

Pittsburgh Community Taskforce for Police Reform

October 2020

Contents

[Taskforce Members](#) [3](#)

[Charge of the Taskforce](#) [3](#)

[Executive Summary](#) [4](#)

Key Focus Areas and Recommendations in Alphabetical Order

[Eliminating Racial Disparities](#) [9](#)

[Officer Wellness](#) [14](#)

[Reimagining Policing](#) [17](#)

[Recruitment, Training, Education, and Hiring](#) [22](#)

[Relations with Pittsburgh’s Fraternal Order of Police](#) [28](#)

[Transparency and Accountability](#) [30](#)

[Use of Force Changes Needed to Pittsburgh Bureau of Police \(PBP\) Policy](#) [34](#)

[Use of Tear Gas, Rubber Bullets, “Flash-Bang” Devices and Other Less Lethal Methods of Crowd Control](#) [37](#)

[Presenters and Presentations](#) [40](#)

[References](#) [42](#)

[Appendices](#) [45](#)

Taskforce Members

Dr. Quintin Bullock, President, Community College of Allegheny County and Co-chair, Pittsburgh Community Taskforce for Police Reform

Ms. Valerie McDonald Roberts, Former Chief Urban Affairs Officer of Mayor Peduto's Office and Co-chair, Pittsburgh Community Taskforce for Police Reform

Mr. Tony Beltran, President & CEO, Pittsburgh Mercy

Mr. Richard Garland, MSW, Assistant Professor, University of Pittsburgh School of Public Health

Dr. Bobbi Watt Geer, President & CEO, United Way of Southwestern Pennsylvania

Ms. Sylvia Fields, MPM, Executive Director, Eden Hall Foundation

Professor David A. Harris, Sally Ann Semenko Chair, University of Pittsburgh School of Law

Ms. Amanda Green Hawkins, Esq., Assistant General Counsel, United Steelworkers.

Rev. Marie Kelly, Pastor & Representative of Western Pennsylvania Concerned Clergy

Ms. Patricia Leftwich, MS, Community Advocate & Biomedical Researcher

Dr. Angela Reynolds, CEO, YWCA Greater Pittsburgh

Mr. Tim Stevens, Chairman & CEO, The Black Political Empowerment Project

Rabbi Ron Symons, Director, Center for Loving Kindness, Jewish Community Center of Greater Pittsburgh

Ms. Sharon Werner, Chief Operating Officer Corporate Responsibility Group, PNC Bank

Mr. Nathaniel Yap, Community Advocate

Taskforce Official Charge

Mayor Bill Peduto's official charge to the Pittsburgh Community Taskforce for Police Reform. The charge provides the direction for the taskforce work.

"I ask the taskforce, whose members come from diverse stakeholder communities, to lay out a blueprint for real and sustained change and reform for the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police, generating

recommendations for concrete suggestions and people-oriented solutions that will make Pittsburgh a safe and healthy place for all of our citizens, especially for members of our Black community."

Executive Summary

The City of Pittsburgh and the nation as a whole are at a crossroads—with the major concerns being racial bias, racial disparities, and police tactics in the community. This crossroads presents an opportunity to take a critical look at the universal values we hold and how these societal values align with approaches to policing and public safety. The relationship and trust between police and communities, particularly communities of color, are in need of urgent repair. Pittsburgh must decide now what form policing and public safety will take to move forward together as a city. It is time for change.

Formed in response to the public's and Mayor Bill Peduto's call for real and sustained change and reform of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police, the Pittsburgh Community Taskforce on Police Reform was comprised of a diverse group of 15 individuals representing a vast range of professional and personal interests and viewpoints—corporate, religious and philanthropic entities; unions; health care and community-based service organizations; grassroots activism; and the law. The goal of the taskforce was to develop an authentic, innovative report, which gets to the heart of the issues and includes a broad list of recommendations that if implemented, will enable Pittsburgh to become a safe and healthy place for residents and the public, especially members of our Black community.

Taskforce members researched and reviewed existing information, reports and data, and heard from and interviewed numerous experts in the field and community members, all with the aim of formulating recommendations and a viable plan of action. The taskforce identified eight key focus areas for reform:

1. Eliminating Racial Disparities
2. Officer Wellness
3. Reimagining Policing
4. Recruitment, Training, Education and Hiring
5. Relations with Pittsburgh's Fraternal Order of Police
6. Transparency and Accountability
7. Use of Force Changes Needed to Pittsburgh Bureau of Police Policy
8. Use of Tear Gas, Rubber Bullets, "Flash-Bang" Devices and Other Less Lethal Methods of Crowd Control

The report that follows contains a number of recommendations—many of which appear in different sections of the report for emphasis and reflect the urgent need for data collection and the use of that data to reduce racial disparities, increase accountability and strengthen our communities.

