

City of Worcester Human Rights Commission Minutes
MEETING MINUTES– Monday, July 12, 2021, 6:00pm

Simultaneous Spanish interpretation provided over Zoom

Video available: <https://play.champds.com/worcesterma/event/891>

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

Members Absent: Lauren De Oliveira, Deidre Padgett

Staff: Jayna Turchek

Guests:

Lt. Sean Murtha, Worcester Police Department

Daniel Nakamoto, MA Executive Office of Public Safety and Security

Michael Traynor, City Solicitor

Rahsaan Hall, MA ACLU Racial Justice Program Director

1. Call to order and Introductions

A quorum was established, and Chairperson Yang called the meeting to order at 6:05pm. The Chairperson welcomed members of the commission and those present and a roll call was taken that established quorum.

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Approval of June 7, 2021, meeting minutes

<https://play.champds.com/worcesterma/event/841>

Chairperson Yang motioned to approve the meeting minutes, Commissioner Lewis seconded. Minutes unanimously passed on a rollcall vote 7-0-0.

3. New Business

A. Briefing on police body camera programs in preparation for District listening Sessions

a. Presentation by Lt. Sean Murtha, Worcester Police Department: Lessons learned from pilot police body cameras and pilot policy

I am going to speak on the 6-month pilot program and the experiences we had with it. It went from May to November 2019. It has been a couple of years now since it started. There is a lot of interest in body cameras, it is considered the way of the future in policing and has been for quite some time. Bottom line, with a lot of these really important things that have happened, people want a video of them. They want to be able to see an unbiased, objective account of what happened.

We decided to do this pilot program for 6 months. We had 20 police officers who volunteered to wear the cameras. Everyone involved was a volunteer. No one was forced to do it. They were supervised by 20 sergeants who also went through the training for body worn cameras. At the time Lt. Superior, who is now a Captain, and I were in charge of the program. Everyone involved received 16 hours of training in the equipment, the policy and use. Evidence.com is the website that stores all of the evidence, all of the camera footage that is recorded. It is basically uploaded through a dock and goes to that website. I will go into that a bit more later.

The 20 officers were from 3 different divisions, 16 were from the Operations Division (Patrol), 2 from the Traffic Division, and 2 from the Neighborhood Response team. The officers from the Operations Division were from all three shifts. We wanted to see how the cameras

worked during the day, during the night, different hours, different divisions. All participants were uniformed officers.

By the numbers, we generated over 8,000 videos, over 1,000 total hours of video about 43 videos a day. Of those, 489 depicted arrests and 24 showed a use of force. A lot of them were more mundane, just routine calls, neighbor disputes, traffic stops and the like.

A little bit about the equipment. For the pilot program we used the Axon body camera 2. Axon is by far the market leader right now in the body camera industry. The industry is growing very quickly as more and more police departments across the country adopt body cameras. Axon has about 90% of the market share. Motorola is number two and there are other companies who are trying to aggressively enter the market. Axon uses evidence.com, a secure website, to hold all of the footage. The police department does not hold any of the footage. It is all held in the cloud of this 3rd party, Axon, who has top level security personnel to make sure it does not get hacked into and the like.

The way it works. The camera worn by the officer records a video. At the end of the officer's shift, they would come back to the station and put the camera in a docking station. The footage would then be uploaded, everything on that camera, would be uploaded to the cloud at evidence.com. The original video, at that point, can't be altered or deleted. Once it is in the cloud, that is where it is and it is going to stay there.

If we were to do a public records request with redaction, let's say to get rid of children's faces in the video, we would blur out the faces, but the original video would never be touched. We would send out the altered one based on the redactions.

Overall, our officers were generally satisfied with the equipment and the online interface. The website worked well. The camera itself worked well. It is mounted on the officer's chest, once or twice it did come off, but that was rare. Basically, it is a simple system, a push of the button activates the camera. One thing that is interesting is when the officer manually activates the camera, it actually catches the 30 seconds prior to when the officer pushed the button. This is possible because the camera is actually always recording, just on a 30 second loop. So it is always deleting and recording all the time so it is able to get that 30 seconds before you push the button.

Our policy for the pilot Body Camera Program is all available online. If you want to see the entire thing, you can go to the city website and the whole policy is there. This was the policy for just the pilot program. If we do implement body cameras for the whole department we would look at that and come up with a new policy. It would not necessarily be this one. The most important part, and the basis of it, was that officers were required to activate their cameras for all police encounters whether it was a 911 call, a non-emergency call for service, or if the police initiated an investigation or a stop. They were required to activate their cameras for all of those. The only exception would be something, if they were driving down the street and there was a shooting right in front of them, or something like that, where it not realistic that they would be able to do that before taking care of what needed to be taken care of. Before entering a private residence for a non-emergency, officers were required to ask the residents for consent to record inside. The officer would meet the resident at the door and before they walked in they would say something to the effect of "Excuse me Sir/Ma'am, I have a body camera recording, would you like me to continue recording or would you like me to turn it off." At times people had no problem with recording, but others did have a preference not to be recorded inside their houses.

This did not apply to emergencies. If there was a domestic in progress or something serious going on, the officer would just get in there as soon as possible and not ask the question about the camera.

In areas where people have a reasonable expectation of privacy such as churches, schools, daycare centers, hospitals, places like that. If there was not an emergency, the officers would generally use their judgment and would generally not record. For example, if you are on a hospital guard with a prisoner, the officer would not be recording everything going on in the hospital at that point. If the prisoner decided to try and escape or something, at that point, it would be different, that would be an emergency. This also applies to witnesses and victims of a crime. If a witness wanted to remain anonymous or a victim felt uncomfortable talking about their experience on camera, then the officer would turn off the camera.

Officers were allowed to watch all their own videos. Anything they were involved with, they could watch. They were not required to watch every video. I think to do that would slow things down too much. If an officer is generating hours of footage every day, watching every single video would make it difficult to do their job. For things like arrests, they were encouraged to watch the video and make sure they did not leave anything out, to make sure they were as thorough as possible. For use of force, they were required to watch the videos. Other officers who would be on scene, not wearing cameras, could watch any footage they were involved with. Officers who were not there could not watch the footage. If they were not involved with it, they were not able to watch it. Of course, the chain of command could watch what their people were up to. If officers were involved in a serious use of force incident, they were required to write the report before viewing the video. After the report was done, they would watch the video and add into the report whatever the video showed, writing a second narrative to add in what the video added. Every arrest and every use of force was watched by an official either a Sergeant or someone in the body camera unit. Sergeants performed random audits of calls to ensure that officers were turning their cameras on. They would look at random incidents, even mundane ones to make sure the officers had their cameras on when they were supposed to.

