heavily depressed, my parents found me holding a knife to my abdomen. They called 911 because they thought I was going to harm myself.

Armed police showed up without any type of mental health support personnel, and I remember sitting on the steps to my parents' basement disassociated and trembling with adrenaline, as my mom begged me to drop the knife so the police wouldn't shoot me.

If it wasn't for my mom that day, who was the only one

deescalating the situation, I don't know what would have happened.

Today is my birthday. I turned 22. Since that police incident, I graduated high school. I've completed several years of college, and I've simultaneously spent nearly four years giving back to my community at social good organizations and non-profits.

Faisal will never have the chance to turn 22 like me, nor will he have the opportunity to graduate from UMass Boston like me. I think we all agree he deserved to live.

I don't view this as an individual's fault. I view it as a systemic issue. The police force may have mental health training, but they currently act as a jack-of-all-trades, and the City needs to invest in specialized options for residents to access when mental health crises happen.

Funds should be diverted from the Cambridge Police Department's \$73-million budget to fund specialized issues, including increased development of the Community Safety Department, as well as funding for mental health community partners like Cambridge HEART. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Darien Williams.

DARIEN WILLIAMS: Salam Alaikum. My name is Darien

Alexander Williams. I live here in Cambridge off Memorial.

Uh, we've been here before. We've pushed for alternatives. We've had conversations about investing in HEART. And I'm telling you, our Council and city government, that it's unacceptable that here we are, again, asking for many of the same things in the wake of a completely preventable death of a young person. A murder of a young person.

I'm grateful for my neighbors, or to my neighbors, who have shared the numbers about the obscenely large police budget already. And in light of these numbers, I would like to remind you, my neighbors here and the Council, that the police are defunding you from the operating budget, to the resources we have to pour into our community organizations to keep each other taken care of, to the settlements, the lawsuits, the money we raise to support the grieving Feisal family. It is unsustainable and unacceptable.

Patronizing community meetings like the one that we all endured recently are unsustainable and unacceptable.

All of this exacerbates the harm of the direct violence itself. I repeat, this is unsustainable and unacceptable, and we are demanding that you change this so

we do not have to be here again. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Alex Kalsneck followed by Kelly Geddes.

ALEX KALSNECK: Hello, my name is Alex Kalsneck. Uh, I do not live in Cambridge. I have many close friends in Cambridge, and I work in Cambridge as a security guard for an office building.

Um, I had initially wanted to make this comment in regards to police training questions about it and what can be done better. I believe everyone who went before me already spoke much more articulate than I could on that, so I want to--I believe that this, the social contract between the people and the police in so many parts of this country has been shattered.

And I work in security. I work with police, specifically Cambridge Police Department, once every week, maybe once every two weeks.

And when I started working at my office building, I was explicitly instructed by my manager not to call the police unless there was like a literal shooting. You know, these smaller instances where at other security sites I had worked at, we would work hand in hand with the police. I

was explicitly instructed by my first, second, and now my third manager, um, individuals with different politics and different beliefs about the police, but all of them telling me "Do not get the Cambridge Police Department involved.", specifically in regards to the unhoused and their mental health crises in the area.

I work by Alewife, which is where the City of Cambridge likes to funnel it's unhoused population, contain them, and sweep them. And I have seen the police's interactions with them when I get off work at 11:00 p.m. and I see cruisers sweeping under a bridge. These people, they have nowhere to go.

There's no trust anymore, and this is why so many people are--are not asking for oversight. They're not asking for more of an explanation. They're asking for demilitarization and defunding, because nobody trusts many police departments.

And I know for a fact that so many people in Cambridge do not trust the Cambridge Police Department and frankly, they should not until many things change.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We have Kelly Geddes next, followed by Mirage Gill.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Kelly Geddes, if you can unmute yourself, please go ahead.

Mirage Gill, please unmute yourself. You have the floor.

MIRAGE GILL: Hi, yeah, this is Mirage. I'm a Cambridge resident. I've been here for about four-and-a-half years. I think I'm going to tell you, echo everything everyone's said but more directly, I think this is, this murder in specifically, uh, is a result of the failure of the City Manager's Office to urgently and sufficiently support programs, uh, that could have offered alternative non-police and non-corresponder responses to mental health crises.

Over the past couple of years, almost two, three years now, we've been continuously telling you of the--the urgency with which the City Manager's Office needed to allocate public funding away from the Cambridge Police Department and towards HEART. And we know that this death is not an isolated incident.

The City Manager's Office could already have supported HEART when we asked you first, when the City Council asked you first about two or three years ago. And they could have

already, uh, funded HEART and supported its capacity to increase to a level that this call, in particular, could have been answered by HEART and not met with police and guns.

So I think today I'm just asking you yet again to, the City Manager in particular, and the City Council to do what's in their power to immediately allocate more funds, in addition to that recent ARPA allocation towards sustaining HEART as a thriving and well-funded, non-governmental alternative emergency response program.

That's all.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Sarah Beier, followed by Mike Prince.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Sarah Beier, if you can unmute yourself, please go ahead.

Mike Prince, please unmute yourself. You have the floor.

MIKE PRINCE: All right, can you hear me?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes, go ahead.

MIKE PRINCE: Hi, I'm Mike Prince. I represent Cambridge HEART as an emergency responder. I am a person from this community who has lived traumatic experience,

which aids me when assisting a person in crisis.

Being trauma-informed means understanding a person can be extremely elevated or low and still deserve proper human treatment.

Being trauma-informed also means looking at the impact of the police showing up and trying to deescalate a person who may be elevated, and how police often elevate situations historically, really.

So police are trained to use force with violence and are not necessary for every crisis. Sayed he did not have to die, and there was a trauma-informed response--if there was a trauma-informed response, things could have been different.

We don't need the City to invest more money in policing. The City needs to invest in other options for residents to call when they need support.

This is why we want the City to invest in Cambridge HEART and hire more people from our community who can handle these types of calls.

Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Amber Moulton next.

AMBER MOULTON: Thank you very much and--

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Sorry about that, Amber. Please go ahead.

AMBER MOULTON: All right, thank you so much. Thanks. Sending first love and solidarity to Arif Sayed Faisal's family.

Um, as this is a meeting about protocols, I'm particularly keen to hear about what reform is needed to ensure that a 911 call for mental health crisis support actually triggered--triggers mental health crisis response?

But mainly, I want to reiterate what others have said. Um, this should be a wake-up call for the City. We need to listen to what community members, particularly BIPOC community members are calling for, move money out of the police budget and use our discretionary funding to fund mental health crisis teams, fund Cambridge HEART, and support the demands of the Black response to stop over-policing and build a community where everyone thrives and is cared for in our time of need.

And critically, demilitarize our police. I'm particularly disturbed by the messaging from the CPD that shooting someone with quote-unquote "non-lethal weaponry"

is considered a form of de-escalation. Be honest that that is an attempt to subdue someone. That is different from de-escalation. This is evidence of how militarized we've allowed our police forces to become and it's a danger to all of us, as others have noted earlier.

If we're talking about building trust, as Commissioner Elow did during the MLK School meeting last week, please do it on the community's terms. For example, fund Cambridge HEART and insist that the City officials do the hard work of building bridges with those who demand genuine alternatives to policing. Um, wanting to have alternatives to policing should not be a barrier to collaboration.

In this country, our systems of policing and our excessive gun ownership were created to control BIPOC and protect White supremacy. We should all be skeptical of these systems and work toward a culture of care.

Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Naomie, is there anyone who has, who I've--who's come back?

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: That concludes the list of those who signed up.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Okay. Um, Mayor Reeves, um--

FORMER MAYOR KEN REEVES: Yes, ma'am?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: I'm not sure if you--did you sign up?

FORMER MAYOR KEN REEVES: I didn't. I neglected to do that. I would do so if I might.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: I, it's we closed public sign up at 3:30.

FORMER MAYOR KEN REEVES: Oh, okay.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Motion to suspend the rules to allow Former Mayor Reeves to speak.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: On a motion by Vice Mayor Mallon to suspend the rules to take Mayor Ken Reeves at this time, after we closed public comment at 3:30. We--all those in favor say aye. Those against say nay.

The ayes have it. Please continue. You have two minutes.

FORMER MAYOR KEN REEVES: I do thank you for your courtesy in this regard. Um, I'm supposed to know the rules.

Okay, uh, I actually came to testify on behalf of the--can you hear me?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We can hear you.

FORMER MAYOR KEN REEVES: Okay. I'm here on behalf of the Cambridge branch of the NAACP, to say that we really, we attended the meeting at the King School and we're kind of just dumbfounded, confounded at--at the tenor and the many things about that meeting, I could go on. I could go on.

However, the thing that is most profound for us is that this incident, this death really causes us to underscore the necessity of the police department concentrating on the issue of what restraint can be without guns.

I don't think there's a person that believes that that young man should be dead. So, it's the restraint and we're aware that, you know, with stun guns, you can have a heart attack and all of that sort of thing, but we really do expect, we value human life. And that ought to be the principal consideration in all municipal functions, including police.

Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: I want to thank everyone who came to testify today in person and remotely. I'll entertain a motion to close public comment at this time.

On a motion by Councillor Simmons to close public comment, all those in favor say aye. All those against say nay. The ayes have it. Public comment is now closed.

As I mentioned earlier, and I'll repeat it again for those who've, who have joined recently is, the goal of today's meeting is to get factual information about the police department on the table and for the Council to discuss next steps.

As I said, we know there's a DA investigation moving forward. But it's very incumbent on the Council to dig into the processes and procedures that led to this incident, as well as larger systemic questions about policing in our city.

My hope is that we will get through many of the questions that the Council submitted today, but we may not. And in that event, we will continue this meeting and have ample time to go through those questions.

As I said, I organized the questions that were received through in various categories. First one, incident specific. Second one, policies, procedures and protocols. Third category, equipment-specific. Fourth category, Office of Community Safety and HEART Program. And then the next

category is, um, under the Police Review and Advisory Board. And then the final category is Other.

And in the interest of time, I will be facilitating these questions. I have, I know who's asked them and so, um, what I'll do is we'll go through each category. And at that time, I will ask councillors if they have any follow up, given that we have a lot to cover and I want to make sure we get through as many as possible, I'll ask that that clarifying question be very specific. And so that's how we'll continue through today's meeting.

Some of the questions that have come up came in light of the meeting, as most of us were there on Thursday night. So you'll hear very similar questions that all of us presented.

So first, I'll go to the City Manager and the Commissioner. I know that, I think that they have brief statements, and then we'll proceed on to the questions.

City Manager.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Thank you so much, Mayor Siddiqui, and thank you for calling this important meeting. I will be quick, recognizing that we don't have a lot of time.

I was reflecting on the community meeting last Thursday, and I continue to be grateful to everyone who came out and spoke. This is a period of anger and pain and grief in our community, and we are not hiding from it. We are engaging and we are listening. And we are willing to be present in this conversation.

I also really believe that this is part of our vibrant city, that we have passion in activism and protests. And I have been a protester. I've organized rallies and shouted into a bullhorn. And now I find myself on the other side, sitting in City Hall.

We just spent a day honoring and celebrating Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was viewed by so many as an extremist, and I can only welcome the voices of the many people in this room because I recognize that there is a truth underneath, the calling for justice that we need to hear.

I also believe that the world is more complex and messier than any of us would like. We sometimes want to find a simple answer. And I see it in our national politics where there is a desire to flatten the incredibly complex issues that we face, instead of wrestling with the nuance

and the challenges that we must confront together.

We are facing difficult questions about how we balance risk to public safety, risk to individuals who are in crisis who have a weapon, and risk to our officers whose job is to put themselves in danger on behalf of our community. This is not an easy conversation, but it is one that I trust that we can have together, both within the city, with the Council and with our community.

As I process the public comment today, I want to call out that there are oversimplifications that I have heard. A devaluing of the real work that our police officers do every day, and a distance from the leadership of our Commissioner and her team, who have recognized these challenges and have been doing this work for years.

Yet I also hear a lot of truth. Um, I have heard, I have had this conversation with Commissioner Elow and her leadership team, that I recognize we are in a national conversation in crisis of police legitimacy.

There have been so many examples where it is clear that there have been both individual and systemic failures in our policing system, and it's clear to me that we have a tremendous challenge in how to respond to people who are in

mental health crisis and armed.

When I read about similar instances across our state and across our country, it breaks my heart and it is clear that we collectively need to struggle with how to do better.

That's the conversation that we are beginning today, and that I'm committed to following through at the direction of this Council and in conversation with our entire community.

Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Commissioner.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to have us to answer questions on the tragic shooting of Sayed Faisal.

I want to take a few minutes to discuss a brief description of the incident, our department, our training, and our progressive approach to community engagement that dates well over a decade.

On January 4th, 2023, at about 1:15 p.m., we responded to a call of a person later identified as Sayed Faisal, with a large knife, later identified as a cookery knife,

who was cutting themselves, and at some point jumped out of a window, breaking the glass and subsequently cutting themselves both with the glass and the knife.

We responded and attempted to verbally engage Faisal, with the goal of trying to get him to talk to us and drop the knife. For over five blocks we pursued Faisal, trying to get him to speak with us and drop the knife.

When Faisal ran away with a knife, he was refusing all attempts to talk or to stop. And at this point, he was no longer only a threat to himself.

Cambridge is a dense community, and there were several people in the area. We were concerned--there were several people in the area we were concerned about, along with a daycare nearby. We were finally able to contain Faisal in a yard and continue to try to verbally engage him unsuccessfully.

This is when we used our 40-millimeter non-lethal sponge round, that also did not have an impact. This is when one officer used lethal force.

There are a lot of questions about our use of force, and why we didn't aim for a hand or a leg. It's important to add, we train to stop the threat. Aiming for a small

target in a very stressful, rapidly evolving event is not safe or practical. And more likely than not, we will not hit the intended target and may actually injure an innocent bystander.

The number of rounds that were fired as part of the ongoing investigation, and we cannot comment on that at this time.

It's important for you all to know that this is a significant tragedy, we feel it's a significant tragedy for our entire community. We have also worked incredibly hard, been thoughtful and strategic over the years to do all we can to prepare for every possible situation we may face and to keep everyone safe.

Policing is all about the sanctity of human life. And when a life is lost, it's a tragedy on so many levels. We have set the bar when it comes to outreach and engagement with our most vulnerable.

Our Safety Net Collaborative is a national model. Business Insider in 2021 said we set the example when it comes to how to help our unhoused.

We were the first department in the country to participate in Historic Injustices and Present Policing

Project in 2019.

We participated in a national procedural justice study that was published in 2022.

The Cambridge Police Department is just the second agency in Massachusetts, and the third in New England, to receive ICAT training, which is Integrating Communication, Assessment and Tactics.

One of the primary purposes of ICAT training is to help police take volatile situations and make them manageable, and we are really fortunate to have a nationally recognized instructor here with us today.

This training served as the--serves as the next logical step in building upon the foundation that officers have acquired over the years through training such as crisis intervention, defensive tactics, managing aggressive behavior, mental health, first aid and trauma-informed policing.

We trained on use of force four times per year, exceeding the state requirements. As a department, we have--we have taken immense pride and being one of the most progressive, well-trained national leaders in policing that is constantly seeking to grow and improve in our service in

support of the community.

You don't have to look any further that we are proactively, we're in the midst of a complete review and update our policies, procedures, rules, regulations, seeking to obtain accreditation from the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement, which is the gold standard.

And yet we have heard over the last two weeks, that despite this, how does somebody tragically dies, die at the hands of our police?

There are--there is a lot of weight behind that question. There are some very harsh realities with this job. It is, excuse me, it is dangerous. It is unpredictable. And it can result in situations that most of society will never be exposed to or want to be exposed to at any point in their lives.

We are not here today to defend ourselves, but we want to utilize this opportunity to walk our Councillors and our community through some of the realities, and how we have prepared for those realities, and how we are doing everything possibly to prevent an extreme situation like January 4th from ever happening again.

Since 2004, we have responded to more than 2 million calls for service, including just over 124,000 in 2022, which is more than any other year going back.

For years, we have been at the forefront of model policies and trainings, de-escalation and fair and impartial policing became buzzwords following the murders of George Floyd and Michael Brown. We began this training in 2012.

Our use of force policy is continually reviewed to ensure that it exceeds standards and best practices well before other agencies across the country, many who don't even have an active use of force policy.

And one of those trainings now serves as the basis for all of our responses, and that's ICAT training, which is Integrating Communication, Assessment and Tactics. ICAT has had a dramatic impact on our department.

For example, as soon as we implemented ICAT training in our department, we saw an--immediate benefits, including a 22% reduction in use-of-force incidents, and developed a department of culture--a department culture of restraint, with our focus on gaining voluntary compliance, and reducing or eliminating the need to use force.

In 2--in 2--2022, we responded to over 124,000 calls for service and have used force 66 times, which is 0.053%, with the majority of those officers using their hands to gain control of a situation.

Additionally, we have to go back over seven years to our last firearm discharge, and this is where an officer was fired upon by a person and we returned fire. Nobody was injured in this incident.

One of the questions that we receive is how do we, as a--as a department respond to a person who is in crisis? Response to a person who is in crisis or having mental health concerns, we want a person to go to the hospital voluntarily. And there are many times when a person may have to go involuntarily, according to a court order.

In situations like these, we try to slow the situation down. We want to bring in other professionals as we possibly can and when it's safe to do so. We have an example of a barricaded suspect who was suicidal in their apartment by themselves. We stayed there for over 14 hours communicating with them until we were able to safely get them to a hospital without injury.

In 2022, we had more mental health reports than in any

other year going back to 2015. It nearly doubled, and that's when we started keeping track.

Another question is, could this call have been handled by a non-police resp--excuse me, a non-police response? Anytime a request for service involves a crime, a potentially dangerous situation, or a weapon, the call will be referred to the police department, and that is per CAHOOTS.

I will stop here. I know there are a lot of questions. And I have our team here who will also help to answer those questions.

Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Commissioner, you answered some questions high level, and I think some of these questions that we'll ask are a little more specific, so you may have to repeat some of the information.

So we'll start with incident-specific. This is related to the number of responders and the officer's name. So these were by Councillor Azeem and Councillor McGovern.

So as to the first one, the question states, I've heard that there--there were 12-plus officers responding to

this incident. What's the protocol for how many officers respond, and why are there sometimes so many officers involved?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So initially when we get a priority call, which this was, our emergency communications will dispatch a two-person car, a one-person, what we call a report car, and a supervisor. There are also other officers that might be in the--in the vicinity who may, depending on the nature of the call, kind of roll in the direction of the call to see if there's--if anybody needs any additional help.

As this call progresses, ultimately the supervisor is the one who dictates how many people should be at the call. This--this incident, um, over five blocks kind of quickly escalated and other people were in the area who came really as a perimeter to help secure the scene.

Um, but there were not 12 officers that were involved in the interaction with Mr. Faisal. That would have been four or five officers that were immediately involved in the incident.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And there's been a lot of calls to release the officer's name. We believe we heard at

the community meeting that it was City policy not to release officer's name until after the investigation is completed.

Is--is this a City policy passed by the previous Council, Cambridge Police Department policy, or part of the union contract?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So it's not a policy that is in writing. It is, been past practice not to release names. Um, there's no uniform agreed-upon standard.

I think it's really important to recognize that in cases, particularly across the country, where officers names have been released, and I know this is going to be really difficult to hear, but past--when--when there is pretty much egregious rules violations or even potential criminal charges, you have seen the names of officers being released.

In this particular case, and I understand this is difficult, right now, we do not see any glaring, preliminarily, any glaring policy violations. So, and then we still have to wait for the district attorney's investigation, um, to complete.

And after that, the officer's name and all the details

of the incident will be revealed. Until that, we don't, do not have criminal charges pending, there is no discipline pending and we do not see any glaring policy violation.

So for that reason, we are not currently going to release the name of the officer.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And just to confirm, you say there's nothing in writing?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: That's correct. Not to my knowledge.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So I'm going to go to Councillor Azeem and Councillor McGovern for any follow up to their questions, and then I'll open it up on this section before we move on to policies, procedures and protocols. Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you, Madam Mayor. To follow up on my question, could you define the perimeter? Are we talking like, you know, they were in the general vicinity, or at the scene of the incidence when the shooting happened? How many officers were at that specific location?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So that will be revealed in the investigation. Um, the scene spread over

five blocks, um, with us pursuing and trying to get him to drop the knife. So, a lot of that will be revealed in the investigation. I'm sorry, through you, Madam Mayor, uh, that will be revealed in the investigation.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor McGovern.

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Excuse me. Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you.

Um, so I just again, and I think the Mayor clarified it, because we heard at the meeting the other night that it was a poli--it was, it sounded like it was a written policy to not release an officer's name. And I think I got calls after that saying, "Well, if this is a City Council policy, just change the policy."

But you're saying that it's not actually, it's not a policy that was ever voted on. It's not a policy--I kind of thought it was part of collective bargaining, that there's some protocols around, um, releasing names. But that's not true.

So this is something that is a practice more than it is a policy?

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Through you, Mayor

Siddiqui. Um, I think that that's correct, that I don't believe that there is anything specifically written regarding officer shootings.

I think in some ways, um, it is because there have not been so many that we have needed to write a policy. Um, I believe that when--when there's a reference to city policy, the actual policy would be more broad personnel policy regarding releasing names of people who are, you know, being, um, being assessed related to personnel matters.

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Okay. And I think, Madam Mayor, thank you. You know, I think it's really important in terms of talking about transparency, I hope that we can get some written answers to these questions that can also be put online and shared with the community. I'm sure there's a lot of people who aren't watching today.

Because again, I think there's a lot of things that get floated as to, you know, it's sort of like a game of telephone and things get floated as to, to what people are assuming or not assuming.

And I think as concrete as we can be with the community and transparent as we can be with the community on answering these questions and putting that information

out there it's, the better it's going to be. So, I hope that we see that. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: To my other colleagues, any follow up? We'll move to the next section, which is a long section.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Um, sorry--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes, Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: I had a--could I follow up for the second question if that's okay?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Okay, go ahead.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Apologies, I wasn't sure if we were doing question by question.

Um, you, uh, to the Commissioner, or to anyone really, you say that the policy was to not release officer names, because at this point the underlying assumption is that they will, you know, they did not break protocol.

I was wondering if you could explain what the rationale behind the policy is and why it's different based on what your assumption about whether protocol was broken or not?

Like what are, what are you worried about, given that the name will be revealed at the end anyway?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So it's more of a practice, um, and not a policy.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Uh, through you, Mayor Siddiqui. I think, um, I think partly what we are weighing is thinking through, obviously this is not a normal personnel matter. There is significantly more public scrutiny.