External access to footage. The law department and others will talk about this in more detail. It is mainly the public records law what determines who has access to the footage outside the department. Under the current law, the vast majority of the footage we generate would be available to the public. Of course the footage is shared with the DA's office for court purposes as well.

A few things we hoped the cameras would accomplish include the following. By far the most important is just objective recordings of critical incidents. It is the most important reason to have body cameras. When something important happens everybody wants to have a camera. Everyone wants to see whether the police did a good job or whether they acted inappropriately. The camera is a major piece of evidence in determining what happened. I think that is the most important reason to have the cameras. It certainly did that. They worked as intended. The video quality was good. They stayed on the officer's chest, mounted in the right position. They were simple enough to be managed during tense situations. It was not a complicated system, you just have to push a button.

Training was another thing. The benefit to police training that the cameras potentially have is huge. Just like any field, music, athletics, if you can watch video of yourself you can do a much better job of accessing where your strong, where you are weak, that sort of thing. You can

also have other people watch the video, whether it be your Sergeant, Lieutenant, or others on the chain of command. People can be brought in for re-training if necessary. We used the camera during training to do some active shooter training. That is a realistic scenario stimulating an active shooter environment. We had to put the cameras on and found that when officers went back and watched what they did there was all kinds of things that they were picking up that they did not notice when they were there, both in terms of things they did well and did not do well. I think for anything like that the training benefit is going to be huge.

Another thing is potential de-escalation. If people know they are on camera the chances of an escalating situation, whether verbally or physically is must lower. If people know they will have to go in front of a court, a judge, and explain their behavior because it is on camera, I think, there is a chance that people will change their attitude a little. And that did happen. Certainly, not for everybody. It depends on the person but any situation where we can calm people down just by the presence of a camera is huge because it is better for everyone.

Another big benefit of cameras is resolving complaints quickly and efficiently. We did not receive any complaints involving any officers in the pilot program. Looking forward, I think a lot of complaints for things like rudeness, if there is a video of it, could very easily be adjudicated and figured out very quickly.

There are a few drawbacks to the cameras. One is just that there is a lot of extra work required. As I mentioned before, if an officer is watching their video, it means they are not out on the street forming relationships or dealing with crimes. It is a major time commitment to get what you can get out of these videos. Watching them, assessing yourself, watching people who work for you, there are a lot of benefits to it but it is a major time commitment. Number two is obvious. It is expensive. We have to pay for the storage and the cameras and add extra officers to administer them. There is a certain amount of money involved. Next is that there are potential privacy concerns for citizens involved in police incidents. This is something, again, that is going to be a state level thing, but as it stands right now there is a lot of potential for people to, let's say, request videos of their neighbors, or a landlord to request a video of their tenant or something similar. Someone could request a video of their ex-girlfriend or that kind of thing. I think it does create privacy concerns because right now they are public records and there are very limited abilities for them not to go out if requested. Quite a few cases, even for noncriminal situations, are still public record.

The last one, I think, is that the cameras might reduce the officer's ability to resolve things informally or to use their discretion in exercising creative problem solving and form relationships. I think it does make people a little bit more official when they are on camera. In terms of dealing with these situations where officers may be less likely to want to try something new if they are concerned about being embarrassed on YouTube or something like that.

There are a few lessons we have learned from the pilot program. If the goal is to capture these critical events and have cameras with a record of them then the cameras do very well. Officers became more comfortable with the cameras as the program progressed. In the beginning there was some uncertainty as to when they would turn them on or off in one of those sensitive situations. I think, over the course of the program, they became comfortable and I think that would happen if we fully implement the cameras as well. I think the cameras have the potential to be the best police training tool in many years for the reasons I went over, the ability to self-critique, ability to watch the people who work for you in action (which you do not always have).

I think the cameras create a record of people's performance. It really is a tremendous training tool. Administration of the program was more time consuming than we had anticipated. The equipment problems were minimal, but we had a lot of problems with people asking questions about the policy. We had public records requests and there is a lot of redactions involved when those happen. There are just a lot of things that had to be done administratively that we had not previously anticipated. Overall, I think there will be an adjustment period for both officers and citizens as the cameras do become more widespread. It is happening across the country now and I think it will be the same in Worcester. It really has so much to offer even with the drawbacks. It is very tough to look past all the potential benefits the cameras could bring.

b. Comments from Daniel Nakamoto, MA Executive Office of Public Safety and Security regarding state body camera taskforce

Lt. Murtha did a very excellent presentation on the body cameras. He highlighted all of the professional issues that have to be addressed by the program. I am going to talk about current efforts at the state level around body-worn cameras. There is a grant program that the executive office just released. We also just released a request for information for the potential for regional cloud-sharing by local police departments. Also, to talk about the legislative mandate taskforce on body-worn cameras.

To put it in perspective, Massachusetts is generally behind the rest of the country in terms of the use of body-worn cameras. The national estimates about 5-6 years ago said that basically half the police departments had programs in place. My judgment is that, now, probably 2/3 of the departments probably have cameras. We had a survey, with the Massachusetts Chiefs' Association, that showed that we had about 10% of our local police departments with body-worn camera programs.

As I mentioned, we have a body-worn camera grant program that was released last week. It is \$20M in funding, \$4M a year for 5 years. The responses are due August 30th to get the grants. It is a Capital program, funded by capital dollars. This means that its body-worn cameras, servers, other accessories but things such as staffing or cloud-storage would not fall into that category. Even though the program is out, the Secretary is really concerned about non-capital costs such as video recordings, storage of those recordings and management of the recordings themselves. One of the things that he was interested in looking into as a way to reduce future costs for municipalities was perhaps creating a regional cloud that could be shared by many local police departments. We have done some scanning in terms of what the industry offers and we could not find anything so we have issued a request for information and I have contacted the major body-worn camera companies, hoping to see if they can give us some insight as to developing this kind of program. The request for information was released July 2nd and responses are due August 23rd and we will see if we can chart a course that would be more cost-effective than everyone have their own contract for video storage.