And so I can understand the desire for greater transparency. Um, at the same time, I think that there is also just a reality that, um, that level of transparency will increase the amount of public scrutiny and potential harassment to the officer involved.

And I think at this point in time, to the Commissioner's point about, um, whether we ultimately believe that there has been a policy violation or egregious conduct, and whether there is any sort of an internal assessment of whether that has been the case, it does factor it in.

And so I think that is part of how we're weighing this. I think, as we have said, there is an active independent investigation into all of this, and so the name will be released at the end of it.

I think what's important is that at the end of the investigation, there will also be all the facts and a determination on--on whether or not, uh, whether or not the district attorney is going to pursue charges. And I think that is the important information that comes with the release of the officer's name.

I think, given some of the conversations we've even had, I have certainly felt a little bit more discomfort with what the ultimate public conversation would look like if the name is known.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you. And I think the tension that exists, City Manager and Commissioner, is that this process that's independent will take a really long time.

And so, you know, a lot of things can be true at the same time, but we have the reality is, you know, we're balancing that. So that's just a really difficult thing.

So we will move on to the policies, procedures and protocols. The first section is on firearm use.

And Commissioner you've touched on some of this, but I'm going to repeat these questions. These were from a range from Councillor Toner, Councillor Azeem, Councillor

Zondervan, and Vice Mayor Mallon.

What's the policy and training on using firearms?

Why don't police try to shoot a suspect in the leg or arm rather than upper body?

Are you considering any such alternative options in the wake of the shooting?

How many shots are officers trained to respond with? Is this part of standard training?

How often do police use their guns? How often does that lead to a fatality?

In 2019, I attended a portion of a three-day de-escalation training held in CPD headquarters which included a retraining of officers who had been taught in the State Police Academy that they had a certain amount of seconds to fire on someone advancing towards them. There are visuals in the form of a PowerPoint presentation provided by the consultant. Can CBD provide that training PowerPoint?

So those are the, the list of the questions, Commissioner.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you. So I'm going to turn this over to our nationally recognized expert officer, Officer Cam Deane, to answer questions on

use of force. Thank you.

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Good afternoon, Madam Mayor and Council, through you.

In general reference to what you were just asking, and then I can get into the specific questions again, I'm sorry, I don't have them in front of me.

But if we are going to use any type of force that may have lethality to it, there is not just statute, but there's also a case law. Thank you.

The policies follow the case law that the judges from the Supreme Court of the United States, from the Massachusetts Legislature and from the Massachusetts court system has given us. And that is, we are not as police officers just allowed to say we are afraid and therefore we may use a firearm. It doesn't work that way.

The police officers actually are held to a standard where we must articulate and it must be specific, articulate, objective and reasonable facts that they have to outline within a reporting system in which they have to show, throughout the totality of the circumstances, why they believed that an individual posed a risk to either the officer, officers on scene, or to the general public that

was in fact, immediate, lethal, or at least had the ability to be immediate.

And so, before we are even justified in drawing out a firearm, we have to be able to articulate that risk. And the Cambridge Police Department has required, since I believe 2010 or 2011, that anytime a officer points a weapon, even if it's not used at another individual, that must be reported.

And we must report why it was a risk or a threat that we believed this person, or the individual that we were dealing with, or the situation that we were dealing with, posed a risk of lethal consequences or, uh, posed the risk, that the threat would become immediately deadly in some way, shape or form.

Once we form the thought process that the threat has become immediate, meaning it is likely to happen, it's imminent, then we have to decide who it is that--that we're going to -- excuse me. We have to decide what it is that we're going to do to take that action, uh, if we are even going to take that action.

And so why don't we shoot them in the arm or the leg of the upper body? It is well documented, especially under

stress, that human beings have a difficulty in actually getting themselves into a position where they could be that accurate under those circumstances.

Uh, police officers, we trained to the best of our abilities but even in standardized training, when we target practice at the range, uh, the targets have usually a pretty fairly wide berth to them. It's not like every bullet goes through the same exact hole. It's very, it's not a precise thing that we can--that we can always make happen.

So the arms and the legs, especially if they're moving, become very difficult targets. And here in Massachusetts, we have something called round accountability. We have to be accountable that each round that comes out of the weapon was intended to try and stop whatever the threat or continuing threat was.

And so this kind of, response to both questions as far as the number of shots and also why don't we aim for these positions is that one, if a round does get by the arm or the leg, those rounds continue to travel for a very, very far distance. And they can travel through walls, they can travel through fences, they can travel through automobiles.

We want to be certain that if we're using rounds to stop what we believe is a lethal threat to either the officers or the community, that we are not having those rounds go anywhere else to where we intend them to go.

Secondly is, in particular for the legs, we never really want to shoot for the legs because of the femoral artery. It takes just a nick on the femoral artery, it's actually almost more dangerous and more deadly to shoot someone in the leg than it actually is in the torso. They actually have a better chance of surviving.

The other reason is, is that the torso provides the greatest likelihood of us to strike the intended target, lessen the dangerous to the general public, and limit it down to whatever it is that we are trying to stop.

And then, uh, as far as, uh, how many shots are we trained to respond with, and as a standard part of training?

There is no number of shots that we are trained to stop with. It's--it's something where you have to gauge if the action is continuing, do we continue to fire? And it's a reassessment process after every single time you pull the trigger.

So if I fire one shot and the action has not stopped, then I may fire a second. If the action has not stopped then I may fire a third. This is something that we have to be cognizant of the fact that the way human beings think and the way that we look at these situations is, if we want an action to stop, we will stop when that action stops. And that's--that's the way we're programmed.

And I--you can break it down into a simple level which you can watch, uh, any adult or child play a video game. And when, uh, if it's a shooting style game when the thing comes at them, and they continue to press the button even faster and faster, it's--it's a human reaction that you're trying to get an--an action to stop.

So when the action, when the lethality of the action has stopped, then we would assume that the officers would also stop.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And that, I think the training that was referenced was the ICAT training from earlier, Officer?

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Uh, yes. Is that the three day that you were--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes.

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Yeah, so ICAT Training is actually looking at trying to get where, into a position where officers can recognize crisis and recognize situations that we can de-escalate without hopefully ever having to use force. That was the goal of the program.

The goal of the program was officers were stepping into situations for years around this country, but something that if any of us were to step into, you get into close proximity or you walk into a house or a room, and somebody has a weapon that's capable of harming, capable of lethality, it's concerning.

And so as human beings, officers became afraid. And a self-provision, excuse me, a self-preservation, preservation mechanism begins to kick in. In which we say, "Oh, my gosh, I'm afraid." And we begin to do things like say the same things over and over again. We begin to say, "Drop the knife, drop the knife, drop the knife."

When what we've realized through research and training, and ICAT has been researched, and we can get into that at some point. We realized that if we can get officers to recognize through training, "I'm saying the same thing over and over again and nothing's changing in this

situation." We may get them to approach conversationally, the individuals differently.

And we have learned that to start with empathy as a tactic instead of some of the other prior tactics our enforcement had used to corral these incidents, we can start by slowing down the incident by maybe realizing, am I the one that's bringing the level up here? As opposed to, am I the one who's actually trying to calm things down? And we're trying to get them to recognize that on a conscious level.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So my clarifying question is, you're saying this training that exists come from--comes from the state and state-certified organizations and case law.

I guess the question that's coming up is, this is the training that you're saying exists. Are there alternative options that exist or this is just the training that's, it's a set deal?

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: So this training was developed by the Police Executive Research Forum, which is, uh, out of Washington, DC. Uh, it came about in response to, uh, the shooting of Michael Brown in 2014. And then it came,

uh, out in 2016. It was piloted in several agencies.

And what it was designed to do was to try and get police to change their response to incidents involving people armed with weapons other than firearms, or unarmed.

And what we were trying to do is get our officers to slow down the thought process and recognize that not every person who has a weapon in their hand is threatening. That the weapon may be a threat, but they may not be immediately threatening.

And in law enforcement, for years, even when I went to the police academy back in 1998, we were told somebody has a knife, they're an immediate threat. You have to get them to put it down.

Well, what we realized over time is that officers should have been being taught better communication and negotiation skills. And we weren't. We were being taught that the immediacy of that particular object required an action on our part.

And so what ICAT really brought to the forefront was to say, nationally across the country, we need to get better at negotiating. We need to get better at how we enter these conversations. We need to get better at

understanding what the skill of negotiation actually involves. It's about a six-step process.

And what I realized when I went through the training is that I had never really been taught that before. Um, I had been taught it in bits and pieces throughout trainings that we had. But it had not been an all encompassing training that taught me not only how to, uh, how to assess threat properly, and understand what's the difference between a risk and an actual threat? Which is what we're training our offices to try and do, but also how to communicate effectively.

Nobody ever taught me about using empathy as a tactic, saying, "I'm sorry." Saying--not that people should have to be taught this. But when you get into a situation that is very dangerous because a person has some sort of a tool that they could do some serious harm to someone else, serious bodily harm or even death, and you're that only person there that might be able to prevent that from happening, it's a very delicate game that begins to get played. And I think sometimes the self-preservation mode kicks in prematurely.

And so this training was to prevent that from

happening. And it was later research by the University of Cincinnati, it was a pre, post and longevity study done by Dr. Robin Engel, and it proved through this study that was done with the Louisville Metro Police Department in Kentucky, that use of force dropped considerably, 26% use of force to -- I'm sorry. Injuries by the, by the--the people with, in which the force was used had dropped by 26%. And the injury to officers was actually reduced by 36%.

So, for us to come back and say to our agency, not only are we safer if we try not to engage in these use-of-force incidents, but it's better for everybody. I think the--the officers actually wanted that. We don't want to be in these incidents.

And so I think that's what the goal of the training was. And that's why we decided to--to, because of the research, there's no other de escalation training, to my knowledge, in the country that has been researched as well as ICAT. And therefore, that's why we decided to go, because it's research based.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: I'll have follow up. Vice Mayor Mallon and then Councillor Zondervan and then

Councillor Azeem.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you, Madam Mayor, through you, and thank you for explaining the ICAT training. I was actually invited to attend one of the trainings in 2019, because I had a--a real interest in our de-escalation policy back then, and wanting to make sure that we had a really good one in place. And I was very impressed with what I saw.

So ICAT's basic tenet is, the most important thing is that--sorry. It's going from the most important thing is that I go home safely, to the most important thing is that we all go home safely. That's the basic tenet of ICAT.

And their stated focus is incidents in which us subject in crisis is unarmed or armed with a weapon other than a firearm. So this training seems to be training our officers for exactly what sort of happened two weeks ago.

I have a couple of questions. One is the ICAT training, I've spent the last couple days looking at the training manual. It seems like the training is really to slow down. Because the--the first officers on scene or patrol officers or beat cops.

It's to slow everything down and make sure that you

can call in those additional resources, whether it's a negotiation tactic, or someone else who's more well-versed on the team in these types of situations.

I know we can't really get into the specifics of what happened, um, because of the ongoing investigation, but were those additional resources called in? And were our patrol officers able to slow that down long enough for them to arrive on scene?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: I just want to be careful to not, um. What I can tell you, what is already, um, in the media is that we were never able to engage Faisal. We never were able to get him to stop and to engage with us.

Um, and that is when we moved from, okay, let's try to slow it down and see if we can engage and drop the weapon. You know, he's no longer just a--a risk to himself, he's now a risk to the community, and when he was running away with that large knife, and the next move for us was to try to contain what we felt was an ongoing threat to the community, which was what we were able to do, um, in the yard.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you, Madam Mayor.

Through you, I just was reflecting on another situation that was mentioned earlier, around a 14-hour barricade event where there was significant time put into containing a situation.

And so I wonder, you know, I know that a lot will come out of this investigation, and I hope that it is very, um, clear and transparent to the public what happened.

I don't want to take up too much time. But I did want to ask what percentage of our police officers have had this ICAT training?

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Through you, Madam Mayor. We have trained our entire agency. It was, the entire agency was trained in 2019. And then it has been implemented as an added class to the post required curriculum to the training academy. So every new recruit that goes to the academy goes through extensive ICAT training.

They not only go through the training, as our officers got it, but they actually get additional training to help them understand a lot of the concepts that maybe are--you don't understand until you learn them at the police academy. We have to get those first, and then we train them in the ICAT and then we do multiple, they go through

approximately 8 to 12 scenarios where the ICAT training only requires three.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Okay, thank you. So it's safe to assume that almost everybody has been trained and everybody who was on scene that day was trained in ICAT?

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Every member of our agency so far has been trained, unless the--there's somebody that I'm not aware of, but.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Okay, thank you, Madam Mayor. I yield back.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor, through you. Guns are very dangerous. I actually took a gun safety training course many years ago and we were told, "If you're going to fire gun at somebody, you aim for their torso." just like you said.

So what does that tell us? The problem is not the training, it's the gun. Based on some research that, uh, someone did for me of local news reports going back more than a century, it appears -- and I could be wrong about this. So please correct me -- that Cambridge Police Officers have only discharged their weapon in the direction

of a human four times since 1934.

There were two non-fatal shootings in 1934 and 1937 by the Cambridge Police that were reported in the newspapers. Daniel Furtado was shot and killed by Cambridge Police in 2002. And Arif Sayed Feisal was shot and killed two weeks ago.

And in both of the recent fatal shootings, the victim was experiencing a crisis. Did I miss any? Are you--you aware of other shootings by the Cambridge Police? Fatal or not fatal?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELW: Seven years ago, we had an incident where we responded to a break-in and a en--a B&E, a breaking and entering. Uh, there was a person on scene who had a firearm. He fired once at the officer, the officer did return firing once and, um, nobody was struck or injured in that case.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you. Through you, Madam Mayor. So if we add that we have five shootings by the police in 80 years, and the two where someone was in crisis, that person was killed.

So it doesn't seem like the Cambridge Police really has a reason to fire a gun at someone other than killing

people in crisis. And Cambridge Police are currently the first responders to people who are self-harming with a knife. You just--just confirmed that right? If somebody calls 911, somebody is harming with a knife, the police are going to respond.

In that context, and based on what you just explained to us about ICAT training, having that first responder having a gun is not necessary, right?

Even as you said, if the situation transforms where you feel that the community may now be in the--in some danger, you're creating a perimeter to protect against that. But the people who are engaging directly with this person who's in crisis, why do they need to have a gun?

It's more dangerous to--to that whole situation that this officer goes into it with a gun.

So--so my question is, how do we transform our approach to public safety so that when we get that 911 call, we're not sending someone who is armed with a gun?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So before we move to that question, I know that there are a few folks who have to leave. Um, but I know when we had been scheduling this, we had said this could go over.

So I will entertain a motion to extend the meeting by one hour, and then we will find a, we have, we're looking for time for next week and the week after discussion.

Yes, Councillor Simmons?

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Mayor. First of all, thank you for calling this meeting and the opportunity to have the--the Council and the Committee engage in conversation about our community a good one.

I kind of had a hard stop at 5:00. I will try to--I'm going to vote to extend. But I don't want the Council or the audience to think I'm dismissing them because I have to take my leave before that. So I just wanted to say that before we took the vote, I didn't want anyone to misinterpret my leaving.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Councillor Simmons. Councillor Toner.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Madam Mayor, thank you. I'm in a similar situation. I definitely want all these answers. I do look forward to, uh, seeing them in writing as well and I'll be watching the tape after and hopefully we can have further meetings as well. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: One more, I'm sorry, Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes, Councillor Simmons.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: So it is your intention not to adjourn, but recess so that we'd be able to pick up where we left off? I just want to get a sense of what your intentions are.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: And I think it's important for people that might be listening, and a lot of folks that I knew that might have wanted to come or at least listen in, you know, couldn't. So I want to be able to inform them what we might be doing.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes. So, as I said earlier, there are a number of questions and there has to also be discussion by the City Council. And so my--my full plan is to go to 6:00 and then we will--will recess and then we'll continue the discussion and follow up that--that exists, because this is not going to be wrapped up.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Okay, very good. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So on a motion, I'll entertain

a motion by the Vice Mayor to extend the meeting for an additional hour. All those in favor say aye. All those against say nay. The ayes have it.

So Councillor Zondervan asked, um, the question was, how do we turn transform our approach to public safety so that we're not confronting people in the situation with armed police officers?

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Through you, Madam Mayor. I--I think what the Commissioner wants me to speak about is, there has been a term that's been thrown out there in the past called the 21-foot rule. It was trained for years. It was something that was an informal experiment that a sergeant from Salt Lake City Utah did in the basement of a police station.

In which he was trying to get officers to understand the risk of facing somebody with an edged weapon in particular in that one, and what distance could that person reach you before you'd be able to recognize that they're coming at you, that you'd be able to formulate a plan of response which may be draw your firearm or to run or whatever that would be and to put that plan into action.

He discovered it was approximately 1.3 to 1.7 seconds,

and he averaged it at 1.5. But it was a non-scientific study. It has been looked at over and over again over time.

And one of the things that we wanted to make sure in Cambridge that we got away from, and we did in 2007 and I don't believe it's ever been taught since then, since I started teaching there, is that there is no universal distance that makes it okay to shoot somebody. There is no universal distance.

The threat is subjective to the totality of the circumstances. And so when we're talking about somebody, sending somebody in that's potentially unarmed, when we know that there is the risk of a weapon being there that could cause lethality, what we're doing is, we're setting them up to know that if they're going to get into a position where they may be able to successfully engage with this, they have to understand what would be the appropriate reactionary gap if I was unarmed.

And this 1.5 seconds, reaction time has been standardized through traffic crash investigation. It's the standard for NHSTA, the National Highway Safety and Transportation Administration. 1.5 seconds is also what they use as a standard for operators of motor vehicles when

we're calculating reaction time prior to a crash. It's a standardized thing that has been studied over and over again.

And so what we've learned through the research studies involving human movement is that approximately, in the latest study that was done just a few years ago on this, a person of average physical ability can travel upwards of 33 feet in the first five to six steps, they can be at 15 feet, and in 1.5 seconds. So that's a very quick amount of time.

And if the person there is not prepared for what they may be facing, that person might be able to reach them, or that threat may change very quickly to an unarmed individual.

What we train as far as--I don't want to skip over, excuse me. So may change to an unarmed individual. Uh, they have to first see that the threat is coming or see whatever is changed, then they have to decide what they want to do. So it's about 0.5 seconds for them to recognize what it is that they're that--they're now witnessing. It's about 0.5 seconds for them to make a decision as to whether or not they're going to turn and run? Are they're going to try and

protect themselves and put their hands up? And then it's about 0.5 seconds for them to put that plan into action.

And so at that time, the studies have started it informally at 21 feet. And then another study came out and said it was 27 feet, and then it was 29 feet, and now it's all the way up to 33 feet.

Um, the point of that, though, is that if we, if we send someone who was unarmed to go face off with an armed individual, and we don't have any way to mitigate the potential of harm that may come to that person, we are potentially setting them up to get hurt. And that's-- that's, I think, when we talk about why do armed police officers go to these particular types of calls when this is the threat? It's because they're unpredictable.

Especially when you have somebody in situation or mental crisis, we--we don't want to have an officer get themselves into a unwinnable spot where they have come there. They're attempting to, uh, or even a--an unarmed person that's with them, put them into a position in which they don't understand the risk that they're stepping into, just based off of, uh, what humans are capable of.

Uh, with ICAT in particular, and one of the things

that we try and train our officers, is that we--we are not having the officers come up with--with the guns out.

That's one of the things that we're talking about is, we have somebody that may cover them off to the side, we call it a cover officer. But we're actually recommending that when there's not an immediate threat, that the officers holster their weapons and attempt to engage the person in dialogue, while another officer somewhere along the line is ready in case that threat does materialize.

But we're not looking, it's very difficult to negotiate pointing a weapon at somebody. We don't want to negotiate that way. It's not how we're training our officers to negotiate.

But we also don't want to step out of the reality that anyone that has some sort of a weapon in their hand or something that could be seen as a weapon or used as a weapon, we have to assess the risk and the threat of that, using whether or not they have the means, whether or not they have the ability, the opportunity and the intent. And that's the four ways that we assess risk. And based off of that would depend on how we respond to that particular situation.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: And if I can just quickly, Madam Mayor through you, just give some recent examples--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Commissioner, I'm sorry. I'm going to just move it along. But go ahead, Councillor Zondervan, and then go to Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor, through you. I--I appreciate where that answer is coming from, but it's part of the problem. You know, fires are dangerous and unpredictable and we send firefighters properly equipped into that situation to save people's lives and property. We don't send them with a gun. Because shooting at fire doesn't make any sense.

And--and the answer that you gave is very focused on protect--the officer protecting themselves. And I understand that.

But if we had a public safety system, where people are trained, and they understand that they're going into that situation to save lives, not only to or primarily to protect themselves, then it should be possible for them to carry that out.

Not always. But, you know, the same is true for

firefighters. Sometimes they--they get hurt or they die on duty, but--but that they accept that risk as part of their job.

And apparently, we are not doing that, right? We're sending people in who are armed and trained to defend themselves and the public. But the answers you gave are all about "Is this person a threat?"

But in a situation like this, where the person is self-harming, they're primarily a threat to themselves. And so we should be sending first responders to rescue them, to save their life. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Just quickly, if I can add that, um, there is not a co-responder model in this country that would send a social worker or an alternative response in with an armed person in crisis.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And we'll--we have some questions like that coming up so we can also answer--

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Through you, Madam Mayor, if I can just make one comment on that which I, I agree with you in the sense that the sanctity of human life is really at the center of what we want to do as police. And I, I absolutely believe that.

I believe in the training, that we don't want just the police to go home. We want everybody to go home. It's better for everybody if we do not have a fatal encounter with anyone in society. And that's why I train so hard to try and train our officers to do that.

Um, just the one comment I wanted to make on that was I am not saying in any way shape or form that it is simply just the police that we're worried about.

The--the realities is that the sanctity of human life has three parts to it. When we're at an incident. It's the subject, the officers and the community as a whole. And so we do have to be concerned if we are not able to protect any one of those three entities that we have prepared, when one begins to out-balance the other, how--how are we going to make sure that we allocate our resources or do the things that we need to do to mitigate that risk or that threat to those other parties?

Because we are responsible for all three. And that's where the--that's where a lot of the confusion comes in is that even when it's not a direct threat to the officer themselves, we have these two other entities that we have to take into effect.

And as much as we may not want to engage with the subject, we also have that third component of the public that relies on us to keep them safe. And if that person was to harm a member of the general public, we'd be also be having this sort of same conversation as to, "How did we not--how were we not able to handle that?"

So it is a very complex issue, and I appreciate your comments on that. I appreciate the fact that I think we are all on the same page, that we would like to see this never happen again.

Um, I think we're trying at least from the perspective of getting our officers to recognize that we can put our weapons away. We can negotiate in certain situations, as long as we are not imbalancing the risk to the three.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Madam Mayor, could-- could the officer state his name, because I didn't catch it earlier?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Could you state your name?

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Through you, Madam Mayor, Cameron Deane.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Officer Deane, thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I have two questions. One is, um, you mentioned that someone might fire multiple bullets, in which case, they would fire one, reassess and re-evaluate. Fire another, reassess and re-evaluate to see if there was a response in the potential subject.

Um, and then, you know, I understand we can't comment on the facts of the case. But, you know, and so we can generalize this.

But you know, from what's been talked about in the public, we talked about one sponge round being shot. I was wondering, why would it not be the case of if you fire one non-lethal round, you wait and reassess, and then fire a second or a third, rather than switch to, uh, you know, lethal bullets?

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Through you, Madam Mayor, that's a fantastic question. I appreciate that.

One is, is non-lethal, um, tools that we might have, it takes time for that reload to happen. So if we don't have multiple, which we--we did not have two or three different options on scene, we had the one less lethal,

that was, when that's deployed, it has to be opened, a new projectile needs to be put in, it needs to be closed, we have to pick up, aim again. Again, all that takes time.

Again, I'm not commenting, because I actually don't even know the specifics of this case. Um, I'm, over at the police academy, and I'm not privy, I haven't been briefed or anything on it.

But I can tell you from a general perspective, had there been enough time, that may have happened. Had we had more options, we may have gone with the sponge round, and then maybe a different option if we had that there, before we ever would have tried the firearm.

The firearm for us is a last resort, uh, again, because of that whole, uh, wanting to make sure that we are preserving the sanctity of human life.

We do not want to shoot a firearm, unless it's absolutely necessary to do that, again, to protect those three entities. And when that becomes out of balance, we sometimes, uh, we have to make that--that tough decision.

The sponge round itself, just so that there's clarity on that. We may get into this in a minute. But the non-lethal forms that we have to potentially stop an action,

uh, are never 100%.

Nor is a firearm ever 100%. You could go on to the Medal of Honor website and in read about hundreds of soldiers who have been shot multiple times and did heroic things and still lived. There's no option that is "the option". But we don't want to take one that has the potential of lethality unless we absolutely have to, if we get to that point.

But the speed of the incident is what would dictate that. It depends on how quickly it happened, and whether or not there was even an ability to go to another option.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you. I think that, you know, because we are shorter on time, I'll leave that there. But I was--I hope that we can revisit this part of the conversation and talk about, you know, how we can make more non-lethal options more effective.

My second question is, you know, one that I wasn't sure to ask but just because it's been said a couple of times. You've said, now said that Faisal was a threat to the community. I was wondering if you could explain why you thought that was? Or why in a higher-level scenario, that might be the case?

And just the second part of the question. You've mentioned that, you know, initially there was a person with a knife that was running away. In general cases, if you know, they are not responsive, and they're running away with a weapon, uh, what is the response? If they're, like simply just running away? Yes.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So that is considered--so when, um, Mr. Faisal ran away, he was no longer--with that knife in distress, there were concerns about him being a threat to the general public.

We couldn't just walk away from that scene. We tried several times to engage him to contain him. They were jumping, you know, fences were being jumped. We tried to engage him over five blocks, where people were out, this is a very dense neighborhood. Um, there was not an option for us just to leave and allow him to continue to jump, you know, fences or engage and potentially hurt somebody or kill somebody with this, um, double edged weapon.

So it was not an option for us to leave that scene or to not pursue him as he's running through Cambridgeport with this large knife.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Um, so just to generalize

this, and I just want to make it clear that in this scenario, I'm not talking about the specifics of the case. If someone is running away with a knife, and they're not being responsive, and we've heard that, you know, the officer probably followed protocol in this case.

Is there no other solution than to shoot them if they're not being responsive and not putting down the weapon?

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Through you, Madam Mayor Just so it's clear, and Officer Deane had spoken about it, um, earlier. There's laws that control when officers can use certain force.

So with police reform, now going on two years, there's both statutes and regulations that control when officers in Massachusetts can use lethal force.

So when an officer is assessing a situation, and they see that someone is only a potential harm to themselves, they are not allowed to use lethal force.

However, when assessing the situation, and an officer believes that the individual's in imminent harm to either the officer or the public, that is a situation by statute and regulation when an officer can use a lethal response in

that situation.

Additional, be--beyond any of the safety to the public, which is obviously first and foremost, also have to consider the type of weapon in this particular case.

And I know the district attorney had commented earlier on the type of weapon that it was. In this particular case, that would be considered a per se dangerous weapon, which is also a felony offense in Massachusetts.

So yes, you're dealing with a call potentially of a person in crisis, who is out holding a weapon. And certainly there's concern for the safety of the public and the responding officers. You also have criminal activity that they're responding to as well.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you, Madam Mayor. So I don't really have like a concluding, like, emotional reaction to it. But what I'm just hearing, I just want to make sure I hear it correctly, just to summarize.

Is that like, if you have someone with this sort of weapon they are, and unless you put it down, this was the proper response to this sort of situation?

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: In a general term. They don't

have to put it down. We actually wouldn't shoot them for not putting it down. It's whether or not whatever the action, uh, that the individual took, or whatever--or whatever it is that the individual did when the officers on the scene perceive that the--the risk has now turned into an immediate threat to either themselves or the general public, they can take an action.

And the first action was to take a non-lethal shot with the 40-millimeter foam round, it was not a gunshot. And then when that failed, if the threat in their eyes had not stopped, or was--or was continuing. Or that threat again, before we use lethal force, we have to articulate and the officers are going to have to articulate why they believed that it was imminent. Why the threat was imminent, not--not, I just thought it was going to happen, why it was imminently going to happen before we are even allowed to use lethal force.

Had that not been the case, the officers potentially could have shown up, saw that he had the large knife and shot him right then, which we didn't do.

As a matter of fact, in general, that's not going to be the concept unless we show up and there actively

committing some sort of a threat with that particular tool.

So that's, that's sort of in a general term. It's not how we respond to the call every single time someone has an edged weapon.

And I'll use just a quick example of, if I have a older mobility impaired, somebody who has a wheelchair or-- and they have a knife in their hand, even if they're yelling threats at me, if I don't believe that they could ever have the opportunity because I could just move or walk away, or if I don't believe that they would ever have the ability to come at me with that weapon, I would not be justified in any way shape or form in using lethal force simply because they had a per se dangerous weapon.

So we have to always, as police officers, our risk assessment process is first do they have the means? And if they have the means, then what do we have that can counter that tool of mechanical enhancement, is how we would refer to that.

And then, whether or not they have the ability and the opportunity? And then the last thing would be, do they have the intent? If they have the means but they're just saying "Get away from me, get away from me." Then we're also not

going to shoot them at that point in time.

It's--it's not the preferred response and it's not the trained response. The trained response is when the threat becomes imminent, we then have that decision to make.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you. I yield.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So we'll move on to another question around, what's the standard protocol for a mental health case where the person has a weapon? In how many mental health cases where someone is armed with a knife does an officer or someone standing by get hurt?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So for us, the standard protocol for somebody who is in crisis is first to try to communicate, um, and get voluntary compliance. Trying to establish communication, we want to slow things down as much as possible, bring in additional resources, you know, when it's safe to do so, and do everything we can to again get voluntary compliance.

Um, with this weapon or no weapon?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: When they have a weapon.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Yeah, when they have a weapon. Um, and I'm going to turn it over to Officer, um, Deane to--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And so in how many mental health cases situations where somebody has an--has a knife, does an officer or someone standing by get hurt?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Can I get to that one before I go?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yeah.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So, so just I have a few examples just from 2020, December 31st, 2022. Three NYPD officers were attacked by a man with a machete.

December 2022, two Long Island officers were stabbed with a Rambo-style knife after a call from a social worker who was conducting a wellbeing check. One of the officers were stabbing the check--chest through his bulletproof vest.

Um, uh, November 2022, LAPD officers stabbed in the hand. Sus--suspect tried to stab her in the neck and face, responding to a mental health call.

October 2022, a Dayton officer stabbed in the neck while responding to a mental health call. Mother called to report her son was delusional.

January 2022, a Springfield officer were stabbed in the face after responding to a man with a history of mental

health issues with, um, a knife who threatened somebody.

November 2021, Boston police officer stabbed in the neck while responding to a domestic call--call.

And lastly, August 2020, three Saugus officers were stabbed at responding to a call over a rental vehicle. So that's just some recent examples.

Officer Deane.

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Madam Mayor, if I just may relate to you and the Council, prior to joining the Cambridge Police Department in 2004, I was a police officer in the City of Medford from 20--or 1998 to 2004. Just before Christmas in 2002, I was stabbed seven times in the back by an individual with a box cutter in a mental health crisis call.

I did not have anyone there with a firearm, I did not take my firearm out because I felt like I could deal with this individual. This individual very quickly walked away from me. I attempted, as somebody asked over here, uh, to give them that space to walk, I was inside of a Stop and Shop in the City of Medford. They went through the double swinging doors into the back. And when I pushed the door open, they came out and attacked me with the box cutter.

It is a very scary thing to encounter somebody with a knife like that. It's also, I thought I was getting punched, I was actually getting stabbed in the back. Uh, I was able, through what I will call survival, fight off this attack without ever drawing my firearm and managed to take this individual into custody.

But to say that we should be putting people into those positions to face someone like that, I can tell you from personal experience where I tried to give the benefit of the doubt to this particular individual and I almost lost my life because of it. It is something that will sit with me forever. It's an incident that I have not forgotten, I can still picture the individual to this day. And I can tell you the sequence of events in that traumatic moment over and over in excruciating detail if anybody wished to hear it.

But I can tell you as I sit here, it's what formulated my desire to train better as a police officer. It's what formulated my desire to make sure that officers are doing what is best practice.

And no, do I believe that we need to be using lethal force on all these people? I was able to subdue this

individual without using lethal force. But I want to say that that can't be the only option. Because it was scary, and had it not been for, back then we were allowed to wear leather jackets and also my bulletproof vest, it was a four-inch box cutter that came out of the front, it went through the leather jacket, through the padding, through my bulletproof vest and got me in the back but only about maybe an eighth to maybe a quarter-of-an-inch deep on all seven wounds.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So I--folks are welcome to share comments. But, so since we have so many questions, I just want to stick to the question.

So Commissioner, going back to your answer, um, the cases that you just mentioned, they're all--they're all outside of Cambridge? Just wanted to clarify. I just want to make sure.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELW: That's correct.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Okay. Councillor Azeem, you asked this question. Do you have any follow up?

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Yes. Just one quick follow up. This kind of connects with a point that you made earlier. Which is, you know, a potential subject can move

very quickly. They, uh, police officers can find this a frightening situation and repeat the same thing multiple times, and that you wait to see a response in the subject before changing action.

I was wondering, what are your expectations for a subject who's potentially experiencing mental health issues and, you know, police officers are trained for these sorts of situations, and they can still find it very frightening. But someone who's potentially experiencing mental health issues, and has not been in the situation or trained for it before and can find a police officer very frightening? What are your expectations for them and how quickly they respond, and how--and how quickly they respond and how they handle the situation?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So through you, Madam Mayor, I just want to be clear about the question.

So the question is, if the police respond to somebody who is in crisis, who is not used to or might get, I think the presence of the police could exacerbate, right, the situation? How do we respond if somebody doesn't respond to us in a favorable way? Like do we withdraw from the situation?

Is it--would that be what you're asking?

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Yes.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So I think it really depends and I'll--I'll turn to Officer Deane, but it really depends on the set of circumstances and if there is a, an existing threat.

OFFICER CAMERON DEANE: Through you, Madam Mayor, that is correct. The situation would dictate a lot of elements. Again, we have to consider that triangle of risk to the community and to the officers and to the individual.

But we also, we want our officers to not rush into situations. And we ought to understand and we use something called the critical decision-making model. It's the thing that we train them in. It's a five-step model. And it just shows a thought process when you're critically thinking,

But one of the blocks in that model is, am I equipped to handle this myself or do I need additional resources? And additional resources oftentimes, I've done this myself on calls, we recognize that if we can just con--when I say contain, if we are able to at least reasonably preserve the safety to the general public, we may not engage with them at all. And we may call an ambulance down, and we may start

with that route. And we may look at what additional resources.

Oftentimes, we have called into our, um, our family justice unit or--or some of these other units when we've had juveniles that are in crisis that we know some officers are more familiar with. And we want our officers to know those resources.

And one of the things that we've been trying to train, because it's not consistent across the US it's not consistent across Massachusetts even, is many police officers don't even know what options they have. They don't even know what resources are available.

Our officers understand that we have the best team. Our officers understand that we have resources within the agency that might be able to come out.

The goal of a patrol response is to stabilize. That's all we're looking to do. And if we can't safely engage, there's no need to as long as there's no threat being presented. So we can, we've had situations where officers have simply just kind of hung around and waited for somebody who is just hanging out, they're not doing anything, they're not really proposing a threat. But we

know that we have, let's say a, um, a involuntary hospitalization form in which they're going to have to go to the hospital involuntary. Or, they're such a threat to themselves, that we know that they're going to have to try and be seen at a local medical facility.

We in Cambridge, I know from training these officers, the officers are being trained that that is the first option. The first option is to simply contain and if we can get the resources on the scene, then we'll do that. But the first step in trying to figure some of these things out is we arrive, and we have to assess risk. And then once we assess the risk, the best option sometimes maybe just to watch the person until we can get more resources there that--there's all types of things that we can go into.

So I don't know if that exactly answers your question, but.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I just wanted to say that answers the question for now. I just want to say that this is a difficult conversation. Because what I'm hearing is that like, oh, when they have like a double-edged blade, even if they're running away,

um, and like still not letting it go, like that can potentially be fine where they don't end up needing to get, you know, shot at.

And if they're having mental health crisis, we just like will try to stabilize the situation. You know, we have protocols for this.

And yet, you know, from what we know so far, like that was not what happened in this case. And I think it's really hard because, you know, there's, you know, if we asked specifically in this case why that didn't happen, we don't have the details in front of us.

And so I hope that, you know, as you know, so I guess when we do get those facts in front of us, we can do this again, and re-evaluate and go over the situation with the details in front of us. And ask, like, why it didn't play out in as these scenarios would entail?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Commissioner,

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Okay, through you, Madam Mayor. So one thing that I really wanted to say is the importance of our outreach and community engagement, and try to identify early people in our community who could be struggling with mental health issues. We don't want to

wait for people to get to that crisis point.

We have a clinical support unit, we have social workers, we have been working really diligently to proactively, you know, identify and intervene early in people, on people in our community that have been struggling with mental health issues, so we don't get to this critical point.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So on that question that Councillor Nolan asked, we have a staff social worker on the police department staff. Why wasn't that person deployed? And you mentioned something about CAHOOTS? Can you mention that again?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Yep. I just want to, through you, Madam Mayor, I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Barrett, who is the head of our clinical support unit, who is here remotely. Dr. Barrett.

DR. JAMES BARRETT: Thank you. And through you, Madam Mayor, um, we have two licensed clinical social workers, on--on staff at the Cambridge Police Department.

Um, we have a case follow-up model with our social workers, which is different from the co-response model, which I'll touch on in a second.

But basically, our social workers try to work in conjunction with officers. They managed over 1,360 cases last year. That's not individuals, that's police incidents, that then was turned into a mental health case to follow up on.

So they're not co-response meaning that they're not stationed in cruisers. Um, but that doesn't mean they're not in the community, as I'm sure everyone on this meeting has seen them in outreach, doing visits with follow-up officers, follow-up visits, excuse me, with officers.

I've been out with officers. We have gone to active scenes, as long as it's not a crime scene and as long as there's no physical danger present.

And that, when we're talking about to echo what Officer Deane said, when we were talking about deploying non-sworn civilians, safety is kind of paramount, and who will be the first to engage that situation. And that needs to be assessed by the officer.

In fact, in November of this year, we started talking with the Department of Mental Health about what it would look like to start a co-response model in Cambridge as well. They, DMH has the state contract for co-response

clinicians and is managed through a technical resource center in conjunction with William James University.

And at the--at the top of their decision tree, when it comes to a co-response clinician, meaning clinician that is always in a police cruiser, and able to respond on scene, is that the officer needs to deem first that that situation is safe for that clinician to approach.

And, you know, in the CAHOOTS, so the Massachusetts model, that's their statement that they use. The officer makes the determination.

The CAHOOTS model actually spells it out a little bit in their materials where they say, not an active crime scene, and not a person posing a danger to themselves or others, a physical danger, and not a medical emergency.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Nolan, did you have follow up?

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Thank you just I--I understand that they wouldn't be in cruisers. But one of my questions is, in this situation was clearly from my understanding from what we know of the first call, it was a mental health issue. Whether the answer is that we--we would never deploy after the fact when a call came in, in

this situation, in this type of situation, even if it's mental health.

That because a perceived danger was involved, that means this would not have happened?

Or I guess we'll get to a question later on is, would it have been different if we had a different co-responder model? But I believe that's a further, that's a later question.

DR. JAMES BARRETT: And through you, Madam Mayor, just to answer that question. One thing that's important is when these calls come in, although someone may say it's a mental health call or, you know, this call, as we know, came in a person who had come through a window with a large knife cutting themselves. So we can clearly assume there's some kind of distress going on in that call.

Um, but once we have the situation of, uh, a weapon present, and a person actively bleeding, the first response would not be a clinician responding to that scene, whether it's our current model, or if we had a co-response model in place.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And while I think, you know, some of the topics coming up are probably going to take

longer, while we're on that category of, you know, Office of Community Safety and HEART program. That was your, the question that you had asked, and there was an additional question about, why hasn't the Community Safety Department been staffed up yet for the December briefing?

And Councillor Nolan, you also wrote that HEART's been able to hire and train many alternate responders for their program.

City Manager, can you give us any next steps on where we are?

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Yes. Through you, Mayor Siddiqui, regarding HEART, we continue to be in conversations with them. I don't have substantive updates since last Thursday regarding progress there. I think we continue to be working with them.

Um, I would comment I would report out I suppose more publicly, I did email the Council and say that regarding the City's efforts on both community safety and also potential partnerships with HEART, um, I have been reflecting since beginning conversations with HEART in the fall.

I had conversation with them in October, November and

then met with them actually last Thursday. Um, and so there has been a lot of engagement, to better understand what the context was. I was coming in new into many conversations, and also to chart a path forward.

I've been reflecting on, on--on how we think about situating community safety and alternative response within the City's departments. I think certainly from the conversations we had last Thursday and the public comment today, uh, there is a real conversation about that alternative response being further away from the police and the public safety department.

We--we have structured it initially as efforts that were housed within Emergency Communications, so the 911 call center. And I have greatly appreciated the work that Christina Jacoby has done to lay out many of the foundations for our Community Safety Department.

But I also recognize that it is a little bit difficult to think about some of that alternative response sitting ultimately within what is part of the public safety infrastructure.

And over the last week, we've--we've made the decision to move that out. And so Liz Speakman, who is our

Coordinator for Gender and Domestic Violence Prevention is going to lead some of the efforts in the interim, while we--while we explore both these conversations with HEART on funding, and what the partnership might look like, and then also, working on community safety.

I would say in regards to community safety, I know that that has been a big area of conversation over the last, uh, the last two weeks. It is deeply regretful that we have not been able to move more quickly. I think it continues to be an effort that is a priority and that we really want to re-commit to and I hope to be able to provide more, more progress updates shortly.

But I think there is a level of just putting this in the right place within the City that I think will help orient our efforts better. I think it does align better with the spirit of many of these efforts, and certainly with a lot of the conversations that we've been having with our community.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillors, do you have any follow up? Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Thank you. I appreciate it's challenging. I think what we're all hearing and

knowing is that HEART has actually trained and hired many, many, many people in our communities to do this work.

And I, what we're hearing is that because of an inability of the City to hire the leadership of this new department, we have not actually been able to even do the contracts or do the--the RFP for proposals for use, for working with HEART and other providers.

So I--I understand, I hear it's very challenging. We have heard all over the place that it's very difficult to get certain hires. And yet, we also, the--the urgency around the fact that another group has actually trained and hired a lot of people that we hope that we would eventually bring in.

So--so--so let's take that frustration and urgency and really move forward. And I also appreciate your talking about ensuring that this department is sitting in a place that is going to respond to some real concerns about how it is that, that the structure can be in place that it is separate and apart from some of the--that which is a difficult decision.

I recognize you stepped into something, frankly, let's be honest, that was--was, what was a culture that would--we

would not be having that conversation, I believe, that decision six or eight months ago. And this culture shift is going to be very hard and painful for some of the people in the community all around. So I appreciate that. And yet I'm also frustrated.

Thank you. I yield, Mayor Siddiqui.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And the Vice Mayor, and then Councillor Zondervan.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you, and thank you for the update. I know we received it last week. And I'm--Liz Speakman is here with us today and I'm--I'm glad that she's going to be helping to direct the efforts.

In the interim. I think one of the things and I--I'm speaking for the community right now, is that there have not been regular updates about the Department of Community Safety and how we're moving forward with HEART.

And I think that how us to be a commitment that we're making right now through the City Manager's Office. Now that Liz is on board, those regular reports need to come through the City Manager's agenda in some way that is transmitting to not only us, but to the public.

Because I think, sure, I know you've just said you've met with HEART three or four times. These guys don't know that, right? I'm just pointing out here, not at Liz.

But I think it's important for the public to understand that there is work being done. It has been slow, it needs to speed up. But it does need to be communicated. And I think, while we're on the topic, budget season is coming forward, and I think we need to really understand through the public comment that we heard today, that increased funding for both the Department of Community Safety and for HEART through the regular budget is something that we need to be committed to.

So I just wanted to say that. Thanks, Liz, for coming on board and taking this on, and really have a call for more regular updates on this. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you, I appreciate the comments by my colleagues. And I--I also appreciate the Manager's engagement on this issue and with HEART specifically.

But, you know, as has been mentioned, it's taking too long. HEART has moved forward nonetheless on their own. And

they've already hired and trained responders. You heard some of them on public comment today.

And even in the aftermath of this shooting, they've been providing a lot of community support already.

So they're ready to go. They're already providing services to the community. It's really critical that we support those efforts immediately.

Thank you.

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor McGovern.

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Thank you. Um, I just want to, and I don't know if this is, I know the Solicitor's not at the table. But--but I do think it's just important for, again for the community, because people aren't engrossed in this whole budget conversation as much as we are.

One of the reasons that ARPA money is being talked about is because although there are some restrictions on ARPA money, it actually is, comes with a lot less strings than when you use taxpayer, general funds money from the City.