There is legislature that was enacted December 31, 2020, which was a major piece of police reform legislation. One section called for a taskforce in body-worn cameras. It is a legislatively mandated taskforce that has 20 identified members. Representatives from legislative caucuses, state agencies, associations and the Governor has 5 appointees as well. I am the representative for the Executive Office. Its mission was to develop proposed legislation

regarding the use of body-worn cameras and dash-cameras. Covering issues around procurement, what should be bought, conditions for its use, technology for redacting, storage, use of facial recognition technologies, sanctions for misuse, and reporting of its annual use to the general public. The Taskforce unfortunately has not met yet. As of a couple of weeks ago, not all members have been appointed, so we will have to see what happens. The taskforce was supposed to come up with an interim report by July 31st with a final set of recommendations for the legislature a year from then. The taskforce is supposed to have 5 regional areas across the state. Worcester plays a very prominent role in Central Massachusetts so I would imagine that there will be a high likelihood that Worcester could be a site. If there is interest by the local community.

c. Michael Traynor, City Solicitor, briefing on the impact of MA police reform bill to public records and other areas of interest

First, Jayna asked me to talk about one of the amendments to the public records law contained in the Police Reform Act. One of the exemptions for public records is Exemption C, it pertains to medical, personnel files, information of a private nature that the disclosure of which would be an undue intrusion of someone's privacy. The Police Reform Act has put a qualifier on that Exemption so that it no longer applies to any files related to police misconduct. All records from Internal Affairs investigative reports are now subject to being released. It is so broad it would also include not being able to redact names. A lot of times we would use the Privacy Exemption for people who were the subject of some altercation. But now, everything in those records is subject to disclosure. That is a large change in the Public Records Law moving forward. We have been implementing that since the beginning of the year when that legislation was put in place. That will affect the public records on the body-worn cameras. I know that Jayna asked me about the basic question which is "are they public records?" which as Lt. Murtha addressed, they are the same public records as if they were a paper report. They all come under the same definition. But there are still exemptions that would apply in regards to redacting or blurring out certain features in some of these records as they go forward.

Exemption A is the statutory exemption. It is a mandatory withholding of information that is explicitly or by implication deemed not public by another statute. Within any public records request there may be more than one Exemption that is applicable. Even though we have Exemption C for privacy as being no longer applicable, if the record involved domestic assault, sexual assault, or minors, there are statutory prohibitions to making that information public under Exemption A. For the body-worn cameras there will still be some privacy protections under certain circumstances and again each one has to be looked at on its own merits. It is a case by case determination as to what information might be in that tape that is subject to a mandatory exemption.

Another question I was asked was "what can the city do about destroying records?" That would be subject to the same regulations as paper records. There is a municipal schedule for the destruction of public records that is published by the Secretary of the Commonwealth and there is a specific schedule for police records. Depending on what information is contained within the recording, it would have a different time period as to how long we need to keep it for. I don't know, at the state level, if the new taskforce will be looking at any changes to the retention

schedule or if there will be any suggestions for the Secretary of State regarding the recordings from body-worn cameras.

I would also like to say that the Police Reform Act, as you probably all know, is very wide-ranging. I think one of the most significant piece is that the POST Commission will have a division of Police Standards and the Division of Certification. All police officers must be certified by this new commission and the commission will certify local police agencies as well. They will oversee the complaint process. If a complaint is filed against a police officer at the local level, we need to get that complaint to the POST within two business days. Local authorities will still have oversight over investigating the complaint but it has to go through that whole process before the POST can take any action on suspension or revocation of a certification. POST has to wait for the local authority to finish its investigation or for a year or so to lapse, then they can take that up. Pending that, the POST can also do some preliminary inquiries. In some instances, it is mandatory that they do an inquiry at the same time as the local authorities are doing it. Under certain circumstances they have the discretion to do so. They have the ultimate authority to certify, decertify or suspend the certifications of police officers. They would work in concert with the local agency after an investigation was completed. If they suspend or revoke a certification of a police officer, the action that then follows by the local agency is not appealable to the Civil Service Commission so the actions of the POST Commission are final unless they are appealed to the Superior Court, but once we at a local level would work pursuant to the determination as a final action.

The legislature has a lot of other smaller pieces. There are new rules on use of force, facial technology, which we will be putting out some guidance on. We are coming to city council with an ordinance to ban facial recognition technology in the city. There are a lot of committees that have been put together, taskforces, to review various different topics with all different, staggering, deadlines for reports. So, there will be further guidance as we go forward, on a number of topics throughout this whole Police Reform Act. As I said it is very far ranging and covers a lot of different topics.

I am happy to answer any questions that you might have.

d. Rahsaan Hall, MA ACLU Racial Justice Program Director

Thank you for having me. I appreciate the invitation and opportunity to meet with you all. I have been asked to talk about best practices for the body-worn cameras. I will say this at the outset. The push for body-worn cameras is really a function of activists looking for greater accountability in law enforcement and not so much as an evidence collection tool. There is a lot of concern within communities, particularly communities of color, where there are higher rates of policing and higher rates of police surveillance. There are a lot of advocates who have concerns about body-worn cameras being used as an additional surveillance tool. The ACLU has come up with a model policy that municipalities should consider when developing a body-worn camera policy and program.

The most fundamental elements of a body-worn camera policy should govern (1) what events the officer should record, (2) what should be done with the video once it is created, and (3) what the consequences should be when officers violate the rules.

We launched a campaign back in 2016-2017 called “Do It Right” and there are elements of this. The first is participation. Whenever a municipality is considering body-worn cameras, and the policy creation, there should be participation. There must be engagement with the community to assess local priorities, particularly communities of color, communities that are directly impacted by over-policing, aggressive-policing, violent-policing. There should be a public process to shape and approve the policies. People should be able to weigh in around what the policies should be and how officers should conduct themselves while using this technology. The policies should be disclosed, as well as key footage which should be made available. That was discussed in regards to the Public Records Law and how that is impacted.

Another element of our “Do It Right” campaign is privacy. Policies should prohibit recording without notice and recording in private spaces without consent. The policies should prohibit the surveillance of activists or individuals engaged in political or protected speech and activities and it should ban the use of biometric analyses, face-recognition, technology including iris scanning and gate measuring. The policy should also provide for the prompt deletion of video that does not involve the use of force or a complaint or detention and arrest. I know that there is some contention with the requirements of record keeping for municipalities and departments but the policy should be clear on what is the earliest possible time that records can be deleted.