So the City cannot give a non-profit funding unless

there is a contract between the City and that non-profit to provide certain services. And so ARPA money, you actually can.

So I think the first step is, let's release that ARPA money and at least get some money flowing that we promised that we would get flowing, because that's--that's just a much easier thing to do.

Putting money in the budget to fund not just HEART, any. Any. CEOC, transition house, any program, we are not legally allowed to do that unless there is a contract for certain services.

And so that is the conversation that is happening is what are the services that HEART would provide? And then how much would the City have to use--how much money would the City have to use to fund that?

Now, I will say, that's a conversation that I've been involved in for, you know, I was having those conversations with Councillor Zondervan and HEART and the City, what, a year-and-a-half ago or so? Where there was still that conversation is what would be the contract of agreement?

So it's taking a very long time to figure that out, too long to figure that out. But it's, I just, you know,

people don't know that. People just think, well just give them money. But we're not allowed to do that unless there's a contract for services.

And that's where things are getting stuck right now and I just implore everybody, let's, whatever we can agree upon, let's--it may not be the whole ball of wax. It may not be everything that HEART wants or that the City wants. But let's at least get it started and figure out what could they respond to and then build that relationship over time.

But it's not as easy as just, we're just not allowed to do what some people are asking us to do. So, I mean, I'm 99.9% sure I'm right on that. But um, that is correct.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Through you, Mayor Siddiqui. That's correct. I think that is the approach that we've taken. I think that, um I know, I've been meeting with some of the folks who are here.

And I would just say since this has been such a public conversation, that is the approach that we are taking, that the ARPA money is the easiest to deploy. That was something that I think I will say if you talk to other non-profits in the city, we are working hard to try and get that ARPA money out.

If folks are listening, I know that folks are waiting and so I just want to acknowledge that this has been a little bit of a journey on getting the ARPA money deployed. HEART is also on that list and we are working with them to get that--get that money in their hands so that they can start doing some of that work.

In terms of contracted services, Councillor McGovern, that's absolutely correct. I would say that some of the challenges in the conversations have been regarding how we actually think about, um, how we think about actual 911 calls that are coming in, which ultimately, are public safety calls.

And I think what has been challenging, and I continue to be very committed to this conversation with the HEART team. But there is a challenge and understanding how we actually contract for those services, which are public safety calls and requires some level of coordination with the police in certain circumstances.

And that is something that we do need to ultimately work out in order to, to have HEART respond to any sort of public safety call.

I will say that some of the conversations that we've

been having, I have encouraged us to contract for services first, for aftercare services, much of which they're already currently doing. And also for some of the calls, the crisis calls that they are fielding in today, currently. And so those are things that we can actually contract for.

I would probably prefer that we start doing that, because it's something that I see a path for. I will say given some of the broader positions and tensions regarding how we think about cooperation with the police. We want to have that conversation.

I would regret if that was ultimately the one thing that we were really focused on contracting for, because I could very much see that we're still here, three months from now, six months from now, still trying to figure out how we ended up with a co-responder models for 911 Public Safety calls and--and I think that has ultimately been a lot of the challenge in, in sort of prior conversations.

I remain really committed to finding a way to partnership and continuing to be in conversation. I will say I have had more conversations with HEART than many other non-profits. And so I think this really is something

that we are trying to do. I certainly recognize that it has been slow.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor McGovern and then Councillor Simmons.

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Thank you. And, um, I would just say to that, in this going back to something that was said a little bit earlier, not so much about the funding, something that Dr. Barrett has said.

Because, you know, I know the City's, you know, we talked a lot about CAHOOTS as being sort of the national, national model, and--and a lot of programs are based--based on CAHOOTS, including HEART and including the City's, you know, the conversation about the Community Safety Department.

Um, I did call and I spoke with -- and I wish I had written down the name in front of me -- I spoke to someone from the Whitehead Center, it's the Whitehead Center, Lakeside Whitehead, that--that oversees CAHOOTS with the City--White Bird, sorry.

And it does, it--I think it's really important as we have these conversations, and they're really hard to have in the midst of a tragedy, are sort of talking about in

absolutes.

And what I was told was that if there's a call where a weapon is involved, they do--they do one of two things. They either send out the police alone, or they do a co-responder model where CAHOOTS is also there. They never send out the mental health professionals alone when there's a weapon.

And so I think when people are saying, you know, we got to--I think when people are saying, well, you know, we should have just sent--if we if we had this program up and running, or we called HEART, that they would have gone out and the police wouldn't have been involved. I don't see that that would have--I don't know any city that would do it that way or does it that way, including Eugene, Oregon.

And so I do think we have to really be grappling with what this co-responder model--now I can certainly see situations where I'm a social worker, I'm--I believe in de-escalation completely. Um, I was a certified national trainer in crisis intervention, in nonviolent crisis intervention.

I also know that sometimes it doesn't work, because these are--these are difficult situations. But I can

certainly see situations like, you know, things that have been brought up by the community where they've, where they brought up certain instances that have happened in Cambridge, where having a social worker on scene could have -- and I'm not saying this case in particular, but I think of the young man who showed up at Biscuit Lofts when his mother had died and was really, really agitated because his mother just died and he wasn't allowed in to see her because there was an investigation going on.

If a social worker had been on that scene, not in a uniform, not with a gun, and been able to say, if I had been on that scene, I would have said, "Hey, Joe, you know what? Why don't we go take a walk and sit down for a minute? This isn't working, right? I want to get you in to see your mom but we got to do it safely and we got to do it, right. Let's go, let's go and talk about it."

That's a really different interaction than, no matter how well trained the officers are, in an act--in a situation where officers are there to secure a scene and they're in uniform.

So we, this is really, I mean, we really don't know what the outcome is going to be. But having somebody on

site that is not in uniform can be really, really beneficial.

In some cases, it could also be dangerous. And I think people have to understand that it doesn't, there aren't absolutes in this. Having been someone who's been assaulted, you know, trying to de-escalate situations, and so I'm hoping that we can have that more nuanced conversation.

But we need--we need to get this moving as soon as possible. Because again, it--it could lead to different, different outcomes.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Simmons.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm trying to hit my computer -- but I wanted to say, start by giving my heartfelt condolences to the family of Faisal, um, who was a man who we assume still he had his struggles, because we don't quite know that. From the testimonies I've heard, that--that seems to be the case.

And my heart truly mourns for those who knew him, those who loved him, and those who mourn him.

I also want to share that those of us on this Council, in service to the public, have been deeply affected by this

tragedy and recognize that there's still so much about the incident that we do not know. And that the appropriate venue for, for learning precisely what happened is, is to allow the process to unfold, however slow that might be.

And that is horrible. It's horrible, that slow process. We all want answers, we want them yesterday. But the process is as it is, and we're going to have to, I would say, allow the District Attorney's Office to conduct that thorough investigation and have that happen as quickly as possible.

We were in a meeting earlier, we were making queries and statements around another process that we wanted to see go faster and you know, unfortunately, we haven't figured that out why do some things just take far, far longer than we want them or that they should?

But we, you know, what we do know that there's a protocol. I commend Commissioner Elow. She has spoken repeated--repeatedly around what, uh, protocols were to follow, that were followed at that time.

And I've heard the voices from members of the community and from outside the community, and who have urged, who have felt that we need a community response

process, immediately and I agree.

And so I'm looking forward to the appointment through the City Manager of the--the community-based community, not community based, but Community Response Program that we have percolating and have had--have had percolating for a long time.

I--I don't believe and I hope we don't believe that it will be the fix for all the city's woes as it comes, as they come forward. It is just one of many tools that we can deploy to keep our community safe.

There's been some conversations around defund the police. And I can say to you as someone, as an African American who has talked to a--a number of African Americans and seniors, that's not a conversation that they're interested in having. They don't believe in defunding the police as a solution.

They do want to see better training and de-escalation methods greatly deployed, but they're not in that camp. And that's a voice that isn't heard here.

And I just want to caution us, I know and understand the exuberance of the people that are in the room. But for some folks, they're fearful of coming because they may not

hold the same opinion. And they're afraid that people in the room that's supposed to be part of the community will harass them and treat them badly, because we don't all agree.

I just think it's important just to sit, to remember that we're all going through this together and we all want to be respectful to all opinions, even if they're opinions that we don't all share.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Simmons, do you have specific questions?

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Nope. I'm almost finished, I believe it's very important that we recognize that the Cambridge Police Department is not the same as the Minneapolis Police Department. And so the City is going to engage in this process and is going to open that Office of Public Safety and there will be some, some emergency calls going forward, and I fully support that effort.

And I also want to caution people that this new department will be working with outside groups that may or may not be, um, a program that I've heard a lot about. But I very much hope that, um, the new Office of Public Safety is going to lead us to help the more holistic approach to

all emergency calls.

So my question, um, the Commissioner had started to answer a question and she was cut off. And I was kind of, I was very anxious in hearing what her response was. She may not remember the question at this time. But if she does, I did want to allow her to answer.

I,. and I also wanted to, she--I think she did answer my question earlier about, we do have mental health support in our police, police department and I think also Councillor McGovern spoke to it that we would never, these other programs would never deploy, um, a non-police response group where there was danger for, um, danger of a knife or some other thing.

I found my question. The question was, why was it that the Cambridge Police Department, um, had canv--I guess there's a rumor that the police department is canvassing for the DA and I wanted to know if Commissioner Elow could speak to that.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And the questions that we have are, we will get to an entire section about equipment specific at our, we will have to do that at the next meeting. But Commissioner, if you want to briefly respond?

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: That's fine, but you had asked me if I had questions, so I was asking them.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Do you want to briefly respond, and then I can take it from there.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Okay, so--

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Madam Mayor, point--I'm sorry, point of information. Do we have to--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yeah, we have to we have a few minutes because we--

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Okay.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So just quickly, I was able to get my point in. It was just about injuries involving knives in a police response.

And to answer the question--question about the canvassing. Some Cambridge Police officers were involved identifying witnesses for the State Police and the District Attorney's Office where they would, you know, identify the witnesses, and then turn them over to the State Police for them to get additional information.

We weren't involved in the actual interviews of witnesses, but we were trying to assist the State Police in the District Attorney's Office with just identifying

potential witnesses to this incident, um, for the DA's Office.

I will also say that anybody that the Cambridge Police did identify and send to the State Police, they all have to go in front of the grand jury. Every police officer that was involved in anything has to go in front of a grand jury, has to testify. So there is another, you know, independent lens that looks over the entire investigation.

And I understand that it might appear like it's a conflict of interest, I understand that. But there's also many layers that it has to go through. Cambridge Police, we have the resources and we have the knowledge of the community to go and try to help identify, again, witnesses.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Mayor, I yield.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So I'll go to you in a moment, Councillor Zondervan. I think at our next meeting, we'll cover the equipment specific and the Police Review Board questions, along with the other questions. I know that there's a few. There's a few questions that we didn't also not answer, just about the review of the policies and procedures. So I do want to get into that at that next

session about the internal review.

I'll go to you Councillor Zondervan, then we will go ahead and recess--recess.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you, according to the ordinance that created the Police Advisory Review Board, the City Council and the PARB are supposed to have an opportunity to review the police budget before it is submitted to the City Manager.

So I'm wondering if that has ever happened. And I will be reaching out to the co-chairs of the Finance Committee to set up and to Mr. Kale to set up a procedure for making sure that it does happen starting this year. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So those were the questions that we'll aim to answer next week and as was said, anything that came out today that can be provided in written format for the public, that would be great. Um, and we'll continue the discussion. I'll, I'll share the information about the next meeting so that we can go through for the remaining questions and then also for the Council to discuss some next steps.

Obviously we've heard tonight, we have a commitment

from, we have a real priority from most of this Council to get, you know, funding for HEART figured--figured out immediately, and from the next meeting there will be some next--next steps.

So with that, we will go ahead and on a motion by the Vice Mayor to recess all those--this special meeting. All those in favor say aye. All those in favor say aye? Those against say nay? The ayes have it.

We are in recess and we'll reach out for, about the next meeting. Thank you.

**The Cambridge City Council recessed at approximately
6:01 p.m.**

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAOMIE STEPHEN: Madam Mayor, you have a quorum.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Good afternoon, everyone. A quorum of the City Council being present, I am going to reconvene the Special Meeting of the Cambridge City Council, which began and recessed on January 18, 2023. The first order of business is to come out of recess and do a roll call of all the members present. [Call the roll.
phonetic 00:14:05]

City Clerk Diane P. LeBlanc called the roll:

Councillor Burhan Azeem - Present

Councillor Dennis J. Carlone - Present

Vice Mayor Alanna M. Mallon - Present

Councillor Marc C. McGovern - Present

Councillor Patricia M. Nolan - Present

Councillor E. Denise Simmons - Absent

Councillor Paul F. Toner - Present

Councillor Quinton Y. Zondervan - Present

Mayor Sumbul Siddiqui - Present

Present-8, Absent-1. Quorum established.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: As I mentioned, this is to continue our Special Meeting from last week to discuss

protocols, processes, and the training of the Cambridge Police Department related to the shooting of Sayed Arif Faisal, as this was a continuation of the last week's meeting, um, and our past practices. There--there's no public comment heard, but we ask that you can continue to email written comments for the record to the City Clerk at cityclerk@cambridgema.gov.

Pursuant to the Acts of 20--Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2022 adopted by the Massachusetts General Assembly and approved by the Governor, the City is authorized to use remote participation at meetings of the Cambridge City Council. To watch the meeting, please tune into Channel 22 or visit the Open Meeting Portal on the City's website, where the Zoom link is posted.

Any votes taken today will be by roll call. Last week the Council discussed questions related to the shooting incident itself, to policies and procedures and protocols, and the Office of Community Safety program questions, or we will continue where we left off. Um, there are remaining questions in the policies, procedures and protocols section as well as the equipment specific and other questions, and then my plan is to, um, is to move--as, as in last week

what we did was after each question was asked, the Council is welcome to continue to ask any follow up and have that discussion. So we'll get through some of those questions and then have further discussion.

So we left off, um, on policies, procedures and protocols and we went through, uh, most of these questions and I think where we left off, was I know that Commissioner Elow talked about the social worker co-response model. There was an additional question around what are occasions where a negotiator is actually sent to a scene. Um, and if you could say more about that?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Yes, Madam Mayor, and good afternoon. Um, so we do have crisis negotiators that respond to scenes, where we have barricaded suspects, um, we had a situation, um--yeah, barricaded people that could be, you know, potentially a threat to themselves.

We had a situation where a person had barricaded themselves in their apartment, um, and the only person that was in the apartment were them and they were, you know, expressing that they, uh, wanted to hurt themselves and we will negotiate with them, um, for as long as we possibly can. So we'll negotiate with them until the crisis

negotiators decide that communication has, uh, broken off, and that is really the opportunity for us to slow things down and, and try to engage in conversation and see if we can get that person to come out and voluntarily go to the hospital.

We've had situations where we have literally stayed outside somebody's apartment for 14 hours. We will sit there for days trying to negotiate with them to get them to, you know, please come to the hospital and get some support. So crisis negotiation usually barricaded, um, subjects or any time where we can slow a person down that might be in crisis, um, and we can, um, add communication. And I'm not sure if anybody on my team wants to add anything else to the crisis negotiation, uh, piece that I just gave, just looking for hands and I don't see it. Okay.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And, Commissioner, can you share if the crisis negotiator was sent to this situation?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: There was not time for a crisis negotiator to be sent to the situation.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Okay. And the crisis negotiator, the follow-up question I have there is, what type of training are these crisis negotiators going

through?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Okay, I'm gonna look to Director Mulcahy. Can you talk at all? I think I saw him, about the trainings that our crisis negotiators go through? Director Mulcahy, you're on?

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: I am, yes. Thank you, Commissioner. Through you, Madam Mayor, uh, our crisis negotiation team regularly trains, um, if there's new members that come on to the crisis negotiation team, uh, they receive an initial training, uh, and then they regularly meet as a team, uh, to go through and do trainings, go over scenarios. Um, and as a part of almost every, uh, major event or critical incident that occurs, uh, as a department, we will typically do a debrief meeting, which is also critical to future training and responses.

And the crisis negotiation team will be part of those debriefs and a discussion of how they interacted with other police personnel or other specialized groups within the department, but, uh, they have a regular training function that they attend, uh, and it's specific to them as a crisis

negotiation team.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Do my colleagues have any additional follow up to this negotiator question?
Councillor Toner.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Just one quick question, Madam Mayor. Through you, and forgive me if this has been discussed in the past meetings and I missed it, but just how long was it from the first call to the, uh, the incident, uh, in terms of time, was it 15 minutes, 25 minutes?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam Mayor. Sorry, Councillor. Through you, Madam Mayor, um, I believe somewhere, somewhere around 12 to 18 minutes.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Are there follow-up questions?
Councillor Toner. Councillor Nolan, I have--Vice Mayor Mallon.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: And, again, apologies if I missed this. Is there a difference between sending a negotiator and a mental health responder?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam Mayor, um, our crisis negotiators are police

officers. They're trained police officers, they're trained just the way all of us do. That's a separate team that is embedded into the police department.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Okay, thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Vice Mayor.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you, Madam Mayor.

I had a question, um, that was spurred by the debrief meeting conversation in terms of, um, ICAT, there is an after action meeting that happens as part of the ICAT procedures and policies. Did that happen?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam Mayor. So de--yes, um, and we do debriefs on any critical incident, not just we--ICAT is a part of training--a de-escalation training that we use, you know, that could be in conjunction with other, um, techniques and every--after every critical incident, we are required through our Critical Incident Stress Management Team to do a debrief. So we have formalized debriefs with the officers. It--it is a, it's a very structured process. They do a diffusing--diffusion, I could have this wrong, and then within 48 hours they have to do a debrief. So that is part of the critical incident stress management process after a

critical incident that officers are required to attend.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you and to the Commissioner, has that after action meeting or the debrief meeting the--has that all been forwarded on to the District Attorney's Office as part of the investigation?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: That is not part of the, um, investigation. Those are confidential processes, where officers are able to just talk about the stress of the actual event and their experience through the event. It's just really to help them process, um, a stressful event. That's not necessarily for--there's a couple of different things, we do a debrief through the critical incident stress management and then there's an after action review, which happens through the use of force, which is--that's part of--it's a different review process, um, that happens at the police department and that has not been done. That's a parallel process that happens, um, in the police department, parallel to the district attorney's investigation.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you. Madam Mayor, through you, that--that's what I was asking about the after

action review. Is that--what's the timeframe and where that--I mean, I would imagine that some of that has to be fresh. That information, you know, that this incident just happened, this incident happened three days ago. How--at what point does that hap--that after action review happen and when does it get forwarded to the DA?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: It is--it really is dependent on each case. So the DA will not have access to our after action review necessarily. The DA will have acc--access to our use of force and then the review of the use of force. So there's a number of different steps that we take after a critical incident. There is a use of force review that the DA gets that, um, then we do our critical incident stress management review, which is a confidential process, and then an after action review, which, and I'm gonna look to Superintendent Lowe, as far as the process that our patrol operations goes through, um, to answer the question about when an act--actual, after action happens with his patrol unit.

SUPERINTENDENT ROBERT LOWE: Thank you, Commissioner. Through you, Madam Mayor. So as the Commissioner mentioned, uh, each case is really case-specific. So the timing, uh,

to answer your question, Vice Mayor Mallon, the timing is really dependent on each case. Uh, depending on what the case is, if it's a critical incident, uh, that took place over a long period of time or if it's a protracted event, uh, we have to wait for officers to complete their reports and then we can start that after action review process.

So to answer your question, Vice Mayor, it really depends on the specific case that we're conducting that after action review on.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank--thank you, Madam Mayor. I just want to ask one follow-up question to Superintendent Lowe and we're just talking about one incident right now. We're not talking about incidents at the--as a whole. So I was just looking for an answer on this incident and this inquest and information that goes to the District Attorney.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So can I jump in on that through you, Madam Mayor? So because there is an active investigation going on into the actual incident, the actual after action has not taken place for this particular incident because it is going through an investigation in the District Attorney's office.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: My--I have a lot more questions on that but I'll yield back because this is gonna be a long meeting, but thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And Commissioner I wanted to follow-up, um, based on what you had mentioned. Could you share how many police officers are trained as crisis negotiation--negotiators? If you have that information?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Um we have a team of crisis negotiators and I'm not sure how many people are on that team. Superintendent Cabral, do you have that number?

SUPERINTENDENT FREDERICK CABRAL: No, it is a team. I can probably get that number pretty quickly, uh, through you, Madam Mayor. It's, it's, it's many, um, it's--then it's spread out throughout the department to respond to these types of, you know, this barricaded subject and stuff. I can probably by the end of the meeting I get you that exact number.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you. And, right, you know, I think a general, I think point of thinking about is, you know, negotiating with the police officer and the efficacy of that, and it would be helpful to get an

understanding, you know, do our most negotiation--negotiators, police officers, um, and, you know, I think--so that's something that I'm thinking about, um, its crisis and, you know, I understand the training you told me about, but it's something that I'm--it's coming up for me. So any other follow-up questions? So another question, um, this was also by me, was around the review of policies, procedures and protocols. So it's a few multipart question, first is, what kind of regular internal review of CPD policies, procedures and protocols, is there? How does this happen? What is the council's role in oversight and what is the process to discuss provisions and edits? So it's a multi per, per --, you know, part question. Uh, so, um, I'm sure they'll be follow up to it, to it.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Sure. So, um, the Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission established that all agencies be certified by POST and they establish the certification standards, um, in the implementation of agency policies. And I'm gonna turn it over to Jim Mulcahy to talk more about our policy process.

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: Thank you, Commissioner.

Um, Madam Mayor, to your question. As the Commissioner just noted as a result of police reform, uh, POST does have oversight, um, and requires the certification of all, not only all law enforcement officers within the commonwealth, but also all law enforcement agencies. Um, as part of that certification, uh, process, as the Commissioner alluded to, um, they need to set minimum certification standards as part of those minimum certification standards, uh, by regulation that shall include the establishment and implementation of agency policies, uh, in that regards use of force, use of force reporting, uh, officer code of conduct, officer response procedures, criminal investigation procedures, juvenile operations, internal affairs and officer complaint investigation procedures, detainee transportation and collection and preservation of evidence.

So, POST has in terms of certifying, uh, any agency, the ability to set a standard on policies as well as review and agency's policies and procedures in those, uh, listed categories.