Lastly, is public accountability. There should be limits on officer’s discretion to turn off cameras. The policy should require officers to write the initial report before reviewing camera footage and the policy should clearly outline the discipline for officers who violate the policy.

I briefly reviewed the pilot program for Worcester and there were a couple of things that stood out to me. It had the core elements regarding what should be recorded and what should happen to the recordings, but it was somewhat lacking on the last prong, accountability and discipline. Sections 2.3 & 2.4 put some restraints around recording in private areas and consent, but from the ACLU perspective, the recordings should be happening at the time that the consent is received or the declination to record happens. That should be recorded as part of the footage. Section 4.1.1, from my reading of it, allows officers to access the video to draft incident reports. That is a significant concern for us. From our prospective, officers should write the reports based on their understanding and recollection of what happened and if there is a need for a supplement after having reviewed the recording, that can be filed. What we are concerned about as Civil Rights and Civil Liberties activists is officers curtailing the initial draft to fit what the video shows. At first blush, people will say that the video is objective but, the writing of the report is not objective. So, if there is something that cannot be captured by the video an officer can indicate that there was something that happened out of the view of the camera to justify their actions. Section 5 says that footage shall not be deleted for up to a year after the pilot program. Going back to the point earlier about the immediate deletion of things that have not been flagged, either as involvement in a criminal case, or a case of excessive force or some other type of violation or concern, then it should be deleted. Again, there is tensions with record keeping requirements, but this is still another concern.

Additionally, there was no description of the footage that must be retained. My presumption is that the policy would require all of the footage to be retained. From the ACLU’s prospective we would only want footage that is relevant to ongoing investigations, complaints of excessive force, or flagged footage to be retained. The policy should limit the duration of retention and identify what needs to be deleted. The policy did not contain a ban on biometric technology. The

disciplinary measures were not clearly articulated for the violation of the policy, but only (by my read) what would not constitute a violation of policy. From our prospective, for a policy to be effective the disciplinary measures must be clearly articulated or at least pointed to if there are other disciplinary provisions within the department's overall policy. They should be cited to in the body-worn camera policy. There was no prohibition of surveilling protected political activity or protected first amendment activity. There was no prohibition on surreptitious recording, or secret recording, so using a body-worn camera in a secret way to record people's conversations. When an officer is prominently displaying and wearing their body-worn camera, our position is that does not violate any confidentiality or privacy concerns, but if it is being secretive or hidden and turned on to capture information that would be inappropriate and arguably illegal. So, there is a concern that the policy does not speak to that. There was also no redaction requirement in the policy, at least, again as I read it.

Those were some of the concerns about the existing pilot policy. Now, moving forward, if the program rolls out to the full department and there is a new policy that is written, it is our hope that some of the concerns that I have raised and some of the recommendations in the ACLU's Model Policy will be adopted.

Our model policy and more can be found at www.aclum.org/en/police-body-worn-cameras-lets-do-it-right

Questions from the Commission Members:

Commissioner Robinson: *I was just wondering who would be redacting the footage? Would it be the police department, a third agency, or a combination thereof?*

Michael Traynor: It is usually a combination of attorneys in my department who specialize in Public Records working with Records Access Officers of the police department. It is a collaborative effort.

Commissioner O'Callahan: *Was any of the video footage ever reviewed or released to the public or subpoenaed or anything like that?*

Lt. Murtha: Many of the videos were sent to court. Every arrest or criminal charge, or just about everyone, I would expect to go to court and be reviewed there. There were also several public records requests that went out also. So, there were quite a few videos that went out to various different places.

Commissioner O'Callahan: *Are you able to speak to the nature of any of the public records requests, what their purpose was?*

Lt. Murtha: Various different aspects of videos. They wanted particular incidents, certain arrests or use of force. They were kind of all over the place.

Commissioner O'Callahan: *Can you tell me a little bit about what was redacted in those circumstances?*

Lt. Murtha: Sure. Things like, for example, if the radio is on in the background and someone's social security number is read over the radio, anything domestic, anything related to sexual assault. There were things like witnesses coming up and reporting crimes and their faces would be blurred. Children's faces would be blurred. Things like that.

Commissioner O’Callahan: *I am just looking at the 1849 videos of arrests of the 8000 that were generated so that is about 6%. Is that the rate that you can expect that we would have for a broader body-worn camera program or is it because the pilot was voluntary that, maybe, certain sectors of the department were under-represented?*

Lt. Murtha: I would have to look at our total call volume for the year verses the number of arrests. We can get that to you though.

Commissioner O’Callahan: *What was the compliance rate of random audits?*

Lt. Murtha: I don’t have a percentage, but Sergeants took care of that internally within the operations division. It was very high. Generally it was found that officers were turning the cameras on when they were supposed to. I think there were a couple right in the beginning where they were confused about when they were supposed to or not supposed to but overall it was very high.

Commissioner O’Callahan: *Do you know about how many times it was used for training and could you speak to how performance improved after undergoing the training?*

Lt. Murtha: I think a lot of it is individualized. To me, any time an officer watches his or her own video and watches what they did, I think that is training. Also, the Sergeants would bring the officers in sometimes and point out if they could improve somewhere or what was good. They would get feedback from the bosses. There were a couple of official training uses like I mentioned with the Active Shooter Scenario where they recorded everything and the officers would watch it afterward along with the people they worked with and there would be a simulation of the effects of stress.

Commissioner Creamer: *I have a question about the volunteer group. Did you feel like there was a tough time finding volunteers or was there an overwhelming amount of volunteers that wanted to do this?*

Lt. Murtha: There were quite a few volunteers. We actually had 10-15 backup officers in case there was an issue with the first ones getting transferred to another division or something like that. So, there was a strong response.

Commissioner Creamer: *Do you believe that the body of volunteers reflect that of the department?*

LT Murtha: I think overall they were probably younger than the average officer. They are the officers who are excited about this and eager to take on new technology.

Commissioner Creamer: *What about the overall feeling throughout the department at the moment? How is the department feeling as a whole in terms of moving forward with something like this?*

Lt. Murtha: Overall I think the feeling is pretty positive. Everyone has a different opinion but overall I think that people think the cameras will be a good protection for them and will be good at explaining the nature of each call.

Commissioner Creamer: *Were there distinct negatives that officers brought forth? I know you mentioned some in the presentation but were there any that stood out to you and you had said specifically that it was more hours so I am wondering if you have a number for that? Did it add more to the officer’s day or did you all have to cut the officer back from being on the field in order to make up for those hours? How did the department do that?*

Lt. Murtha: Officers were still out there. There were cases where someone else had to take a call that that officer would have gone to otherwise, because they were watching the video. Also there was something in the pilot program that will be worked out where the officer had to enter information into the system every time specifically for the cameras. Now that is something we have been told by various companies that, if we went with them, they would have an automated system that would take care of all of that work which would be a significant reduction in workload.

Chairperson Yang: *How long is non-evidentiary video kept? Evidentiary?*

Lt. Murtha: This is something that will be changed with the full implementation but for the pilot program we did not delete anything. Everything was retained.

Chairperson Yang: *Does anyone know moving forward how this will happen? What the limitations are? How long? Mr. Traynor I know you mentioned that we are on a schedule?*

Michael Traynor: The municipal records retention schedule. There is different retention requirements for different documents throughout all the different departments of the city. It is published by the Secretary of State's Office. I don't know what, specifically, the retention schedule is for the cameras.

Daniel Nakamoto: Just to add, the taskforce in body-worn cameras is supposed to make a recommendation around storage. What happens from that will be up to the legislature.

Chairperson Yang: *Do you know when that is supposed to be happening?*

Daniel Nakamoto: July 21, 2022, theoretically, but the taskforce is behind. Maybe they can make up the timelapse.

Chairperson Yang: *I know you had mentioned something about data-sharing. Is that like the joint-information center? Is that what the state is looking into doing?*

Daniel Nakamoto: This is a cost issue. Right now, each police department handles their own storage whether on site or in the cloud and there are fees attached to it. The fees for cloud storage are actually greater than the cost of the cameras. We wanted to see if there is a cheaper way for cloud storage than each individual police department doing their own thing with a private company.

Chairperson Yang: *Regarding recordings of incidents involving deadly force, they are obviously subject to investigation. Will footage be provided to the public and if so, how long is the time frame?*

Michael Traynor: Footage of that nature would be part of an ongoing investigation so it would not be released until the investigation is complete and possibly even through when the DA's office does its investigation beyond ours. I cannot say with any specificity when it would be released, just when that process concludes, then the exemption no longer applies.

Chairperson Yang: *Usually there is a timeframe attached to that, like 90 days.*

Michael Traynor: Not if it is an ongoing investigation by the police department.

Chairperson Yang: *Some states release it. So, is Massachusetts not doing that?*

Michael Traynor: I am not aware that there is any time limit on those records, no.

Chairperson Yang: *When it comes to juveniles being arrested, what are we doing with that data? Who has access to that?*

Michael Traynor: I would defer to Lt. Murtha on how to handle that.

Lt. Murtha: I believe nothing about that would be public.

Chairperson Yang: *Regarding violation of policy, will there be any consequences for failure to record? If an officer does not record an incident, what are the consequences and will that be put into policy?*

Lt. Murtha: That is the kind of thing that will be part of the discussion when we do full implementation. The policy for the pilot program is not going to apply for things like that in a general policy if we do have cameras for everybody.

Chairperson Yang: *So, there is no policy in place yet?*

Lt. Murtha: Right. There would be a policy written if we did decide to do full implementation.

Commissioner Lewis: *I am just interested in what your thoughts are on some of the issues that Attorney Hall found within the procedure? And also what happens if an officer were to use their body-worn camera to record in secret?*

Lt. Murtha: I believe he was talking about taking the cameras off and using them by like taking them off and putting them in a pocket to record, that sort of thing. That would have been against our policy. There is no secret recording. That is certainly not anything we are trying to do with this program. Again, the policy will be looked at and adjusted for full implementation if we do go that route.

Commissioner Lewis: *And you guys will also take a look into disciplinary action will be taken for officers who do violate the policy?*

Lt. Murtha: Yes. With any kind of policy like this we would certainly expect everyone to follow it. Officers are expected to know and follow the policies of the department.

Commissioner Lewis: *If an officer violates policy will there be a protocol for disciplinary action? I see in the pilot program it says that they will be given more training.*

Lt. Murtha: That was for the pilot program. Once again, this is a separate policy. We want to try it out with volunteers. It will be years later, after that, that the rest of officers will get cameras. We certainly would adjust that kind of thing. We expect the officers to follow whatever kind of policy we put into place.

Commissioner Chukwurah: *I have a follow up question. The policy says that they cannot secretly record. When officers go to an incident they can ask the homeowner, or the individuals involved, if they want the camera to be turned on or not, except for emergency situations. If the person says no and the footage is still recorded, whether by accident or on purpose, is there a policy in place for what happens to that video? Does it get deleted? For prosecution purposes I am not sure it could be legally used in court, but for investigation purposes will that be used?*

Lt. Murtha: That is an interesting question. I don't think we ran into that. Where the officer had the recording on, the person said no and then the recording kept going. I don't think we say that at all. That is what would happen if, let's say, there was a murder or something in the house and it was picked up by the camera after the person asked the officer not to record. That is not something we addressed in our policy, but it is an interesting question and we would have to look into it.

Commissioner Creamer: *For the privacy of the officer, what are the rules in terms of utilizing the restrooms? Are officers encouraged to take off the camera? Are they encouraged to keep them on at all times?*

Lt. Murtha: The officer would not record something like that. There is that 30 second loop. In a situation like that the officer could take it off. That is one of the few situations, I think, when you would not necessarily want it to be on your chest. Beside that they would basically be expected to wear it and to activate it when they are performing any kind of police action such as responding to a call, etc.

Chairperson Yang: *You may have already touched on this. How often will the data be reviewed? Will it be reviewed randomly? Will the Chief be reviewing it or a Sergeant? Do we know?*

Lt. Murtha: Another very important question. It is a big issue and another thing we are going to have to work out going forward. It was a specific set of circumstances for the pilot program of 20 officers which will change if we have 300+. We are going to have to come up with a system and work out exactly how to do that.

Commissioner Chukwurah: *I have a question about privacy for victims of crime. I know when it comes to the release of information, there will be blurring out of faces but is that really the extent of protection that can be provided in these videos?*

Lt. Murtha: I think a lot of that is going to depend on what happens at the state level. Both in terms of legislation and in terms of recommendations by the committee. Right now, as Mr. Traynor was saying, the redactions are not as robust as they used to be, I think there are certain things that could be done, at the very least blurring of the faces but I am not aware of what more could be done other than that right now. We would do what we could to protect the identity of anybody who wanted to remain anonymous though.