Um, when the department learned of this certification process, we wanted to exceed the POST standards. Uh, and

we're currently in the process of seeking advanced law enforcement accreditation through CALEA, which is the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies. As a part of that accreditation, uh, process, the department has rewritten its entire policy and procedures, manual, rules and regulations and code of conduct to meet CALEA standards. We are not just seeking CALEA accreditation; we are seeking CALEA Advanced Law Enforcement Accreditation, which is the national gold standard for creating a comprehensive and legally defensible law enforcement policy and procedure manual.

Um, now as part of our accreditation process, uh, CALEA will review all of the department's policies and procedures to make sure that they meet every one of CALEA's advanced standards. Uh, and then if we do obtain accreditation, in order to maintain that accreditation-- accreditation, the department will be reassessed every year remotely and then onsite every fourth year.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Are you done?

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: Yes, sorry.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: I see from Su, uh,--

Superintendent Cabral and--uh, you're muted down.

SUPERINTENDENT FREDERICK CABRAL: I just want to give you that number. It's 16 on the Crisis Negotiation Team and they don't just respond. So that is for barricaded subjects. That's not necessarily mental health calls. It could be a hostage type situation with someone who's barricaded themselves in. So it's not--they're not only a mental health response; it has to do with trying to negotiate out of a situation, where that has been-- become a stalemate. So it's not jut--they are like a clinician, there's they have to be negotiating and they're trained negotiators, but it's not just mental health calls that they respond to.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yes, Commissioner Elow.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Yeah, I want to go back to the Vice Mayor's question about debriefs. This is an active investigation with the District Attorney's Office. So we can't answer any questions about the active investigation. Our debriefs that we do as part of critical incidents would not including an incident like this. Um, this is a very specific kind of incident that doesn't happen very often, but we debrief critical incidents just

as a matter of course, just to figure out what we could do better. Not in a case, where there's an active investigation, uh, being conducted by the District Attorney's Office.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So [clears throat] going back to policy, I think some of the--the first question was answered about the kind of regular internal review and it seems from what I'm hearing there's various, in a nutshell, the simplified version is that there's various agencies that exist that certify policies and procedures. Um, I'm--I think my follow-up is what is the council's role in oversight of any of this? Um, and, you know, I think a larger question is, I understand that there's these golden stand--these gold standards that exist, but, you know, are, are, are there other agencies that can also review these policies and procedures? So pup, pop, like what's the role of the council or if there's no role, you can tell me, I just I'm trying to understand, um, you know, that for example, let's talk about the use of force policy. From what you're saying, is that there's these agencies that have a certification process. Um, they review the policies to make sure they are aligned with the law and whatever

standards. So really that's kind of where it stops.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Yes, madam, yeah through you, yes. Um, so the council doesn't have a role in reviewing our policies. We have policies that are set through the state standards. Um, I think it makes sense for you all to take a look. You get--our policies are available publicly and we can ask questions and answer questions about, um, our policy but technically no role.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And technically--go ahead.
City Manager.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Oh yeah, I think, um, maybe I would just frame that to say, I think within the governance structure, the council doesn't have a specific role in reviewing policies or procedures within the police department similar to, you know, not necessarily having a specific role in reviewing safety protocols within the department of Public works. I think within the overall governance structure there's obviously accountability, um, that flows up. And so, um, I think this is sort of the conversation that we're having, um, right now, which is a level of creating greater transparency into how these policies and procedures are created, are reviewed, are

validated by outside agencies. Um, but I think in addition there, there is a level here of trying to share with the council the level of professional complexity that actually goes into all of these policies and procedures. Um, and, and that's just something I want to emphasize, that, that, you know, um, I think it is importance that we have legitimacy and that there is some trust that these are being done correctly, which I hope that is being communicated today. Um, but also very open to kind of thinking through how we--how we bring the council a little bit more into, um, just how much actually goes into this work.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: You know, I think that's where I'm kind of, you know, like [clear throats] I'm confused, right? I think it's we have these policies, procedures, protocols. A 20-year-old man is dead, um,--young man is dead. And, I know, thinking through what these policies are, they're being used, um, and where does the accountability lie? I think, you know, I, I'm trying to understand your point. You know, I'm trying to understand your point, um, City Manager about like where we fit in. I think, ultimately, you know, my question is what is

evaluating these policies look like and reflecting on them to make sure, you know, nothing like this. There's a different outcome essentially. That's, that's what's in my heart that, um. So I'll stop there. But I think I really am--I'm just wondering where are - I, I want the council to have, you know, some kind of, where, where the govern--reset legislative policies right. But, you know, I understand we can't set these policies, but how do we make sure they're the right policies. [laughs] So I'm struggling that. Commissioner Elow.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Oh, yeah and I just want to think about using example for the use of force policy that we have, right, and we're talking about like an escalation of force and if you wanted to change that use of force policy that's set through, you know, POST in the Mass Criminal Justice Training Council, you know, what would that, in fact, do to our police [inaudible 00:37:42]?

So I just want to understand like what would you want to look at, what would change, particularly when it comes to, you know, an incident involving use of force, right, in the escalation of a force.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yeah, I think that's where I

like no wonder - think my wondering is, is there a third party who could help with that? Obviously I'm not an expert here. Um, but is there a, a different third party? I think it's more independent, right?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: I mean that's role of the POST, too.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: POST--the police officer, peace officer training, as standards and training commission plus the Mass, you know, Criminal Justice Training Council plus the, um, accreditation, right? The CALEA accreditation process, right? So there's multiple layers that police departments across the country go through when setting these policies. It's not just--I think we should do this. There are standards at the state level and what we're doing is national best practice standards, which is at the, again, national level. These are best practices across the country that reflects 21st century, um, policing practices.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And the reality is we're here. So it's, it's hard to kind of --

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: I understand that.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: --you know, quite simply. Um, Councillor Nolan and then Councillor Carlone.

COUNCILLOR NOLAN: Thank you, Mayor Siddiqui. This--if this is not the appropriate follow-up, let me know. I just wanted to note that, uh, one of the things on use of force is that there's a question about how public it is and how it is that people can even know it. My understanding, unless I'm wrong, is that it's actually published on our website that if you just did a search, when I did it after our last meeting, to confirm this Cambridge Mass police use of force. The policy is, is online; it's available to anyone to see, which means, am I right about that? And is it kept up-to-date so that anybody can see it? Because I know some people have asked questions about it and I was surprised that they hadn't been able to find it, but it seems readily available. And as the mayor just said, then there's the question of, if it would be updated or reviewed, then there's a question about how that policy is. But, but is that correct that what is online, is the current policy that's in place.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam Mayor, Yes, the--what is online are, are our current

policies, but as Director Mulcahy said, we are going through an entire accreditation process, which is a rewrite of all our policies. So those policies have not been implemented yet. So those are not online, but we do have as new updates, I'm gonna look to Jim, are made to any of their policies. We add those up, we do addendum to those policies. Jim, you want to talk about how we keep our policies up-to-date when there's policy changes, please?

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: Thank you, Commissioner and through you, um, Madam Mayor. Um, yes, as we go through we would update policies. You'll see on some of the policies that are online, there may be a 0.1 or 0.2, uh, that's attached to the policy number, uh, and that would show certain, uh, changes were made to the original baseline policy.

Um, as the Commissioner mentioned, and I noted before as well, we did not just edit, um, our policies going through for accreditation. We did a full rewrite that we're planning to release later this year, um, in terms of our entire policy manual, uh, and when that--we will release the entire, uh, volume and manual of all policies and

procedures. And when that's released you will see a different, uh, numbering and ordering system that goes along with that, uh, and similar to what we do now. Any policy updates that will occur will be, um, updated online as well so that the public can see them.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Jim, can you also talk about the updates to the use of force policy that we just added right there updates to that policy?

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: Certainly Commissioner, again, through you, Madam Mayor. Um, so with police reform, there were a number of changes, um, as we talked about a little bit, um, last week a lot of what went into use of force often was a part of case law. Um, now with police reform, use of force is governed and codified in statutory law, uh, as well as some of the regulations that were required out of the statutory law. Um, so when we went through to go and update our, uh, use of force policy, uh, naturally we incorporated all of the statutory and regulatory language. Uh, and as soon as all the statutory and regulatory language was made available, uh, we used an internal tracking system within our department, where we

can upload any updates, um, statutes, regulations and send them out to every officer in the department. And essentially what we get is a read receipt to ensure, not only has it been put out, but they have reviewed any updates as well. So not only do we update the policies, but as soon as we get the changes in the law, we put that out through, uh, our internal system as well.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Nolan, are you yielding?

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Yes, I am yielding. I, I will get to the other questions. I just said that.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Carlone and then Vice Mayor Mallon.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Thank you, Madam Mayor. This might not be the appropriate time to ask, but I--given our meeting last week [clears throat] and thinking about this, I'm sure any police member would like a more effective non-killing, uh, device or mechanism to stop the person from moving forward with a knife or a gun or anything. And I know something was tried and it sounded like a bag, the impact bag or something like that. So my question is, is there anything being developed? I know

Mace, you have to be close to somebody; too close probably if somebody has a knife. Is there any--there's got to be something else in the works. I know a Taser doesn't work 100% of the time. Is there a mechanism under study that would be more effective in stopping somebody than a bullet? And is there research? I assume there's research, but is there anything that hopefully is in the near future that's being looked into?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam Mayor. And I, I will also look to Jim. We are always looking for, you know, new tools. One of the best practices when it comes to less lethal and just so you know that was less lethal, it's a sponge round from a 40 millimeter less lethal and that as, as you understood was, was not effective. And as you also said, Tasers are not always 100% effective. Um, Jim can you talk a little bit more about, um, other less lethal options and, you know, how we're always looking to what are the best practices?

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: Yes, thank you, Commissioner. Through you, Madam Mayor. Um, as the Commissioner noted, we're always trying to re-evaluate and

find the best options or ways that we can respond, uh, to any type of scenario. You did raise, um, the notion of Tasers or, um, that's kind of a specific electronic control weapon. Um, no device that we know of is going to be 100% effective and, uh, electronic control weapons are, are no different. Um, in terms of devices such as Tasers, we do live in the Northeast, where for a good portion of the year, people are, for lack of a better word, bundled or heavily clothed and we know that can often, uh, reduce the effectiveness of electronic control weapons. Uh, we also know that through studies and also from other cases, uh, even here in Massachusetts that electronic control weapons are not always effective on, uh, every person. Just as Officer [? Dean] had explained last week, OC spray is not always effective on all individuals. Um, we have looked at other devices. There are other devi--devices such as what's known as the BolaWrap, um, which is essentially a Kevlar lasso or rope, uh, so to speak. Um, we reviewed it, we've been to, uh, presentations on it and, in fact, we had the BolaWrap deployed on one of our training officers, um, and we found that it was not entirely effective. So again, um, going to your point Councillor, um, is there a device right

now that is going to be 100% effective? No, we've reviewed a number of different things and we haven't found any devices that are going to be entirely effective in every situation. We'll continue to review, uh, different devices as they come out and onto market. Um, and if they're feasible, certainly bring them to the City's attention for, uh, review and possible implementation.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Carlone.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Thank you, Madam Mayor, that is my only question at this point. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Vice Mayor Mallon.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you, Madam Mayor through you. Um, I just wanted to say that I agree with you and your earlier point around having a third party evaluation of our policies, especially our use of force and our de-escalation policies. I think, just to highlight kind of what you said, which was we have policies in place; they may have been the policies that led to a young man being shot. Do--are those policies, ones that we want to bring forward into the future around use of force and de-escalation?

I think there has to be a way for us to be doing some

kind of a third party evaluation, whether it's through like the police Executive Research Forum or even one of our university partners to say, "Here's our policies. If we don't want that to happen again, this is what would need to change." Because I think at the end of the day, the conversation that we're having right now is because there's a, young man who's not alive anymore. And I, I think as a community that everybody on this call, we want to ensure that this doesn't happen again; this is why we're here. And so, you know, I really want us to think about bringing somebody in from the outside, whether it's one of our university partners or somebody like the Police Executive Research Forum, who does this, um, for other municipalities, who have experienced a crisis like this and do sort of this after report on, on how we can think about our policies, moving forward, and making sure that this doesn't happen again. Um, I, again, this really isn't about the incident that happened, but how we're gonna move forward because we can talk about body cameras and, you know, how we feel about those, but at the end of the day, more needs to be done. We can't just say, we're moving forward to body cameras and then that's it. I think we

really need to do a deep dive internally around our policies around use of force and de-escalation and determine if they are the right policies for our police department to be moving forward to avoid something like this ever happening again. So, um, Commissioner Elow Or City Manager are there--have there been discussions about partnering with maybe Harvard or MIT, I know, um, Dutch Leonard over at Harvard actually did a whole research paper on the Boston Marathon and the response over there. There are--there are university partners that might be interested in doing this work for us.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: City Manager.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Um, I think, I think we're certainly open to this conversation. I think that's why we're having this now. Um, I would say, you know, I think maybe the conversation over time is going to be what kind of third party review would make sense. Um, I think it will be helpful as we process this to also think about where we're focusing that conversation. Um, I think that there's a lot of different avenues that we could pursue. Um, I would suggest that it is premature at this point to, even though I think what we really want to talk about is, the

specifics of, of, of the incident with Faisal and his, his death. I think that's what we really want to understand, but I think we really do have to hold until we have the full facts and findings from the District Attorney's investigation. Um, but I don't think that should mean we aren't doing things now in looking at areas we can do better.

Um, so I think we are open to, to this conversation and looking at some of this. Um, I would emphasize though that, um, we are talking ultimately about complicated policies and procedures, um, and, and I think to emphasize a lot of what the team has shared. Um, I do believe there has been rigorous external review, um, that reflects the best practices of national policing, I think to the extent that we are looking beyond the specifics of those policies. I think that might be where, you know, where some of the conversation is.

Um, I think it is just true and it is the case that there is a real struggle when you think about, um, so many of these kinds of incidents where you have somebody who is in distress and, uh, and there is a knife involved, um, where I think, I don't know that any department has

completely figured this out. And so the idea that we would be exploring that, I think that makes a lot of sense.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you, Madam Mayor, through you to the manager and to the Commissioner. I know we, we hold ourselves up as this paragon of even better than best practices of national policing. And so this is where I want us to really push that envelope and understand where we need to be better than the best practices of national policing. So, I, I, I really thank you for your response. I'm glad that we are looking at this. I'm, I'm committed to making sure that this happens, um, but I'll yield back at this time. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Councillor Zondervan and Councillor Toner.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor, through you--and I have some more questions about less-than-lethal, um, options. And, and I just want to say that, you know, I, I'm, I get frustrated when we talk about it as weapons. You know, it's like--it's a very combat-centric conversation and I, I, I think that really goes to the root of the problem here because we're, we're trying to transform what are our, our police does and, and if their

first responders to someone in crisis, we can't have our first thought be, you know, we're going into combat and, and what weapons do we have. We have to think about, we're going into a crisis situation and what tools do we have to help us, um, you know, de-escalate and, and resolve that situation with, with the minimum loss of life and damage. So specifically, I have a question about the, the so-called sponge round and if, if you could explain more what that is and how that's integrated into the police department, you know, who, who carries it, why was that particular option chosen and why was it not effective in, in this case as to the best of our ability to, to determine that right now?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Um, through you Madam Mayor, if I can just, um, address the first point and I'm gonna give the, um, sponge round to Director Mulcahy. Our, our ultimate goal is the sanctity of life. We try to go in not thinking about this as a combat situation. We try to go in trying to de-escalate, defuse, get the person who's in crisis some support. We absolutely--that is our ultimate goal with every interaction, is now not to use force, but it's actually to get some people some help. And that's really the work that we've been doing in this police

department really for the past decade, more, um, about reaching out, trying to identify people in our community who are in crisis and get them the, um, support that they need. Jim, if you could address the less lethal round, please?

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: Certainly Commissioner, um, through you, Madam Mayor. Um, obviously I can't get into the specifics of this particular case, but, um, the less lethal round, um, is essentially a round that would look like an oversized, um, rounded off bullet, um, but essentially on the sides is made out of plastic and then the tip is essentially the equivalent of what you would consider almost like a Nerf-style football. Um, so it's a sponge like tip, uh, that is compressible. Um, and it shoots at an extremely high velocity with the intent of, um, trying to, um, essentially immobilize an individual for a brief period of time. Um, that's either a harm to themselves or others so that a weapon could be removed from them, um, and they could be removed from an otherwise dangerous situation. Uh, in most cases, um, through our training and research that we've done, uh, it does, um, for

almost everybody we've seen incapacitate an individual for a brief period of time, um, such that they could be subdued or have a weapon removed from them. As I mentioned before, in response to another question, uh, not all less lethal devices are going to be 100% effective in 100% of situations. So there are some situations where a less lethal device such as the 40 millimeter uh could be deployed. Uh, it could strike an individual in the desired location, uh, and still have no effect. Um, so that's just the reality of any less lethal device.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan and then Councillor Toner.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor, through you. So I appreciate that answer and I just want to say that, you know, obviously this is a difficult conversation and, and I understand that people may feel challenged, but you know what we're - we're not disagreeing about the intent here. I agree with the Commissioner that that the police does not intend to go out and kill people, but, but we're here, again, because somebody did get killed and so we have to have this conversation in the context of

the result, not in, in the context of the intent. Um so, you know, I had asked about this sponge round, which officers carry this type of, you know, weapon, for lack of better word, and, and why, you know, in the press at least there was report or maybe it was in a prayer meeting it was said that it takes a long time to, to reload and so they, they were only able to fire this weapon one time. Can, can you explain that more? How many of these do we have and, and why is it--takes such a long time to reload?

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: Through you, Madam Mayor, um, Councillor, I apologize in terms of missing a couple of the points you had asked before. Um, we do have the 40 millimeter, um, device in all of our supervisors' vehicles. Um, so it is readily available to the officers, who are out on the street. Um, in terms of who has access to it and who can utilize it. Um, we do have every one of our officers who is on active duty, uh, when we initially received the 40 millimeter, went through a training course, um, in the classroom and then they had to go through, uh, a simulated, um, training scenario as well, where they were certified on the actual use of the 40 millimeter.

Uh, every year in October, the officers are brought in and they're required to re-certify every year on the 40 millimeters. So currently right now all of our active duty, uh, officers are certified to be able to utilize and deploy the 40 millimeter and, again, they're available in all of the supervisors' vehicles.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you. Through you, Madam Mayor, so how many is that? How many supervisor vehicles over there?

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: I don't have the exact number, but I can certainly get that for the exact number unless the Commissioner the--she has--may have the answer.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam Mayor, we have three supervisor cars that are out on any given shift.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, um, Madam Mayor, through you so, so, we have I believe around 300 police officers with, with handguns and then we have about three of these 40 millimeter rounds that are available in, in the, in case of crisis. And, and so again, you know,

separating intent from outcomes, what is becoming clear to me is that we are not equipping our officers with tools that would allow them to deescalate the situation peacefully, right? We're equipping them with handguns, which they can use to kill somebody, but we, we're not giving every single one of our officers a 40 millimeter round that they could use to, you know, less lethally, um, you know, disarm someone. So, so again, I, I think in terms of going forward that's where we should be focusing our examination of, of policies and procedures. How do we shift away from everybody's got a gun that can be used to kill somebody to everybody has these other tools that can be used to more peacefully disarm and, and deescalate the situation.

So in that light, you know, thousands of years ago, the, the Roman gladiators would fight each other and, and they would use nets to, to trap somebody. So is there any technology like that in, in use or in research, where you could deploy some kind of net that would, uh, allow you to disable someone without, without hurting them?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: I think that was briefly answered about a technology that doesn't--I forget what it

was called. Maybe you can mention that again, but it's my understanding that was found that it was not effective.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Right, that--my understanding was that there was some sort of Kevlar lasso, but, but I'm asking about, about a net, which is a different tool and, and, again, I'm just asking what, you know, to what extent are people looking at these alternative tools that we could use?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: So through you, Madam Mayor, I'm not aware of any nets and I'm not sure Director Mulcahy, if you have any knowledge of other less lethal options that are available like a net and I haven't heard anything like that so far.

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: Uh, through you, Madam Mayor, I'm not aware of any, um, net devices, um, again, the BolaWrap or something, uh, we were made aware of and a presentation was provided to our officers, but I'm not aware currently of a net.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor, through you, also, I'd asked why it was, uh, so difficult to, to reload this 40 millimeter device and, you

know, was that an intrinsic property of, of this tool or, or is that something that could be fixed. So that if officers are in fact using that they have the ability to use it, um, multiple times in quick succession if necessary?

JAMES MULCAHY, DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION UNIT: Through you, Madam Mayor, um, I would not say that it is a difficult device to be able to reload. Um, we do training on reloading the device. However, in the time it may take to reload, um, somebody can obviously walk away or run away in that process and an officer may lose, uh, the ability to take, um, an efficient or accurate shot with a reloaded 40 millimeter. But that is something that we train on.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam May through you, I don't mean to be flippant, but you know, my son used to play with Nerf guns when he was little, right in. And they have like, you know, devices that allow them to fire multiple, you know, bullets very quickly. It, it doesn't seem that difficult to imagine that you could augment this device so that it, it could fire multiple rounds more quickly.

So, again, this, this all just speaks to a positive tools that, that you all could use in order to, to peacefully disarm someone. So I, I guess I'm really just urging the police department to look into that and do more research and, and to put more resources towards, you know, how do we train and equip our officers so that they can disarm somebody and deescalate a situation like that without killing them. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Councillor Toner.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you. I'm just curious what flexibility we have or I should say, quite honestly not we the council, but what you, uh, Commissioner Elow and the City Manager and the department have in terms of, uh, the use of force laws are they like--or they are they dictated to us? Could you as a local Commissioner make significant changes to these policies? I know that we are saying that they're the sort of the best thinking of all the experts in the area and there's a state-wide committees and national commissions that helped develop this. But do you the Commissioner have the ability to change the use of force policy, uh, to a great degree on your own?

And also one other question, is there much--is there anything collective bargaining regarding this? And I ask all these questions because I know that we were focused on the tragedy of a young man. We also need to remember that these policies are put in place to protect the men and women on the police department and the people in the community they're trying to serve. So as we have this conversation, I just want us to remember that these policies are put in place to give officers guidance about when it's appropriate to use this use of force.