Commissioner O'Callahan: *So that could be expanded to anything identifiable aside from a person's face? So, it could be a license plate or their ID?*

Lt. Murtha: Right. Those are issues that will have to be worked out also with the Supervisor of Records at the state level as well. I think there are certain common-sense cases like that where we wouldn't want it going out but you'd have to see exactly what the letter of the law was in terms of Public Records.

Commissioner Chukwurah: *So basically the final decision as far as the law itself, we need to look at the state and wait for that to be done? For the pilot program, are there any redactions that were done that we can look at as an example of a place where redaction was done to protect a victim or the witness's identity?*

Lt. Murtha: Yes. We had one that was a gun case where two individuals in the neighborhood reported being threatened with a gun by a specific individual. Their faces and their identifying information were redacted. To my knowledge that is not something that is mandated by law. I think in those cases it is common-sense that we do not want to put those people in any jeopardy at all which is why we redacted that.

Commissioner O'Callahan: *We have been tasked with seeking public feedback at the municipal level. We have been asked to do several listening sessions with members of the public. One of the confusing pieces for us was trying to figure out what is going to be set in stone and what is up for discourse. What type of public discussion could we take in? What public feedback could we take*

in and give the state or our municipality to help inform the policy and what things are not worth asking because they have already been decided upon?

Daniel Nakamoto: Nothing has really been decided at this point. Again, the taskforce hasn't met yet but will hopefully be meeting within the next few weeks. I suspect that we will come up with some recommendations and then we will have at least 5 different public hearings where we can get feedback from interested people. From there it gets sent to legislature where there is another process in terms of input to your local legislatures around any proposed laws or regulations.

Commissioner O'Callahan: *Do you have any recommendations for broad parameters that maybe we shouldn't ask or areas that the taskforce might need a lot of public input on? For example, we know we should not ask does the public want body-worn cameras because we know that that is something that is happening.*

Daniel Nakamoto: I don't. The committee is very broad. For example, I believe the ACLU has a membership, police associations have memberships, legislative caucuses have them. I expect that there will be a wide range of issues.

Commissioner O'Callahan: *Does Exemption C still apply when a complaint has not been filed? For example, if someone has been in a car accident and is receiving medical attention would they be covered under Exemption C?*

Michael Traynor: The change to Exemption C attaches to records, files, related to a police misconduct investigation. If there is just body camera footage with people in it that has nothing to do with a misconduct investigation Exemption C would presumably apply to some of the actions or people that are in that film.

Commissioner Chukwurah: *If the state makes a policy, can the city of Worcester decide to do more than what the state had put in place? Or does the city have to only adhere to the state policy?*

Michael Taylor: You can have state actions that allow municipalities to go further but other times the state action will say this is as far as it can go and they set the limits. With redactions to public records, it is very prescribed to certain exemptions within the statute, and we cannot go beyond those. One of those must apply if we are going to redact or withhold information.

Commissioner O'Callahan: *I know there was some guidance that came out of POST recently which I believe goes into effect as of July 1st and I was just wondering if anyone could elaborate on those recommendations or the guidance that came out? I believe it was around police interactions and things they need to keep in mind when interacting with members of the public.*
N/A

Commissioner Lopez-Alvarez: *I have a question regarding timeframe. Before this goes into full effect, will it be a couple of years? 3-5yr frame before the program actually takes effect?*

Lt. Murtha: Are you asking when Worcester would have a body camera program or when the state would have their committee set up?

Commissioner Lopez-Alvarez: *Worcester and the state.*

Lt. Murtha: I cannot say with any authority what is going to happen going forward. I can just say what we did with the pilot. It is going to be up to the city manager's office and others to decide what to do going forward in Worcester.

Daniel Nakamoto: At the state level the taskforce will come up with a series of recommendations for the legislature and then it will be in their corner. I suspect that programs will continue to open and continue to operate and they will then have to adjust to whatever laws the legislature develops.

Commissioner O’Callahan: *There is overwhelming public support for moving up of timelines. Do you think at the state level that might be possible?*

Daniel Nakamoto: The taskforce has to meet as targeted on the legislative timelines. I think the task itself is pretty broad so I cannot imagine doing it in half the time, for example.

Commissioner Creamer: *Realistically do you believe the department has the infrastructure to move forward on this quickly or do we need to build this infrastructure and that will take some time?*

Lt. Murtha: I think the main things we would need to do would be to train everybody and come up with a policy. I cannot say exactly how long that would take. I think it would be at least a couple of months, but not years.

Commissioner Creamer: *And creating a specific taskforce for the body cameras would need to be implemented as well?*

Lt. Murtha: I think, certainly in the beginning, we would need people dedicated to just this to make sure we had a smooth rollout and everything went well and to keep trained up.

Commissioner Creamer: *Do you believe that you would need civilian-based individuals to join the department?*

Lt. Murtha: These are all discussions that are going to happen over my head. I think there are different directions we could go in and that is one of them.

Chairperson Yang: These questions that you are unable to answer and you are deferring to the Chief, are these going to be answered and submitted to Jayna, then submitted to us?

Lt. Murtha: If you have a list of questions that you still have after this then feel free to send them my way and I will get them to him.

Questions from the public:

Khrystian King: Body cameras has been something we have been talking about going back to 2014. As mentioned, across the country 2/3 of police departments have them. Worcester and the state are lacking. We are behind. I know there has been some talk about having to wait for the state. That is not accurate. There is no moratorium on municipalities implementing body cameras. In terms of our programs, I would ask to confirm that we have not had any in terms of the pilot ending in of October of 2019. Is that accurate?

Chairperson Yang: I thought that the pilot program ended in November.

Khrystian King: I am hoping Lt. Murtha can speak to that.

Lt. Murtha: That is correct. We do not have any body cameras on officers since then.

Khrystian King: So we have been without body cameras since October 2019. We are the second large city in New England. When you look at Boston they have 4 different pilot programs in all sorts of divisions of their police department. I know that there have been some questions around

exactly what divisions were wearing them, but I think they were pretty clear and outlined in the report, that was provided by the Worcester Police Department. It certainly would have been beneficial to see them on those officers, on those shifts, in those areas where the most touch points with individuals based on Worcester's own police data.