And, again, I don't think any police officer wants to use, uh, lethal force, but at some point they may have to. And I just want to make sure that we don't blur the lines to the point we are endangering, uh, you know, uh, police officers as well. But I'm just curious what flexibility do you have as a Commissioner to, to make these changes.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELW: Through you, Madam Mayor. Councillor Toner, thank you for the question. But use of force is dictated through Mass General Laws and CMRs. So, um, they dictate policies regarding use of force, officer code of conduct, officer response procedure, criminal investigations, juvenile operations to several

criteria that are dictated by law.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Thank you. And just a follow-up on - I, I, I would love it if there are opportunities for us to, to obtain less lethal tools for our police officers. I mean, I don't know anything about the issue. I know that people debate Tasers. Uh, some people think that they're useful and helpful in these situations. Unfortunately, I know other people who have concerns and I, I do know that we've had almost 100-year track record with very limited use of force by our weaponry, by our police officers. And you know, is there-- was there ever a concern that if we added Tasers that would lead to more use of force uh in these situations? I will get the footage.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Sorry, through you, Madam Mayor, you know, I, I appreciate the point, you know, no less than lethal has been proven, you know, 100% effective um, you know, even the Tasers. I'm not sure if that answers your question,

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: I, I ask through you, Madam Mayor, uh, my question is, has there been a discussion about--is it useful to have that level of a, a, uh,

secondary option like a Taser, um, available to all of our police officers? Or was there ever any concern expressed about having Tasers as well? I know that there was a tragic incident and, a couple of years ago, another state, where police officer grabbed her gun, uh, purportedly accidentally thinking she was grabbing her Taser. Um have we weighed the pros and cons of that--those decisions through?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through You, Madam Mayor, including going in front of the city council to, uh, potentially acquire Tasers. We actually tasted one of our officers and ultimately it was not, um, looked at as a tool that we wanted to acquire at that time. Um, and there have been other conversations that we've had just kind of in passing, but we never really got to the point of actual, are we going to implement these? And there have been--I think there have been questions, sorry. Um, and there was actual an incident, I believe, in LA, where, um, somebody deployed the Taser and it had fatal consequences.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Thank you, Madam Mayor, I don't have the questions in front of me. So I don't know if you have a separate category about body cameras -

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yeah, that's coming, that's coming. Okay, I'll wait.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Ok, I'll wait, thank you. I yield.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So before we get to body cameras, I know that Director of the Police Review Advisory Board has to leave and I don't think these questions will take too long, um, as they were mentioned last week, but just to get to the policy review and Advisory Board, um, as it states in the questions, you know, we have a section that outlines duties of the, the board and they include that the board shall make quarterly reports, the City Manager, the council, the public um of the department's activities during the previous year, including handling of complaints, future plans, the final disposition of complaints shall be made public. So the question that Councillor Zondervan had was, has the police review and an advisory board produced these quarterly reports. And if so, where they--where can they be accessed by the public?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BRIAN CORR: [clears throat] Excuse me, thank you, Madam Mayor, um, to you, to answer the question, the board has not been producing those reports in

my time. The board does have detailed minutes that are regularly posted publicly on the City website and because of that, it has not been the board's practice to submit quarterly report. Um, the minutes include a report of activities have been undertaken since the previous meeting and plans for upcoming work. And then the board also maintains a public docket of complaints received that includes the nature of each complaint, their statuses and their dispositions if they've been closed. Um, I would definitely be pleased to use that information, uh, from the minutes in the docket to provide quarterly reports the same--the same manager and the City Council and then, of course, the public.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor to you. Um, is there any particular reason why this was not happening? I mean, this is, this is the law that says that the board shall make quarterly reports to the City Manager, the Mayor of the City council and to the public?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BRIAN CORR: Through you, Madam Mayor, there is no particular reason. It is literally what

I inherited, when I started in the role in the fall of 2010. Um, so that I, I--there's nothing more to say other than it was not something that ever began. No one was asking us specifically to do it and I simply continued the previous practice.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you. So I appreciate that. I think, you know, it's pretty clear that it's critical that that those reports are produced going forward and, and as well as some kind of backlog or catch-up that, you know, gets us up to the present moment. I don't know if that's possible, you know, to, to collate, um, previous activities and, and give us a report of, you know, what have been the complaints, what have been the, the disposition of those complaints and, and all of that over, over the last several years, going back in time so that we can get a sense of, you know, what this board has done and, and what has happened.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BRIAN CORR: Through you, Madam Mayor. Certainly the, um, docket goes back to, to 2014 and so that information about the complaints is available. Um, it would take a bit of work, but certainly, um, if that--

there would be not a problem to produce, uh, quarterly reports or some sort of compiled report that goes back a number of years to help inform the council and the public about the work of the board.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you, I would definitely appreciate that.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: City Manager.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Oh, thank you. Through you, Mayor Siddiqui. Um, yeah, I think, I think we would be happy to come back and, and produce something that would make sense in terms of a quarterly report. Um, I think just to note um a lot of the, the, the actual intent behind the code around everything being public is, um, certainly being addressed in the current practice and the past practice. And so to, to Brian's point, I think there has been very extensive, um, uh, documentation of the monthly meetings and a lot of what has come through the Police Review & Advisory Board um for, for many, many years.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: The other question that's, uh, related to this is another duty of the Police Review & Advisory Board from section 2.74040 reads, "Be that the

board and the City Council shall review the department budget reports submitted to the City Manager". When was the last time such a report was produced?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BRIAN CORR: Thank you. And through you, Madam Mayor, the board has not played a role in reviewing the police department budget before it's submitted to the same manager during my tenure nor that my predecessor from looking back. And, again, I'd be very pleased to work with the board and the Police Department to establish a process for reviewing the police department budget and providing the product of that review to the police department and/or the City Manager as appropriate.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan and then Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you, and I appreciate that. And, you know, to be clear and I, I didn't make a mistake, by the way, it should have said, "When was the last time such a review was conducted?" Um, but it does say that the board and the city councils shall review the department budget before it is submitted to the City Manager. So I'm interested in, in, you know, what does that process look like? How do we make

sure that the City Council is indeed part of that review prior to submission to the City Manager?

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yeah, I mean, I think what I'm reading from this is that there's stuff that's outlined and what is our actual practice and figuring out what we're actually doing and not doing. Um, we either change language or we as Director Corr said, things can now be produced. So, um, we can have that conversation with the City Manager on that and what next steps look like.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Great, thank you, Madam Mayor, I look forward to that conversation and I'll be reaching out to you and the City Manager as well on that. Thank you

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Thank you, Mayor Siddiqui. I might ask Commissioner Elow to address this question because long before this, it was actually last October, uh, Councillor Carlone and I as co-chairs of a finance committee reached out to the Commissioner to talk about a possibility of working to have a meeting specifically on the police budget. We had that conversation. We--I know she's been working with her staff

to prepare for an eventual meeting. That was completely separate from this particular process.

I, I think now we are, um, committed to picking it up again. But I don't know if the commissioner wants to address that because I know she had actually done some work in preparation based on that--the meeting that Councillor Carlone and I had with her about addressing specifically questions that have been raised over the last couple of years regarding the police budget in relation to the city and in relation to other cities.

So I don't, I don't know, through you, Mayor Siddiqui, if the Commissioner wants to address that in her work that was ongoing prior to this particular point being made about the, um, Police Review & Advisory Board meeting with the City Council and the, and the police about the, specifically about that budget.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Through you, Madam Mayor. I thank you, Councillor Nolan. Yes, I did appreciate the opportunity to sit down with you and Councillor Carlone earlier last--well, late last year talking about our budget and trying to, you know, explain a little bit more about, you know, whether it's the hiring that we're going through

in some of the, you know, vacant positions. Um, but I, I know that we are scheduling a meeting, you know, through this budget season to explain more of what is in our budget, you know, why were, you know, requesting certain things and explaining and having a council just have a clearer understanding of what we're doing, where the budget money is going and, and why we need it.

So, um, I am really looking forward to sitting down with you and Councillor Carlone to talk more about the work we're doing here with the police department. Um, really in the, in the nature of transparency, you know, learning - having you learn as much as you can about, um, our policies or practices, um, and are, you know, yeah, just our general budget.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Yeah, thank you. And, and as the commissioner indicated her department had already been working on particularly some of the questions have been raised about comparisons of why is it that our numbers seem different from other cities. And part of what the department internally has done is make sure that we're doing apples to apples comparison of the budget. So my understanding is the next steps were that Councillor

Carlone and I are going to work with the Commissioner and the City Manager and you, Mayor Siddiqui, to actually schedule, possibly a finance committee meeting specifically on that. So, so now it seems like we might want to do that in conjunction with the Police Review Advisory Board to make sure that we're all in sync based on Councillor Zondervan's question. Thank you, Councillor Nolan.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So I think we covered, um, those questions and so we'll go back to equipment specific. Um, and under that category, we've, we've covered kind of the last lethal options section that questions that Councillor Toner and Councillor Zondervan had around less lethal - less-lethal options. Another thing that came up was, was, of course, body cameras. So the question is--the questions are as follows: why do we--why have we not adopted the body camera program? What stood in the way? Was it union negotiations, cost concerns about privacy, ACLU concerns, et cetera. The former team never recommended body cams or asked the council to fund. Besides allocating the funds, what are the next steps for body cams and will you be pursuing those discussions? Um, shouldn't, it shouldn't take except--extensive bargaining and should only cost any

additional for buying units and storing video. This was from Councillor Nolan.

So if we can talk about generally, um, the theme of these questions about the history of body cams, um, and the conversations that we had, and then we'll go to questions from my colleagues [inaudible 01:19:40].

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Thank you, Mayor. I can start and then maybe turn it over to the City, I mean, to the City Manager. Uh, you know, body cameras have been a topic of conversation for, um, several years now, cameras are a valuable tool. They enhance transparency, accountability and build community trust. Um, and a lot of times in different places across the country body cameras are correlated with reductions of use of force and reduces citizens--citizen complaints. U, you know, it--I think what's really important to know is that any implementation has to be really thoughtful, it needs to include a community process. We also do have to negotiate this with the unions. I do, we have been in conversation with the unions, the unions are, are in favour of, you know, bargaining and having a conversation about exploring conversation--having an exploratory conversation about

implementing body cameras here. Um, that is something that we, you know, I would like to see how we can move it forward, um but I think it's an important tool, um, and, uh, I'm in favor and I'll turn over to the City Manager and see if he has anything to add to that.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Um, I think that's really helpful through you, Mayor Siddiqui, um, you know, I think we've been having some of this conversation. Um, I would say, the Commissioner and I have certainly been discussing this. We've looked back at some of the conversations that happened within the City before. You know, ultimately we both feel and would recommend that the City move to adopt body cameras for our police department, um, particularly in light of this incident. Um, it doesn't necessarily, uh,-- it, it creates the level of transparency that I think is, um, is important for our community and for our police department.

Um, we would not be the first department to do this. Um, and there's been groundwork laid from the work that happened in 2022--in 2020 when the City was last exploring body cameras. Um, I think to the Commissioner's point, there are these complexities to tackle. Um, and we would, I

believe, say that if there is council support for us to move forward with planning, that we would start this process, uh, and then come back to the council for a larger conversation that would cover some of the detail.

Um, I think the policies and procedures in particular, how it relates to the Surveillance Ordinance, um, ensuring that we are running a community process, um, where we understand where we're landing on those policies and procedures is really important, providing some sort of a timetable. Um, and also looking at how this impacts the budget, regarding things like equipment purchase, maintenance, and how, we how we actually, uh, you know, maintain, maintain body cameras. Um, and so I think there is real work to be done. Um, we would be committed to doing that and we think it would be the right way to go. Um, but also, uh, understand that, you know, we want to have this conversation with the council, um, and, um, and then, uh, and then, and then we'd be happy to proceed with it.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: I will go to a Councillor McGovern.

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Thank you, Madam. Through you. [clears throat] I'm sorry, my camera's--

keeping my camera off that my connection isn't great. Um, so I don't want to belabour this too much because we've, you know, we've talked about, you know, a fair amount, but I do, I do want to say, you know, the two, two concerns that, that, that I've heard and I think that we've heard, um, from folks who have raised concerns about body cameras. Number one, is that the concern that I guess that's straight. Number one being, the body cameras, um, you know, don't change behavior. I'm not sure. I think that's debatable. On some, on some level, I think anybody who's on camera, it changes our behavior when we're on camera. I don't think that, in this case would have changed anything, you know, the outcome, but at any rate, um, given, you know, assuming that that, that, that that's true, um, you know, my support for body cameras is not because I necessarily think that it's gonna lead to a particularly different outcome, but it really is about transparency and accountability and, you know, I know we obviously can't talk specifics about the specific case and I don't know more than what's been in the, in the press releases either. So I don't have any inside knowledge. But what has been put out already is that lethal force was used because Sayed was

moving towards the police with a weapon. I don't know exactly what that means. Was he 50 feet away? Was he 30 feet away? Was he 20 feet away? Was he walking? Was he running? Was there an weapon by his side? Was it over his head? And we know that, that eyewitness reports are notoriously, you know, mixed, right? You see a red car leave the scene, I see--I think the car is blue, the Vice Mayor thinks it's green. Um, and so, you know, we look at this situation and I don't think cameras would have resulted in anything different. But, you know, my guess is, you know, we're--if depending on the, the eyewitness accounts of, you know, what, what they were, there are gonna be some people who are gonna--they're gonna report different things. "Oh, I thought he was X number of feet away". "Well, I thought he was closer". "I thought he was just", and we're not going to end-up with--probably not going to end-up with concrete answers, where body cameras would have provided us with a lot more information and that's not only good for us and for the community, and most importantly, it's for the family. I would want to know what, you know, if, if this happened to my son, I would want to know what those last moments, what was happening,

right? And, and so, um, I do continue to support them. I, I, and, and regardless of whether they change behavior or not, if you truly believe in transparency and accountability, then you should want tools that will increase transparency and accountability. And I think cameras will do that.

Um, the other concern is about our surveillance ordinance and as folks remember, I was one of the leads on, on that. And so, you know, I do think that--I do think there are ways to address that. Um, and, uh, and so I don't want that to hold us back either. Um, and then, you know, the last, the last thing, again, is just about, um, as Councillor Mallon--Vice Mayor Mallon mentioned earlier, I don't want anyone to think that support--my support for body cameras means that I think body cameras is the only step we need to take. I think there's a lot of other things that we need to look at and do. Body cameras are a tool, it's a piece of that. Um, so I am, I am glad to hear that these conversations will be moving forward. I'm, again, a little frustrated that I brought this forward in 2020 and we're still now gonna have to just start these conversations again. Um, and I think it would be helpful

just, you know, for folks to know that the council has never--the policy order asked for the conversation to happen in that past, but the council has never voted on our support for body cameras or not to direct you, more formally, from the council. So I do plan on working. I'm already talking with some of my colleagues to work on a policy that would say, yes, the council officially has voted for it to have you pursue this, Mr. Manager, and I think that would be helpful to set the directive and, and let people know where we stand. So that will be coming, um, at our next meeting. Um, and, uh, and, again I, I just I think we need to move on these conversations a lot more quickly than we have been and I hope to see, um, significant movement and implementation sooner rather than later. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Councillor Azeem and then Councillor Zondervan, followed by Councillor Toner.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Um, one of the big questions we're getting at this moment is, you know, what happened? We don't have the full context. I think that, you know, as, uh, Councillor McGovern brought

up, body cameras could be really helpful in that conversation. Uh, my question to the Police Commissioner and the City Manager is that, if we did have body commerce in this instance, would be--would you be willing to release the footage we have at this time or would it be in any months after the investigation is concluded?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: I, I really don't even know how to answer that question. So do you want to try? Yeah, it depends on the policy that we develop around that. I think that's gonna be the important pieces having clear policies around it.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: I think that's right. I don't, I don't want to speak beyond my actual knowledge. My understanding at this point is that most police departments have some reasonable amount of time, um, just to like make sure that they have processed all the footage and can release it appropriately. Um, my understanding is in many cases, particularly with public scrutiny, body camera footage is released fairly quickly. Um, so it would not, would certainly not. I don't know many departments that would hold it until or I would say I know most departments--many departments are not holding it until after like a

full investigation.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Um, thank you. Um, I would just say that I wanted to echo my support of releasing earlier. I thought it's just very helpful for us to, you know, be able to see what happened as we develop that policy. Um, and then my second last question on this topic is I was wondering, I had gotten a lot of questions about for your request and how they interact with it. Usually, you know, city governments are very transparent and you can, you know, see and get information about City--happens pretty easily. And so I was wondering, you know, in this situation and also there's body cameras, would people be able to, you know, fully request some of that, uh, you know, footage? Is it different than the usual process?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: I think that's a Nancy Glowa's question.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Solicitor.

CITY SOLICITOR NANCY GLOWA: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I think that it's, it's very hard to address these questions that seem--many of which are somewhat speculative and hypothetical. I think it really would depend a lot on what the policy is and whether, for example, if in this--in a

situation like this, the District Attorney felt that these materials needed to be looked at more closely as part of their investigation before they could be released; that would be a factor. So it's, it's very difficult to answer these questions in the abstract.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you. Um, that answered my questions, I yield

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan and then Councillor Toner, followed by Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor through you. Um, it's probably not a secret that I'm, I'm not a fan of body cameras and there's many reasons for that, which I won't get into now, but I'm certain--I certainly understand why people want to go there and, and I'm certainly open to, to having that conversation. I recognize that, that mine is probably a mina--minority position, but I hope that people will respect that and, and we'll have the conversations based on a real weighing of the pros and cons because there, there's certainly not a panacea, uh, and, and for the most part, they do not solve the problems that, that we are discussing here, uh, today.

So, you know, it, it, it really continues to buy into this idea, again, that what the police are doing for the most part is fine and that we just need these cameras to catch, you know, people behaving inappropriately in the act so that we can fire them.

And while I appreciate that perspective, it's, it's not really an accurate description of, of what's happening here. What's happening is, is a systemic problem with policing and, and with our approach to community safety and unfortunately, body cameras don't really address that systemic problems. So I, I just don't put a lot of faith in them helping us in, in this type of situation. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to Councillor Toner and then Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Thank you, Madam Mayor, uh, through you. Um, first of all, I do support body cameras and quite honestly every police officer I've spoken with supports them as well. Uh, they want the transparency and um, personally, I would not be a police officer myself without a body camera at this point in time. I'm just curious what is the cost of--if, if you have some ballpark

numbers of the hardware. And I was actually told that the most expensive part of it is the digital retention of the uh, the footage. Is, is that true to uh, Commissioner, do you have any, uh, notions of what the cost of the program would be?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: I do not have a specific number. City Manager, do you have a number? The one number that I heard was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$4 million for fully outfitting, um, the body cameras but--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Toner, I can share with you that, you know, Boston spent, uh, put up \$2 million upfront to buy about 400 body cameras, um, which didn't include ongoing storage or maintenance costs.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Right, thank you.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Sorry, I just got a number from our personnel director. She said \$2 million um, about a \$1,000 per officer is what I just got.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Thank you. My only other comment, um, is I, I appreciate Councillor Zondervan's comments and I understand that he sees a systemic problem, uh, in policing in general. I just want to keep reminding

us that we're here because this is a tragedy and it's a rare tragedy in Cambridge. And I, I think that having body cameras will help us get answers quick--more quickly in the future. Hopefully, hopefully we never have a future incident, but we need quick answers. But I think this will be helpful for us in the community going forward. Thank you. I yield Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Thank you, Mayor Siddiqui. I, I have to say, I'm, I'm, I'm mixed on body cameras. I think we have to understand the full cost, we have to understand how it is that they would be deployed, what changes it would make.

On the other hand, I'm basically supportive of it simply because of the transparency that it would yield to the community. So in, in general, I can be supportive. I, I do recognize there has been research that suggested it has not changed, uh, some of the behavior, but as Council McGovern said, it cannot--not have change behavior. So I am open to the discussion. I think we need to, to move forward on it.

I will note that, um, that Cambridge. City Council

first started discussing this. Well, it probably discussed it a long time before, but in December of 2014 there was a meeting about it. There was a policy order sponsored by Councillor Chang. There was a policy order that, um, Councillor McGovern referenced, which was discussed and I voted for, although was not--named on in June 10th. It was actually a special meeting of the City council on August 12th of 2020, where the only agenda item was to discuss the use of body cams. And, and that meeting--that the conclusion of that meeting which included some of the ACLU, which gave a statement at the meeting that they do not take a position on the use of body cameras, just that it they like our surveillance, um, policy that would require the City Council to be voting on, on specific use of body cameras.

Um, but again, they, they did not take a position on, on whether we should adopt this; it should be done in conjunction with the, with the surveillance policy that we have. This has been discussed for a long time. At that time the expectation was that, you know, the City administration never came back and, and, and asked the City Council to vote on it. So I want to make that clear that that there's

been some discussion in the community about how it is that the City Council failed to do this.

There was a fairly inflammatory letter published in the Globe that it was all our fault, when, in fact, the record shows pretty clearly that we're open to that discussion. And it was never proposed by the administration for the City Council to even take a vote on it, which it sounds like given what the Current City Manager has said is that he actually will be coming forward with some kind of discussion and a possible proposal. So, so that will be something then will be in our hands. It's really important to set that record straight. It, it is a very expensive proposition just from the, the equipment perspective; it also is expensive for the, uh, guarding of the data.

However, if there's proper safeguards in place to ensure that only certain people can--the circumstances under which that data can be accessed is exactly the, the important safeguards that we need to make sure that this is not something that in--invades privacy unnecessarily. So, I am very open to it. I would fully expect to support some kind of, um, allocation for this. I will say, I also respect and hope that the, the police officers understand

this protects them just as much as it protects someone else. The record shows that it, more often than not, exonerates police officers.

Um, what it does do is to give a record of what it is that has transpired, which I think is, is important and, and I would not expect this--I would expect this if the unions in favor of it for this to be able to be adopted without dramatically increasing the budget and perhaps having some savings in other areas and not costing anything more in personnel because right now, if I find a police officer, anyone on the street can actually videotaped me legally a 100%. Um, so right now there--there's already that expectation that the police officers can be, um, uh, subject to, to videotaping by anyone. Is this something I guess the question related to this, is this something that we might expect to see in the, in the upcoming budget cycle.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: City Manager.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Yes.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: That's a--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: That, that, that's I, I

can yield at this point, uh, Mayor Siddiqui, thank you for all of you working on it. But, again, this has been an ongoing conversation for more than eight years. It was probably even pre--preceded 2014, but that was an explicit discussion. City Council and we've, in a way, been waiting for this moment when the city administration would actually take it up. Thank you, Mayor Siddiqui.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We will go to your mom,

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you, Madam Mayor, through you, and I just wanted to say, thank you to Councillor Nolan for, um, bringing up some of the points around where we were and how we are here right now. Um, you know, according to the 2021 budget hearing--the police budget, we were told that, um, an RFP was being worked on and that actually there were body camera companies that were chomping at the bid to work with Cambridge and that actually the police officers were very in favor of body-worn cameras because and I think the quote was from the pre, previous commissioner that it would be beneficial, as beneficial for them as it would be for residents, and I think that's where we all kind of thought this was, um, moving towards. We had that special meeting with the, with

the mayor that she put together and we've essentially already had this conversation.

I think there were some questions after that meeting around, um, and I've heard this from the community to our police officers just going to be wearing cameras that are recording all the time. That are--are we going to be being surveilled all the time? How will, um,--how will we ensure that a police officer can't just turn the body camera off and turn it back on? And so we had some answers at that meeting and I think that's where that RFP would have gone, which was, we would we want to go with body-worn cameras that, um, was bonded to biorhythms so an increased heart rate would turn on the body camera. So we were--those were some of the conversations that we were left with and hoping that an RFP would go out.

So in some sense, I feel like we already had all of these conversations, were waiting for an RFP and some, some decisions to be made and the previous administration did not act on them. So we are here now and I'm glad to hear the City Manager and the Commissioner are still actually onboard to, to move forward with this. Um, the one thing I will say is I, I understand that the police union feels

that this, um,--in that same conversation in 2021, that this would be a substantial change of work and it would need to be bargained in that way. And I just want to, um, echo what Councillor Nolan said that the police union should be partners with us on this and bar--bargain this very quickly.

And I honestly--one of the other things that people have been concerned within the community is that the police would actually get a raise to just add a tool to their uniform and I'm not in favor of that. Um, I think if it is a tool that is going to be protecting our police officers as much as it is going to be helping, um, that transparency and accountability with our residents, that's not something that our police officers should get a raise for. It's just a new tool, uh, on their tool belt.

And, um, I, I really hope that the police union and the City Manager have that conversation in a very frank way around, this is what the community and the police department want, let's move this forward, let's do it quickly. Um, but it is not a substantial change of work and should not--it doesn't deserve a raise, um, in this moment. I, I just want to really be on record and say that, you

know, this is, this is us working with the police, um, in getting to all of the goals that we want to and I think we should move forward with body cameras. I do understand that my colleague does have some concerns. Um and I, I share some of them. Um, but I do think when we are thinking about transparency and accountability and making sure that we have that footage that we need in any future, um, incidents. I think it far outweighs some of the concerns um that that folks have. So I'll go back at this time, but thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We have--are those old hands, Councillor McGovern and Councillor Toner or follow-up questions.

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Just do a quick, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Sorry what--okay.

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Um, just real quickly, I just want to point out that there is, um, there's state money available to help cities with body cameras. So, um, I can't remember off the top my--how much is there, but, um, if people are concerned about the cost, um, we could ask the state for some funding as well. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Toner.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I just wanted to say that at least through my conversations in the past, the police union thought this was coming two years ago. Uh, they do want to have the ability to negotiate over it. Um, you know, training, et cetera, uh, and what are the--and the implications of the program. But I don't think--I think you have a willing partner in the police union uh going forward, but it does obviously need to be conversations about how the program rolls out.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Commissioner Elow.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Just to answer a question about the state funding, this grant funding around \$250,000.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Any [clears throat]--these were the bulk of the questions on body cameras. Do folks have any additional follow up questions to the discussion before we moved to the public dashboard discussion? Uh and I'll just quickly say, I agree with, you know, a lot of points made, in particular what, what the Vice Mayor just said. Um, you know, I think and, and to Councillor Zondervan's concerns, you know, I think there--and to some

points made earlier, there are a lot of--there are mixed results and I think it's really important that the--that anybody pro-body camera program that this council um pushes to adopt has some clear regulations and policies around it. And I know there's some complex questions that, um, you know, are going to come up and, um, I think it is important for the City Manager to come back to us with some with some--with, with some recommendations based on our discussion today.

And I know that Councillor McGovern will put in a further detailed policy order. But, you know, I think it's another earlier point, this is one piece of something that, I think, what I'm hearing, most of us expected to be happening. Um, and then there's another piece of what I'm hearing today and, which I go importantly when that is. We have to dig a lot there's a lot of other things that we want to be doing and what's our path to doing those.

Councillor Toner. [Crosstalk 1:45:45]

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: A quick question.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yeah.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Kind of quick--quick question. It sounds like some of my fellow councillors have

done some research going through the past records. I'd love it if they would share with us because I certainly don't want us to have more and more hearings on body cameras if that has happened in the past and I could read up on, uh, what the discussions were in the past. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yeah, we'll give that to you, Councillor Toner. So there is a question we, we did them on lethal option question, uh, question that came up and discussed that, um, there is a question on the Public Dashboard in November of 2019, um, a policy order was filed, which asked for an update on the Police Department's public facing dashboard that was outlined in the FY 19 budget book. When will this be operational? This was a question by Vice Mayor Mallon.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam. Mayor so yes, that's, um, this is, uh, we are very committed to establishing this dashboard as we talked about, uh, transparency is very important. The process to acquire a new record management system has been very complex. I knew upon taking this role that the, um, having that publicly available facing dashboard as was promised by

Commissioner Bard was gonna take some time. The delay is unfortunate, but we really want to be thoughtful and diligent--and diligent in the very complex, um,--in this very complex process.

So what we did is we began a parallel process, where we would be contracting with a third party to conduct, to conduct a deep dive on our current data. We have a motor vehicle citation data dating back 10 years. We are finalizing that request for proposal. Um it's just about ready to be put out for bid. The dashboard will be a deeper dive into two of the biggest issues facing law enforcement, um, that can create barriers to community trust, which is race and transparency, where we hope to have this interim dashboard available by the summer. Um, and it will--there will be a comparison of how see-- how the Cambridge Police Department trends um compare nationally and regionally. But, you know, this has taken--it has been, again, a very complex, thoughtful process that has taken a lot longer than I would have hoped, but still very committed to it and that is still moving forward.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Any follow up on that?

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: The next--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Oh, go ahead, Vice Mayor Mallon.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Oh, thank you. I just wanted to respond because this was one of my questions and I know that we've had a lot of conversations, both with Commissioner Bard and now with Commissioner Elow onboard. And I, I appreciate the complexity and I know that there's a lot going into this, but I--if there was some way for us to get more regular updates on where this is because it just feels like, we've been hearing about this since 2019 and there, you know, there's a sense that like it's just not happening, not ever gonna happen and, um, I know there's a lot of work being done other than me calling you every now and then saying, "Where is this dashboard?"

I think the entire council and then the community at large would have some more information if there was more regular updates. I know you said something's coming forward in the summer, maybe there's some interim update in the spring that says, "Here's what's happening, here's the rollout date", just something so that we have an like an eyes into like what this is and when it's coming.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you,

Madam Mayor, that is absolutely reasonable. I will do what I can to update you as this progress--as we move forward with this project. Thank you.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Thank you, Mayor Siddiqui. Thank you, Commissioner Elow for taking this on and Vice Mayor, I know you've been pushing this for a while. I, I could just make a plea, I assume often Cambridge for our dashboards, we just reinvent the wheel. You know, there's lots of police --there's, there's several thousand police departments across the country that probably have a dashboard. Just, I've always felt, look at the best one and just literally copy it; I bet it's not even copyrighted if they already developed it.

Um, so, so I don't know what stage this is at and I haven't reviewed them. I certainly know certain other kinds of dashboards better. I know the Sustainability Dashboard was just copied from someone else and we pay some company that developed this for a bunch of different comp-- different, um, cities but I, I would think that we could move forward if it were going to just say, get the best one

that's already cut and paste and on the market because we have the data, we have this open data portal with tons of data; it's just not as accessible. And the Vice Mayor and, and others have been pushing to say, let's just make it more accessible. So my plea is let's see if that can make this happen much more quickly than otherwise. Always know

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Any other questions related to the public dashboard? Um, we will move on to the 4th question under equipment-specific questions, which is, um, citing the chapter 2.52, police department and the Cambridge Code of Ordinances requires that each July, the Police Commissioner shall make a report to the City Manager, including, but not limited to a detailed inventory of material in the property. The council received such a report for the first time in July 2020 after it was requested via policy order, but updates were not received in July 2021 nor in July 2022.

Did the Police Commissioner transmit it--update reports to the City Manager in either of these past two years? And so why haven't they been shared with the council? Will the Police Commissioner present the updated report as soon as possible? And how do we ensure that the

police prepares an updated report each year, going forward, as required by law? So this is, this is public asked some questions from Councillor Zondervan around one what about policies.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Madam Mayor so yes, we filled out, we completed the inventory in July 2021. We also completed the inventory in July 22 and I think I'll turn it over to the City Manager about the process that we talked about yesterday. Do you want to talk a little bit more about that, sir?

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Oh, um, sure. I think, um, just, uh, just to maybe clarify, I believe that the specific policy order from 2020 was for the city manager to submit uh the inventory. Um as of the July 27th, 2020 special meeting which was done, I think specific to the, um, actual code, it is that the Police Department will submit the inventory Of materials to the City Manager. Um, this has been done in 2021 and 2022. It was not shared with the council because I don't believe we had established an annual automatic submission of this inventory report to the City Council. If it's being requested, I think we're happy to share the 2021 and 2022 reports.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you, I appreciate that answer. I certainly do request that this, uh, most recent inventory be shared with the council and that all, all future reports are shared with the council. It, it should be fairly straightforward to just put that on the manager's agenda. And, and I look forward to having a deeper conversation about particularly our, our weapons and, and how we get rid of them. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Any other questions on these reports? Uh, solicitor, do you need anything? Do you need the council to do anything? Um, I know Councillor Zondervan just asked, but I want to make sure there's something the council needs to be doing, you know, like adding additional language. I hope that's not the case because I think that's not--that's just more ma'am we need to do. But I wanted to make sure either way, solicitor. I don't think she's here. So we'll move on. But, City Manager, let us know if there's something more formal aside from just asking that needs to be done.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Yeah, I mean, I think if,

if it's the desire of the council, um, to see the report, I'm kind of fine for us to bring it forward um and, and we can just discuss how to, how to do that. Um, but obviously I think the normal route would be a policy order. But, I think, in the wake of these conversations, it seems reasonable that this seems like the desire of the council for greater transparency and um this is information that we have and we'll be happy to share.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Okay, so we really move on to questions in the other category and then I can open it up further. But, um, these are all kind of they're--they're in other for a little bit of a reason, but [clears throat] the first one is, what is the response of the city to the criticism that Brian Corr, who led the community meeting [inaudible 01:55:06]?

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: We're not hearing you very well, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Can you hear me now?

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Yes.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So what is the response of the City to the criticism that Brian Corr, who led the--who facilitated the community meeting did not disclose his role

as head of the Police Review Advisory Board?

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Um, through you, Mayor Siddiqui. Um, I believe Brian actually had to go to attend, uh, a meeting of the Police Review and Advisory Board. Um, and, um, I would say this, uh, Brian has--Brian plays different roles within the City. Um, he is the Director of our Peace Commission, um, and he has across many distances, really played a critical role in the wake of different traumatic events that have had an impact on Cambridge. Um, and I think he's done a lot of work in thinking through just how to understand that process, support resilience. Um, he's held many vigils.

Um, and I think there was a value in his, um, just in, in working with him as we kind of processed all of this. Um, I think we could have been more to transparent and, and shared his role as well, um, regarding, uh, regarding his, his position of leadership on the Police Review Advisory Board. Um, It did not feel like that was inappropriate at the time. I can understand some of the criticism though and so happy for us to just take that his feedback and try to just make sure that we're more upfront about the different roles that certain people play within the community.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Thank you, Mayor Siddiqui. Through you, I appreciate uh City Manager Huang's response. I do think it should have been disclosed simply because any--not disclosed at the very beginning of the meeting, specifically on a police incident, just meant anyone in the audience who didn't already know his role, which many of us did, It just raised questions about why it wasn't disclosed. I appreciate that this is, this is lessons learned.

I, I think there's a further question at some point that, that, um, whether it is appropriate to have a, a city employee to be head of the Police Review Advisory Board. And I, I think that's a discussion perhaps for a further day, but I do think it's been raised in a, in a few different places and I certainly would welcome, uh, the City Manager to, to consider that and to, and to work with the various parts of within the City and also the community about appropriate ways, going forward, to ensure that there is, is no question whatsoever about appropriate people being on the various--as we're in the middle of a discussion about boards and commissions. So I appreciate

the answer and I yield.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Carlone.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Uh, I just want to add to the comment and rightfully so the comments that have been said in the manager's response. I thought Brian handled himself extremely well in that difficult meeting and I was proud of the way he was sympathetic to the needs of the audience, but trying to maintain civility and, uh, so, yes, maybe that should have been said, his full background and I agree with Councillor Nolan's comments, but I think we're--I was impressed and I, I just want to make sure that he knows we thank him for that. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Simmons.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: And thank you, Madam Mayor. My guess--my question to you--through you to the City Manager, did Mr.--oh, take a step back. I think, um, the City Manager did say this already. We have and I think, um, it was a good choice, have called on a number of people to facilitate discussions. We've had a lot of things that we've had personally in our city as well as having events that happened outside the city that we wanted to speak to;

several vigils and the like.

I think it's worth restating that we have called on Mr. Corr to do these things, uh, a lot of times. And I think it's because, as my colleague--Councillor colleague has said, he's very--he's a very good facilitator. Um, if we want to talk--if there's any seem to be different or changed, I would say, he may want to--maybe because we do--this happened so often, maybe you hire, go out and hire someone on staff or retainer to be a facilitator for some of these events.

That being said, it was a very difficult job, I don't know. And this is the question to the City Manager. Did he volunteer or was he asked? That's number one and the second thing would be, um, if he--I thought he did say, where he was from, what, what his affiliations were, but if he didn't, knowing Mr. Corr as I do, and I think all of us, uh, should agree, he was probably not trying to deliberately, um, hide it from anyone. It may just--I would think it had been just an oversight on his part because I don't know if he generally introduces himself as who he is and what he is when he does a vigil.

The last thing, one of my colleagues said, you know,

why should we have a City employee doing that? Maybe should we look someplace else? We look someplace else and hire someone else, they become a City employee. So that being said, I just would like to know from the City Manager, was, was um, Mr. Corr, did he volunteer to do this, which I would be not surprised because he just does an extraordinary job at this, or was he pressed into service.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: City Manager.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Uh, through you, Mayor Siddiqui, I, I don't want to speak for Brian. Um, I think Brian did approach and, uh, and I think offered to help and participate in some of the conversations we were having as we thought through just how we were processing and how we would hold a community event. And so, um, so he did become and continues to be part of the group of folks within the City, where we are having some of these conversations and just thinking through how we best, um, work with the community. Um, you know, I'm thinking through like exactly how it happened.

I think, I think he did volunteer and then we asked him so, you know, it's always a little bit of a dance. Um, but he was not--I would say, it would not be--I don't think

that it would be accurate to characterize this as he was pressed into service. Um, I think, that, um, you know, I think it was a difficult role that Brian--I, I greatly appreciated Brian's willingness to help and participate and be on stage with us and facilitate a, a hard conversation, um, in a very raw setting.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And I just wanted to know also add that there was a discussion and I was part of this discussion of, you know, who are other facilitators and I think there were some who were asked, but they weren't available. And so I think there was that kind of discussion of like, okay, um, given this--his role, can we go to, you know, other people? And I think that's a larger question of, um, you know, we should have a running list of people, you know, people, or some people aren't available, but I think there was that conversation that did happen.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Well, thank you, Madam Mayor. The point I'm trying to make whether he was pressed or volunteered, if he volunteered, you know, kudos to him because I don't know how many people would want to walk into what they could rightly assume, maybe volatile. You know, it's, it's sort of like a thankless job. You--someone

asked you to do something that you do reasonably well and then there's a level of what feels like--maybe it's the way I feel about it, being criticized because they may have made a mistake, I don't see Mr. Corr as a person that sculpts around, afraid of who he is or what he does. I've always found him to be very straightforward, um, forthcoming and always willing to assist. So whether he was pressed into service, and that's my word, um I have done things in the past and I have pressed him into service. You know, is this something that you will do, Mr. Corr because you're so good at X, Y and Z.

So, I mean, I, I think the conversation important as it is, I don't want us to, to berate or, or, or malign, uh, an employee who's only doing the job that they, either volunteered, good for him, or was asked to do. It was a difficult--I mean, I don't know if any of us could have done the job that he, he did, considering the temperature or the temperature and the temperament of the people in the room wanting to have answers, not understand the process. You know, there's a, there's a lot of variables that came into play and I think we're on the way.

The one thing I know we're asking all these questions,

but I hope you do these--ask these questions in the context of growing and healing and healing. It's, it's important to get these answers, but it is equally important as we work collectively to heal, hold and heal our community. If we're not doing this, if this is just, you know, that bad City department conversation, that's unfortunate because we should--we need to certainly be cognizant that this was a very, very unfortunate, um--

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Simmons. I totally agree.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Let me finish.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Okay, we have two--few more questions.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Mayor, I've not asked one question. [crosstalk 2:05:25] I've not asked one question.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Okay.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: The long and the short of it is these are important questions to be asked and have answered. I would just like us to do it in the context of how do we work together collegially and how do we heal the con--the community, while we get the answers that we need,

with a view toward making our city a better place as we go forward.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you. We have two more questions that were on this other list. So the second question is, we often hear that the Cambridge Police Department is the best. What stat or evidence do we have of that? This was asked by Councillor Azeem. I know that could be really--this could be spent a lot of time on this, but I did want to get to the last question, uh, in the limited time that we have. Commissioner?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: To our--Madam Mayor, thank you for that question. Um, you know, the department developed, uh,--implemented a Trauma Informed Training Program six years ago. In 2023 the MPTC, the Mass Police Training Council has now required everybody to go through Trauma Informed Police Training. Um, let me see. In 2021 as a result of police reform, the duty to intervene became a statutory requirement. The department already had been training on the duty to intervene during the use of force, um, in service training for many years.

The department was also one of the first agencies in the nation to train all of its officers in ICAT. Um, and

then later the Middlesex District Attorney's Office, uh, requested that all agencies in Middlesex County receive ICAT training. I will say, with respect to Crisis Intervention Training, Trauma Informed Police Training. A lot of police departments across the country use those to be too for a single unit. We wanted to have every single one of our officers trained in Crisis Intervention Training, um, also in Trauma Informed Police Training. I see Dr. Barrett here, someone asked, to gonna turn over to him, but I have a list. But you can stop me at any time. Go ahead, Dr. B.

DR. JAMES BARRETT, DIRECTOR OF CLINICAL SUPPORT

SERVICES: Um, thank you. And through you, Madam Mayor. Just, um, wanted to highlight that one of the things we have tried to do is evaluate some of our, our procedures and specifically around, we started with our policies and procedures around juvenile diversion and, um, tried to get that into the professional literature. So we have four different peer reviewed articles that look at our evaluation of juvenile diversion Program and safety net and our collaborative practices. Um, and we've moved now, which have shown a decrease in not only juvenile arrest, but

recidivism and being able to link diverted kids to supports and services.

We're now looking at evaluating our, um, adult data. And so in partnership with the Health Equity Research lab at Cambridge Health Alliance. We are part of a national center on Suicide Prevention and Criminal Justice and we are part of National Institute of Mental Health Grant that's gonna help us look at the past 10 years of police data, compare that to service utilization data for the health alliance as well as jail data to try to really evaluate, um, our policies and practices with respondering-respondering to vulnerable individuals, um, on the adult side of things too. So I just wanted to put out there that, you know, part of my role in the police department is to move forward in the research and to try to get our data peer reviewed and published to be available to folks.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Jeremy.

JEREMY WARNICK, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS AND MEDIA RELATIONS: Yes, through you, Mayor, I also just wanted to add on to that in terms of a national basis. So you know you met Officer Deane last week, he's one of the national instructors for ICAT. We've been involved in national

speaking opportunities and international speaking opportunities. I've been here for nine years in March and every year that I've been here, we've had involvement in the ICP, which is the International Association of Chiefs of Police Conference. They invite us to speak at that event and have for nine consecutive years that I've been here. Um PERF was mentioned earlier, the police Executive Research Forum. They laid out 30 recommendations for police departments after George Floyd. Out of those 30, we easily met 28, there's 2 that we weren't explicitly meeting, which we've since then, uh, rectified. "8 Can't Wait" came out after George Floyd. We had met all of them, but two of them we felt like we could be more explicit with and then became more explicit after that.

So on a local and national basis, we really do have a really strong reputation, not only just within policing, but with media, with academia. If you look at North-eastern, one of the reasons why we are--we have our academy is because they felt so strongly about the partnership with the Cambridge Police Department and I think that's just really important for not just our council to know, but our community to know.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Uh, thank you, Madam Mayor. Um, thank you for all that information. Um, and I really appreciate hearing from all that, all the, all the extensive training and, um, all of the other, uh, evidence that you've been able to point forward. I think, you know, having, you know, facts and stats that you can use to talk about are really, really helpful in this conversation. Um I would say just because we're brief on time, I just wanted to skip to like one my--my one specific ask is that, you know, I think that the Police Commissioner had given me the number of like, you know, this was our first like fatal incident in about like two million police calls.

And I think just like having some of those stats put up somewhere and especially compared to like Boston or other surrounding cities or places in the US, which would be really helpful in like providing a really quick snapshot of how we compare to other places as well. Um, and that's all I wanted to say at this point. Thank you.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Can I just add Counc--through you, Madam Mayor, one point, you know, it's really interesting when it comes to use of force and I

think Officer Deane brought this up last week. The Department of Justice wanted to conduct a review about how departments compared nationally and one of the things that they ended up shutting down that study because there's so many departments across the country that are not accurately recording the use of force data. We have been capturing use of force data here for over a decade. This has been something, again, one of the leaders, not only in the state, but in the nation as far as capturing use of force data and making that available to our community. It's another place we lead.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you, I feel like this conversation often goes in, in a weird direction because, you know, if we look at our traffic department, our, our policy there is vision zero right? No fatalities and no major injuries and, you know, nobody's saying that our traffic department is not doing a good job, but we're also not saying that we've achieved that goal because we have not; we lose on average 1 person killed traffic every year in Cambridge.

So I think, you know, this is a very similar

conversation, right? If, if our goal is to have zero fatalities or major injuries caused by the police, then we have failed to achieve that goal and we need to do better. So I, I hope that, you know, again, the police department will continue to be open to that conversation that, you know, we may be very good compared to everybody else, but we're still not good enough if our goal is to prevent these incidents from happening ever. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Any additional follow up to that question from my colleagues? Councillor McGovern.

COUNCILLOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Um, just to, you know, follow up on that, on that point. I do wanted to say that one of the things that I have, um, you know,--these are hard conversations to have because, you know, this conversation is, is really a divisive one in a lot of ways and but one of the things that I have really appreciated and I just want to state this.