I really think that we as a city, I have been pushing this on the council level, should re-implement a pilot again as we are figuring this out. There is a benefit to all of this on behalf of the police officers and the community members. I encourage this commission to look into that and to support that if it is appropriate. A lot of this has already been done. The ACLU's bet practices has been out there for some time. A lot of municipalities have used them. It is not really about reinventing the wheel but it is about making sure there is accountability and transparency. There is a lot that we can learn. We can learn when there are false allegations against police officers and when there is officer misconduct.

The most important question I had, which had not been answered in the pilot program documentation, was that part about informing and influencing policy and procedures and it was not clear to what, during all of this, what policies and procedures were enhanced? What policies and procedures, as a result of the pilot program, were brought back to the police administration and the union for further negotiation? Outside of some of the commentary that was in the reports. I am just curious if we have any understanding or if anyone can share today around what changed, where did we see areas of improvement, and things of that nature?

Lt. Murtha: Overall I don't think any major policies changed as a result of the program. I think our training focuses were adjusted though. For example, handcuffing was a thing we noticed some issues with and we noticed some issues with behavior after telling someone they are under arrest before the cuffs are on, letting people wonder around too much at that point. There were a lot of tactical points like that were adjusted and also rollcall training operations. But I think you are correct that there were no major policy changes as a result of the pilot.

Khrystian King: I really would encourage this commission to explore how other municipalities have used their piloting. As I mentioned, Boston used four different companies. We have had a number of things we could have learned over the past year and a half about policing and about what works, and about force. It makes sense to move forward now. I want to reiterate there is not a moratorium that requires us to wait for the state. Thank you.

Commissioner O'Callahan: *does anyone know, in response to Councilor King's recommendations, the grant programs that were released, could some of that money be used to pilot another program, if the city were to pursue that?*

Daniel Nakamoto: Yes, it could support the hardware for a pilot program. But not any other kind of non-capital cost. There is a \$250K limit per grant.

Kevin Ksen: I just want to raise concerns about this idea that the City Manager has floated of using the COVID Relief money we are getting from the federal government to pay for the bodycams. I find that offensive. I think that money should really be going to assist communities here in Worcester. I would actually like to see us hold meetings, much like you are holding here for the bodycams, on how to spend that \$11M. It seems weird to be doing hearings on the bodycams but not on the COVID relief money. I think the public records side of this is really important and I would ask the commission to keep asking strong and dedicated questions on that.

I think, here in Worcester, we have seen a lot of issues and concerns about the lack of transparency in public records. Back in May, as part of the Human Rights Commission, we had asked for the release of records on police officers and have not gotten them. The police department asked that we talk to the law department and I see Solicitor Traynor here so I would like to ask you, would you be willing to release the name of the police officer that has had 25 complaints against him? It has been discussed a few times at the Human Rights Commission and the police department at the last meeting said it was a law department decision on whether that could be released or not.

Michael Traynor: through the chair. First, I don't know the name and second giving someone's name is not a matter of public records requests. You are asking for information. If there are records that someone wants to obtain, put the request in and with the changes in the law, those records would be disclosed.

Kevin Ksen: We asked for the database. We asked for the files. Could you release the files that contain the name of the officer with the 25 complaints against him or her. Would you release the documents?

Michael Traynor: If there is a request that comes in to us then we will get the documents and we will release them.

Kevin Ksen: I am making the request right now. As you know, a verbal request is a public records request in the state of Massachusetts.

Michael Traynor: I will give it to the Public Records Access Department, and we will process it overnight, yes.

Kevin Ksen: My second question is, because we have this problem with the lack of transparency and we all know the city of Worcester keeps fighting the release of the public records to the Telegram Gazette, we are in court, constantly spending money, fighting to get basic public records released and the T&G is forced to go back in court, the city's law department is just taking us back into court again it was up last week in the news. What super law can we pass to force the city to release public documents? I have no confidence in any of the bodycam footage being released when the city of Worcester repeatedly, repeatedly, repeatedly, refused to release public documents in the city.

Chairperson Yang: Kevin, is this directed toward someone?

Kevin Ksen: Anyone who has an idea because at this point the lawsuits aren't even working with the T&G and the city law department keeps fighting it.

Michael Traynor: Madam Chair, we are not going to discuss things that are in litigation, but I would also suggest that this is not a topic that is on your meeting agenda.

Chairperson Yang: But someone also brought up the question so if someone on this line can answer it, I suggest that they do that and if no one can answer that Kevin do you yield your time?

Kevin Ksen: I yield my time, but I do support all of you on the Human Rights Commission for creating this space for us to keep asking, even if we must ask the same question 20 more times, hopefully somebody at City Hall will start to change the way they do things and start to release some of these public records on problems in the police department.

Isabel Gonzalez-Webster: Thank you so much Chair and thank you so much Human Rights Commission for having this important conversation. I appreciate the time to be able to discuss this. I do want to say that in this conversation today and in several points of various presentations, having data and investigations and camera footage being made public was brought

up, the POST commission was brought up, and the statewide bill. I think transparency and accountability and making data requests and who is responsible for that is definitely part of this conversation because it has been brought up by presenters and people in the Human Rights Commission. So I do want to put it out there that it is concerning that we cannot get questions answered.

I am the Executive Director of Worcester Interfaith but I am also a part of the Racial Justice Policing Reform Coalition here in Worcester that has various organizations that are a part of it and we have written letters to the City Manager, and to the public, on various topics. Transparency and accountability being a huge one. In terms of the body-worn cameras, I want to bring up what I brought up in the chat and it is asking the city to really go back and look at the policy to make sure we are writing it with the community and the ACLU, that has a proven track record, and making sure that we are getting it right. Attorney Hall brought it up, the reason we have this program is because communities of color have brought it up, time and time again and advocated for it and we need to make sure it does not become a tool to further criminalize our communities of color and collect evidence by “people” and “criminals” in the community but really becomes a tool of trust that brings the police department and the community together. We were supposed to have a meeting, our Coalition and the City Manager, earlier this afternoon and we couldn’t. I hope that the City Manager and the City will meet with us so that we can discuss these issues further. I also want to answer the question that some people kept talking about whether or not the municipality can go further. When we were looking at workforce and diversifying the workforce, we at the Worcester Community Labor Coalition, did a study with the City of Worcester about the workforce and diversity in Worcester. We worked with the City manager to figure out what the diversity numbers for women and people of color should be in Worcester and the City Manager said “I want to do better.” Some people wanted to use the Boston numbers, he said if they are using 25% for people of color, I want to use 30-35% and I want to use 10% for women instead of 7%. So, the same way that we pass diversity number for construction projects here in Worcester, we can do that same thing with police reform.

Further, I want to say that we have a set of police reform policies that the City Council passed, in favor of, including the body-worn cameras but we don’t have any language or ordinances that are passed giving direction to the police department. I invite the city to work with the ACLU, the Lawyers for Civil Rights, and us community members to draft that language. For instance, in terms of whether or not a municipality can go further, the statewide bill did not put banning facial recognition on, but Worcester decided to add that. That is an example. We are asking for adding a civilian review board with a position of power to that.

Arielle Sharma: I just want to focus in on one thing that was commented on, Lt. Murtha, I believe that you indicated that one of the trainings you pursued as a result of the bodycam footage that was reviewed was that there was an issue with police officers telling people they were under arrest before the handcuffs were on. Is that the policy, that they should be handcuffed and then told they are under arrest?

Lt. Murtha: No. It is not a policy issue, it is a tactical issue and safety issue. When we go, for example, to a domestic call, we will get there and have probable cause for arrest so we will

explain to them that they are being arrested and ask if there is anything they want to grab. To work with them and make it easier for them and to treat people with dignity. But, with the cameras on, we found officers were a little bit too conciliatory and not controlling the situation enough because they were worried about looking like they were being too harsh on the cameras. They would let someone wonder around their house where the person could, for example, go grab a weapon if being told they were under arrest. I think it was just a case of, early on in the program, the officers getting used to the technology and they were concerned about how they would look on camera so sometimes they were letting the guards slip a little bit. It really wasn't a policy issues but a complacency issue.

Rick Cipro: I am the president of the Police Official's Union in the city. I just want to say thank you for having this meeting. I actually look forward to the additional meetings and community input. Unions are for body cameras. [connectivity issues- attempting to call in]

Kevin Ksen: I do not recognize the organization Rick is from, the CLEMCC, what organization is that?

Chairperson Yang: I am not sure we will have to wait for him to call in.

Rick Cipro continued to have connection issues and held his comments.

Isabel Gonzalez-Webster: There is a question in the chat from Kevin. Are the bodycams being paid for by a military grant and why are the military involved?

Chairperson Yang: Kevin, who are you asking this question to?

Kevin Ksen: I am seeing, Rick Cipro, it says: CLEMCC is Civilian Law Enforcement Military Cooperation Committee. I don't know why the military group is part of working with the police department or part of this planning process. I am just kind of confused.

Lt. Murtha: Through the chair, there is no military involvement in our body camera program.

Jeffa (sp?) #IChangeTheWorld: Kevin, I just wanted to support you and thank you very much for checking out Rick Cipro. It was very disturbing reading where he came from. Something that we are really not for, the militarization of the police. So I am really happy that Kevin spotted that quickly.

Rick Cipro (call- in): I am the president of the Police Officials Union. I know there is some talk about CLEMCC, that is another organization I do belong to but I am not here representing them. I do other zoom meetings. I represent the Police Officials Union here in the City of Worcester. As I was saying, thank you Madam Chair for hosting this meeting and the whole Human Rights Commission. We look forward to the additional community input on this. The body cameras have been discussed for a number of years and as a police union we are for the body cameras. We believe they will bring better transparency to the policing here in the city and will help show where officers have maybe done some wrongdoing but also exonerate officers where there has been some false type of allegation. I think that, around the country, we are behind a bit here in Massachusetts and I think we do need to step up. I applaud not waiting for the state to take action. I really believe that Worcester should really take action now and not wait for the state to

do this. Also, there are plenty of great policies that are out there already, either through the Police Executive Research Forum, the International Chiefs of Police and other police departments. I believe they work with a majority of different people, such as the NAACP, ACLU, in developing some of those policies. This is great that we are having these community meetings and we can talk about what is best for Worcester and what is best for the community here. This is a Collective Bargaining issue because it is a change to working conditions so under Collective Bargaining law the city must bargain this with city police unions. We are ready to bargain. Just so everyone knows, though, the Police Officials Union has not had a collective bargaining agreement for years. So we are working that out and we look forward to continuing discussions with this group, with the community at large and also with the city so that we can implement this sooner rather than later.

B. Schedule of district listening sessions

District 5- Monday August 23, 6-8pm, Int'l Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), 242 Mill St.

District 4- Monday September 13, 6-8pm, Chandler Elementary Community School, 114 Chandler St.

District 3- Monday September 27, 6-8pm, Worcester Senior Center, 128 Providence St.

District 2- Monday October 4, 6-8pm, St Bernard's Church, 228 Lincoln St.

District 1- Monday October 18, 6-8pm, MA League of Community Health Centers, Inc., 16 Brooks St.

C. Discussion: Invitation from Board of Health to participate in joint meeting

Meeting will be online, July 19th, we will be discussing the intersectionality of community policing, if anyone would like to join that, the meeting can be found on the city of Worcester website. We will also be talking about the civilian review board.

Commissioner O'Callahan: I am confused about, Ed might be the best to answer this, if it is considered new business, discussing the civilian review board and the Board of Health is inviting us to have this conversation, how does that work? Do we talk about it ahead of time? Do we just go listen and talk about it after? As a board do we discuss it together? Is it considered a joint meeting if they have an agenda and just invite us?

Commissioner Robinson: that is actually more of a Jayna question. I do not know if it is an official joint meeting between the two.

Jayna Turchek: I see that the Chairperson for the Board of Health, Jerry Gurwitz, is present at this meeting, I did not know if you wanted to formally invite the HRC to the Board of Health Meeting you are hosting this month?

[Jerry Gurwitz lost connection and did not speak]

Michael Traynor: on the open meeting law aspect, the recommendation is to have both boards to post as a public meeting. If you are going to attend jointly, I would post both boards, as an open meeting. That is the recommendation from the Attorney General's office as well. There are

certain gatherings that you don't have to post, but it is never a bad thing to post it and cover it, incase anything discussed that would be interpreted as being within your jurisdiction, that would be an Open Meeting Law violation. My recommendation is that if you do meet with the Board of Health, both bodies should post the meeting individually as public meetings.

Commissioner O'Callahan: It sounds like they are posting their agenda with more specific items on it that will help inform what we would then post.

4. Public Comment (see above)

5. Adjournment at 8:15pm.