Um, you know, although our police department, you know, does talk about and, and, and does a lot of really great things in fact I we've heard about a lot of those things and, and, you know, we, we, you know, part of the reason that I think incidents like this, um, like the

shooting rock us like to our core is because they don't happen often here, right? Now, that doesn't matter to the family and to friend care, you know, they don't care that it's been 20 years since the last incident like there's no should they? Um, but, you know, this isn't like some other cities, where there are, you know, many murders a night and people sort of get numb to it. I mean anything like this rocks us because we--it doesn't happen lot. And so one of the things I've appreciated by the police is that, you know, they, they, they do a lot of things really, really well, but they're also not afraid to say, we have to self-reflect and get better, and I just want to acknowledge that.

So, I mean, I've heard from, you know, three police commissioners over my time, um that, you know, that they're non-opposed to looking at themselves and, and, and they're often the first ones to say, "We don't do everything perfectly". And I just, I just think that's important to state because we're hearing lots of things. You know, there are the people who say, "You should never question the police, our police department is perfect. How dare you, you know, say anything negative about them?" And then there are

people saying, that our police department is terrible. I don't think either one of those things are true. I think we do lots of things really, really well. But clearly we still had a tragedy, a couple weeks ago. And so even though we do all these things really well, bad things can still happen here and I just hope that we can have more of those nuanced conversations. Um, because it isn't an either or so I just wanted to state that and hopefully we can, you know, we can really try to address and get better at the things we need to get better at and continue to do the things that we do really well. And so--but I, I don't think our police department is a department that, um, is afraid to look at itself. I think quite the contrary. So I just wanted to state that, thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So we'll go ahead to the next question. Um what are the pathways for a family if someone killed by the Cambridge Police to receive financial compensation for their loss? If the officer involved was found to have acted improperly, would they be compensated? If the officer is not found to have acted improperly, could they still become compensated? This was by Councillor Zondervan.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: You know, um, I can maybe just start and I think the City Solicitor could probably jump, uh, in. Um, I would say, you know, um, my understanding is that, um, especially in the wake of these tragedies, we are trying to better understand, um, how families can be supported. Um, I would say that the way that our society has structured this is the civil lawsuit system, um, where you actually have a process for, um, people bringing forward, um, bringing forward a complaint and then there being a process for ascertaining whether there is wrongdoing and then actually assessing liability and, and I think, I think, that we live in a really litigious society and I, I know that--I sort of like viscerally don't like that answer that, you know, the way that we have set up our system to adjudicate these things is through lawsuits.

Um, and yet I think, as I was reflecting on this question, as I reflect on this question, it does make sense in a certain way. You know, I don't know that there is a clear path for the City to do an independent review and, and say, you know, to the family in the wake of this loss, um, "This is what we think we should compensate you". So

I'm not quite sure if I really understand the question um in that regard, you know, I really think that a lot of this is settled through a very structured and mature system that we have within our society. Um So I think, you know, Nancy, any, any additional thoughts?

CITY SOLICITOR NANCY GLOWA: Through you, Madam Mayor, not really, I'm gonna agree with, with what the manager said. It is obviously difficult in the face of any tragic event. Um, but we're not structured to provide, uh, payouts to residents or citizens for other reasons. There, you know, there are other situations, where people feel that they've been injured or harmed by the City in some way and people can make a claim or file a lawsuit against the City and that is how those things are resolved, but we don't have a mechanism to simply provide monetary compensation to people without that kind of process having been gone through. Councillor Zondervan and Councillor Toner.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you. And it's my understanding being served on the government operations committee that, that the City does compensate people for damages, obviously for, you know, for less tragic situations, um, based on, on a simple

complaint. So, you know, the street pole fell on my car and, you know, it's a \$1,000. And then the City discusses that and decides whether or not to, to compensate them for that. I understand that, you know, that's not the practice around this type of tragedy, but it could be.

And, and there's nothing about the fact that we historically resolve these situations through litigation that prevents us from pre-emptively--our police department is so good that if we kill somebody, we're going to compensate because we don't do that, it doesn't happen. And, you know, that's really the, the intent of my question here is that, again, the, the system is structured so that the police are protected. And if they kill somebody, it's not their fault unless the officer behaved inappropriately. And then, you know, maybe after extensive litigation, which is obviously extremely difficult for a family in that situation, maybe they, they would get some financial compensation. That's not a fair system. That's not justice.

And I understand that that's the system we live in, but that's not the system that, that we should accept. So, you know, I'm challenging all of us to, to really think about how do we make this more just because the way it's

currently structured, that's not justice, that's oppression. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: City Manager, are you going to say something?

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Oh, um, I suppose maybe, through you, Mayor Siddiqui. I mean, I think I would, would respectfully say that, um, you know, like the garbage truck, to your point Councillor Zondervan, the garbage truck hitting your car is not, and is not a comparable circumstance to what we are discussing. Um, and I think I certainly share, I share this deep, like, challenge with how are, you know, these kinds of incidents are uniquely difficult for us to understand what justice looks like. I completely agree. At the same time, I think what you're proposing is not actually that simple. And if you look at the broader, the broader instances, where there can be somebody who's died in an encounter with police, there are any number of circumstances that could arise.

And so when I, when I even think about the reality of how we would actually go about thinking about that sort of policy, it would be immensely difficult because it actu-- it's essentially a process where you need to ascertain

whether there was wrongdoing and for us to set up something within the City to do that. I don't think would have legitimacy. Um, and so as much as, again, like I don't, I don't like the answer that, that's what the civil lawsuit system is, is sort of--that's the place that we do it.

I would love for us to like not end up there and for there to be a cleaner way to do it. And yet that is a structure for having a fair, impartial process that brings together all the facts and then makes a determination. Um, and, and so I suppose, you know, this is a much longer conversation that I think gets into like legal philosophy and, and social philosophy, but I'm not sure if it's so simple to say the City should just set up a fund and write a, write a three-page policy. You know, I don't, I don't actually think that that's really, you know, I'm happy to kind of continue to think about this, but I feel like it's not something that's immediate obviously--it's, it's not immediately obvious to me how that would work.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: And I just wanted to add, I mean, I think, you know, the timing of the civil lawsuit that, that time I hear Councillor Zondervan on just--and it's not the right answer. Um, it's a hard answer to

accept. And then I also wanted to point out that there is a GoFundMe that has been created and I think there are many from the City who are contributing and I, you know, I think I would encourage, um, anyone who's watching and to, to contribute to that because that is some immediate support that can be given to the City.

So I'm gonna move on because I don't--I think Councillor Zondervan we have heard your opinion on that and I appreciate it. Um, but I don't think there is an easy solution for the City to, to, create a fund. So I'll come--go to a Councillor Toner next and then we'll come back for any other questions.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I won't extend the conversation any further. I think both you and the city manager expressed my concerns and feelings pretty well, so I'll yield.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So those are all the questions that were submitted and I really wanted to thank my colleagues who submitted questions in advance. Um it really helped to focus the conversation um and I want to appreciate everyone's patience in getting through what we had. So with, with, with the time we have left, in the time

we have, you know, we said we end this meeting by 5:30 and the clerk did say that, you know, the, the two hours applies to committee meetings and so I don't technically have to extend.

I do want to be mindful of the time. So I was going to, um, go until 6.00 and then, um, you know entertain a motion from either--from the rest of my colleagues, but I want to use the remainder of time for any questions that are coming up that you feel like haven't been answered. So I see a few hands up, so I'll go to Councillor Zondervan and then Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you, I just wanted to very quickly respond and I do have another question. Um, I agree with the manager that in, in, in the context of thinking about this as did we do something wrong and do we owe compensation. The system as it's set up is probably as best as we can do if we think about it as we don't kill people and, you know, if it happens, we compensate people not because we did something wrong, but because that's our guarantee, we're not going to kill you.

And my, my question is around plainclothes officers.

I, I've heard from someone that there were plainclothes police officers at one of the recently held rallies in response to this incident. And so I, I want to understand whether that's routine procedure to send, uh, plainclothes police officers into crowds like that? Are they armed? What, what's their use of force protocol in, in that type of situation?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Um, through you, Madam Mayor, um, we did, um, have some plainclothes police officers at, um, I believe some of the rallies or protests around City Hall. Our thinking around that was really, um, we didn't want a uniform presence to, you know, aggravate, you know, peaceful protesters. We wanted to make sure that people were being safe and wanted to make sure that, you know, things were okay so they are armed, they are sworn police officers and they were there just to not aggravate the situation, but just make sure that, um, you know, people were being safe.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Through you, I, I guess, you know, I appreciate that answer. I think, you know, for better, for worse, some

people know that they are present and, and still find it aggravating. So I don't know if there's another way to do this, but, you know, it can feel to some people as even more underhanded, you know, if, if they're in uniform at least it's obvious, but if they're not then, you know, are they trying to hide and they're trying to pretend they're-- there, you know, so I do or just to think about how we respond to that because, especially in this type of a situation, where we, we can anticipate that, you know, these events are, are generally peaceful and, and not really very likely to be in need of, of an armed police officer. It may not be necessary or, or, you know, it just may not make sense to do it, to do it that way. And thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We'll go to Councillor Azeem and then Councillor Toner.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Um, so I have, uh, just one question with a few pieces. Um, I was wondering if someone feels like they have like helpful background information that they believe could add contacts to the case and how people got where they were, um, are they welcome to, you know, uh share with officers or the

DA?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam Mayor, um, I think they should reach out to the DA's office, um, immediately if they have helpful information.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: So, for example, that might be, um, you know, like let's say there's, you know, for Faisal, for example like, an old teacher or someone who, you know, he ran into the grocery store often, who heard about the case could then go and, you know, figure out what the DA's email is on the website and then reach out?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Yes.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: And so, like, would they be able to do the same if they felt like they had similar information about the police officer involved in this case?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam Mayor, absolutely, think if anybody has any information, they think it's going to be helpful, they should be told to the district Attorney's office.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: How would they know, um, that the police officer is being investigated in this case and be able to bring forth that information, because Faisal

everyone knows in the news, right? So if they, you know, if someone interacted with him a couple months ago or relevant information, they could bring that forward, but they couldn't, if they don't know the officer's name, right?

I'm--to be clear also as context, I'm not asking for the policy to change. I'm very happy to, uh, you know, say that we've had a policy and we should continue on with it. But I wanted to bring forward this particular difficulty that I think members of the community are feeling about why they want this name to be brought forward.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: It's, it's a practice, I'd say, which was that we should clarify. There's no written policy, it's a practice from the City Manager.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Through you, Mayor Siddiqui, I think just to clarify, I would say that there is a written policy that personnel matters within the city are not disclosed publicly. And so I think that's what we were referencing when we were discussing city policy. I think obviously this specific incident is a little bit--it is both a personnel matter, but also, um, something much larger than that. Um, and it's been the practice of the City to not release the names of officers who are pending

investigation, um, in this circumstance.

I think Councillor Azeem's question I understand. Um, I think I understand kind of where it's coming from. Um, I would say that ultimately, I would encourage us to trust the District Attorney's Office is going to conduct a full and independent investigation that would pursue any relevant information regarding the officer. Um, I can recognize that there is a desire to know more quickly what the result is, and also to your question, a desire among some people to contribute to the investigation in some way. But I really ask that we allow for the process to be completed. I think, specific to like whether the public knowing the name of the officer would contribute to the investigation in a way, I would really defer that to the District Attorney's office.

Um, I mean, I think the reality is they are running this investigation, not the City, um, and not, um, not the police department. And so I think if your question is, who is determining what would be useful or beneficial to the investigation and how, we should pursue that in regards to the name of the officer, I would refer that to the District Attorney.

Um, and I would just note that I think where we are landing is not an inconsistent practice from what I've seen in, in other cities in Massachusetts and yet, I think it's also, yeah, so I think that's kind of where we are. I hope this is helpful.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Uh, thank you, Madam Mayor. I think it's very helpful. Like I said, I'm very happy to, you know, continue to support the policy as it stands. Um, I just wanted to explore that series of questions because I think that you can get sometimes lost in protests just--and protesters what exactly they're coming from. And I just thought that was helpful. And I felt your answers were also very helpful in adding a context of why this policy exists and how it's not interfering with the case. So I just wanted to thank you for your response as well. Thank you. I yield.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We have councillor Toner and then Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PAUL F. TONER: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Not, not to be answered now, but I really would appreciate, um, if the City Manager, the City Solicitor and the

Commissioner could prepare some sort of documents or statements or analysis of--quite honestly what are our role as a City Councillors in this? Because I've heard things in this meeting that in my opinion the City Council is going way beyond the realm of our role.

I'm not here to run the police department. I'm not here to make the decisions for the Commissioner. I know we have an oversight role and I know that we want to have input, but I'm hearing things that quite honestly sound like, uh, I'm a supervising officer at the patrol desk. Uh, you know, telling officers how to handle themselves. And I think we--I will say that I do think we have a wonderful police department. I think the statistics that we have shown that we've had a great record of success in the department. It's terrible. This is a terrible tragedy that the family is going through. And this young man went through. We don't know all the facts, yet we're sitting here talking about whether we're going to payout money to people as a result.

I have already contributed to, uh, the GoFundMe Fund and I hope everybody else will too to help support the family. But to start talking about our legal liability,

where we haven't even had the results of the DA, is way beyond where we should be having this conversation. And I really do want some clarity about what the--what our legal role as a City Councillor is when it comes to making determinations about, uh, police regulations, police policies and how they do their job. Thank you. And I'm sorry for sounding heated, but there's, there's just been some things that I feel we've gone way beyond on. So thank you, Madam. I yield.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: I have Councillor Nolan next. Oh, you're muted.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Thank you, Mayor Siddiqui. My first question is a logistics question. Is there a specific number of people should call or is it just the general DA's number? Often there's usually an ADA, an Assistant District Attorney assigned to the case and I'm not sure what the protocol is for this kind of, um, an inquest, which I want to remind people of what we heard is It's pretty very different process and in my view, having worked in the District Attorney's office many years ago in the one of the country's largest, it is an incredible step to try to have some independence by having an inquest

overseen by a judge that does not work in the county.

That is something we should not discount because no matter what you feel, when you know people and you are working with them, it's, it's District Attorneys rely on police officers. So I just want to reiterate that, that that's why I have confidence in this process. We have a District Attorney, who is really on the forefront of trying to do things as, as much as possible in a justice system that often is unjust, which I will certainly agree on that. So my question is, is it just the DA's general office or can we give people more specific as about how they might be reaching out and contacting people?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Mayor Siddiqui, um, I think the general number, but I can find out and get back to you, councillor.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Okay, again, it's more to the community. I mean the general number is 781897 83 100. But again it may be better for people if they're specifically is an ADA and they are sensitive for us to make sure that that number is out in the community for anybody who has information. Um, and then my, my other question is that there has been, um, some concerns or

something I have heard is that actually even though this is being run by the District Attorney's office, that Cambridge police have actually been out in the community interviewing people.

So can, can you address that and either confirm or say that that has actually not been the practice as this inquest process and investigation, um, is starting.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Mayor Siddiqui. Councillor Nolan, uh, the district attorney and the state police have worked with the Cambridge Police conducting the canvas to locate potential witnesses to be interviewed by the state police. So we're not conducting the interviews, but we are going out there, helping to locate, um, witnesses, and I think the information that I had is we were in that area, I think, up until seven o'clock there was some, um, report there were out as far as nine o'clock, but we were out there trying to identify witnesses.

A lot of times we have the relationships with the community. People might be more apt to say, "Yes, I have some information," than if the state police show up. So that is really the way, um, the district attorney handles

that and she's done that in the past and, yeah.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Okay. Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Yeah, thank you. And, and are you also canvassing and doing everything you possibly can, given the prior discussion, we don't have body cams to ensure that whatever video is out there would be accessible?

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Madam Mayor, yes, we absolutely are. I think I have been getting some feedback that people are a little taken back by the canvassing. So we are trying to think about different ways that we can reach out to the community to say, if you have information, you know, getting the number to the district attorney, but, you know, we can have--find out, you know, how to reach out either through the state police to get some information to the community, where if you have additional, you know, information or video footage, the district attorney and the state police would be interested in getting that. So, um, try to find out how she can get a statement out there for our community members.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Jeremy.

JEREMY WARNICK, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS AND MEDIA

RELATIONS: Yes, through you, Mayor, um, one of the flyers that was developed in advance of that Thursday, January 12th meeting had a specific number for the District Attorney's Office. Um, and that was given out to over 1,000 residents, 1,000 homes, both within the Cambridge Port area as well as far as North Cambridge. Um, so that number was listed and was also promoted online. Um, and just for the record, it was 781-897-6600. So that was a specific number for the District Attorney's Office.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Yep, thank you, that's--I think it's helpful. And what I'm hearing from my question about interviewing is that the role of the Cambridge Police has been to go out and try to identify people, but not do the actual interviewing, if--if they say they have some information.

POLICE COMMISSIONER CHRISTINE ELOW: Through you, Mayor Siddiqui. Yes, that's my understanding. And another point I really want to make through this inquest process. So even if you conduct an interview, whoever, if the state police is conducting an interview, there's a second layer

where they have to go in front of a grand jury and also give their testimony, you know, under oath. So I just want to say there's a number of different, you know, layers that go into, um, getting information from the public.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA M. NOLAN: Thank you. I yield.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Any further questions? Before I go back to you, Councillor Zondervan, I want to make sure folks who haven't asked questions can ask. Councillor Carlone.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: A very quick just follow up. Jeremy, I didn't have my pen in hand when you gave us that number, would you mind doing it one more time?

JEREMY WARNICK, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS AND MEDIA RELATIONS: Yes, through you, Mayor. That number was 781-897-6600.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Okay. I have one more hand up and then I'll wrap up. Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Can you just--quickly want to respond to my colleague. I, I appreciate and understand that the range of

this conversation might be making him uncomfortable, but I do urge him to review our Code of Ordinances, where the City Council has complete purview and jurisdiction over how our police department is, is set up and, and regulated and-

-

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Councillor.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN : And to, to respect my, my First Amendment Rights to speak about whatever I feel like. Um, Madam Mayor, I also would like to ask about today's meeting and, and the way it was conducted because I was told when I entered the chamber that the microphones were not enabled and then we would not be able to use the Chamber, and several members of the public who did appear in City Hall to attend the meeting, uh, encountered closed doors. And so I hope that we can get back to a process for having these meetings where City Hall is, is available to, to the public and to the Councillors, um, to participate. Thank you.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Yeah, my goal for today's meeting and moving it remotely was to really make sure we got through the questions because my understanding that the room was available to listen in. Um, City Manager, I don't

know if you have more information about the, the, the protocols. I know that some of that's being developed, but-

-

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Oh, through you, Mayor Siddiqui. Um, I don't believe that we opened the Council Chamber to the public for, for listening. I think, um, my understanding was that this meeting shifted to virtual and, uh, and as such I don't think we were planning on using the Council Chamber as a public forum.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: So I think for future discussions, um, you know, I think where we've been in constant communication with the City Manager's Office, that's about protocols and, um, for me, I wanted to get through this meeting. Uh, so I did--I wasn't, um, in the conversations around City Hall and other things, but I'm happy to follow up with the City Manager about future meetings.

CITY MANAGER YI-AN HUANG: Sure. Yeah, and I think, through you, Mayor Siddiqui, I would just say, um, I think ultimately we are balancing, um, that we live in an open, free and democratic society, where, I think, we welcome people who are looking to protest and have their voices be

heard. Um, at the same time, I do think I would just say aloud that, um, it is important that the City is able to continue to conduct its business.

It's also important that we are prepared and able to ensure the safety of all of the staff that work within City Hall. And I think there is some level of just making sure that we are, um, we're balancing all of these things. Um, and so, um, I think sometimes that can be a little bit, a little bit day by day and so we will continue to try to do this well, um, but, um, and, and kind of, uh, live out our commitments to all of these values.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you. So it is, actually I said I would wrap up, so I'm going to wrap up, um, and I know we'll have future discussions and I want to appreciate all my colleagues for sharing their differing opinions. I know we're not all the same people and, of course, we're going to come to this with different concerns and, and questions.

So, you know, I think as some next steps, you know, I'm looking down some of the themes that have come up and some of the follow up that is necessary. Uh, and, and I'm committed to, you know, working with all of you and the

City Manager to, you know, get some of the questions answered. You know, I think, um, you know, it's, it's going to be a process and I think what I'm learning is that, um, it, it will take some time and I think that's the hard reality. But given that, we also have to be very urgent, um, in, in this. And that's my request to the City Manager about these conversations, uh, and thinking urgently about, not just, you know, I think, or someone said it earlier really well.

There's some things that it feels like this body we have said we should do, that should have happened. Um, but there is a lot more that I think we could be doing, whether it's thinking about policies, um, you know, thinking about the less lethal alternatives, thinking about, um, the follow up to some of our ordinances and the police review work, um, and some of the other questions that have come up today.

So I'm eager to really figure out next steps and, you know, going back on last week's meeting, a lot of the conversation around HUD and ARPA funding. There's a lot of things that, um, we have to come back with and, uh, it's really incumbent on us to do that because we know that

there is a separate DA process that is separate is going to take a long, long time. Um, and we have to be doing the work while that is also happening.

So I'm going to adjourn this meeting, but again, I want to appreciate my colleagues who did send many of their questions in advance. And I know we'll continue to have a lot of more follow up on this really, really difficult, you know, horrible matter that has happened. And so that's all I have. Um, and in the next, you know, weeks and months, we'll continue to have a lot more conversations and some action plans associated with what we've been talking about.

So with that said, I will go ahead and adjourn, um, on a roll call by--a motion by the Vice Mayor and call an adjournment.

City Clerk Diane P. LeBlanc called the roll:

Councillor Burhan Azeem - Yes

Councillor Dennis J. Carlone - Yes

Vice Mayor Alanna M. Mallon - Yes

Councillor Marc C. McGovern - Yes

Councillor Patricia M. Nolan - Yes

Councillor E. Denise Simmons - Yes

Councillor Paul F. Toner - Yes

Councillor Quinton Y. Zondervan - Yes

Mayor Sumbul Siddiqui - Yes

Yes-9, No-0, Absent-0. Motion passed.


MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: We're adjourned. Goodnight.

**The Cambridge City Council Special Meeting adjourned
at approximately 06:04 p.m.**

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, **Kanchan Mutreja**, a transcriber for Datagain, do hereby certify: That said proceedings were listened to and transcribed by me and were prepared using standard electronic transcription equipment under my direction and supervision; and I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the proceedings is a full, true, and accurate transcript to the best of my ability.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name this 2nd day of February 2023.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kanchan Mutreja". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Signature of Transcriber

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS FROM CITY OFFICERS

1. A Communication received from Naomie Stephen, Assistant to the Council transmitting consolidated list of questions.
COF 2023 #14