Eliminating Racial Disparities

Annual Reports of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police show consistent, and in some cases worsening racial disparities across routine activities. While disparities do not necessarily indicate discrimination, actions that have a racially disparate impact for which a non-racial justification cannot be shown must be eliminated. Reform recommendations embrace the absolute entitlement of all citizens of Pittsburgh to fair, just, respectful and equal treatment in police encounters.

Recommendations

1. Pittsburgh Bureau of Police (PBP) and the City of Pittsburgh should gather and analyze more data on routine police actions, in as rigorous a way as possible; subject these data to regular and comprehensive analysis; and use that analysis to locate the explanations or source of disparate outcomes.
2. Obtain an independent partner to develop an internal and public-facing data platform of enforcement activities.

Officer Wellness

Officer wellness is an essential component of public safety. Exploration of reforms regarding officer wellness begins with a concern for law enforcement officials as human beings whose professional commitment places them in harm's way both physically and emotionally. We are grateful for their ongoing commitment to this noble profession dedicated to the protection and safety of the public. Recommendations aim to increase retention of personnel, promote mental wellness, reduce disciplinary issues, and improve police-community relations.

Recommendations

1. Increase communication and partnership between PBP and the City of Pittsburgh's Department of Human Resources in order to more effectively serve public safety officers, employees and their families.
2. Create new and modify existing programs to support a culture of community policing.

Reimagining Policing

Amidst calls to "defund the police," the taskforce considered the spectrum between the status quo and abolishing police departments. PBP plays an important role in responding to and preventing crime. Data analysis and stakeholder interviews show reforms are needed. Proposed reforms would reallocate PBP financial resources to promote improved community-police relations, de-escalation techniques, and appropriate response to human-service crisis intervention.

Recommendations

1. Expand partnerships to handle non-serious crime responses with the goal of moving as many of these responsibilities to others or through hybrid police-social service response models.

2. Partner with County entities, including 9-1-1 and neighboring municipalities, and non-PBP police departments (for example Pittsburgh Public Schools) to reduce over-policing and disparate police actions.

Recruitment, Training, Education and Hiring

The taskforce explored new and innovative ways for PBP to recruit, train, educate and develop its police officers to help guarantee fair and equitable policing in the City of Pittsburgh, increase police legitimacy in the eyes of the public, and work towards creating a premier law enforcement agency whose members are reflective of the diverse communities served by PBP. Recommendations address basic recruit and in-service training, as well as leadership development.

Recommendations

1. Reform hiring practices to ensure that law enforcement better reflects Pittsburgh demographics, promotes a “guardian mindset,” fosters an ongoing commitment to ‘community policing’, and increases language proficiency, cultural sensitivity, and support for people with disabilities and the LGBTQIA+ community.
2. Establish ‘Recruitment Coaches’ to help cadet candidates navigate through the hiring process.

Relations with Pittsburgh’s Fraternal Order of Police

The taskforce was particularly interested in the grievance procedure, based on expressed concerns, generally, that it seems very difficult to terminate an officer for cause. Recommendations acknowledge that proposed reforms that affect any negotiated terms and conditions of employment must be bargained by the City and the FOP. The taskforce identified five areas where there is room for impactful changes.

Recommendations

1. Encourage Municipal Police Officers Education and Training Commission (MPOETC) to exercise its authority to more frequently revoke licenses for certain types of misconduct; expand the PA Confidential Law Enforcement Act to require termination for non-felony misconduct; and amend Act 111 to include a public policy exception to enforcement of arbitration awards.
2. Demand increased age, gender, and race diversity in the selection of arbitrators by MPOETC.

Transparency and Accountability

Lack of trust of police, perceived inappropriate use of force, and over policing of certain communities leads to improved transparency and accountability measures for offices within the PBP, including the Office of Municipal Investigations and the Citizens Police Review Board.

Reforms are needed to data collection and reporting procedures to ensure accountability, and assess how police interact with people of color, immigrant populations, people with disabilities, youth in our schools and members of the LGBTQIA+ community.

Recommendations

1. Institute an office within the Mayor’s administration to track, analyze, and present data and use this data to inform police policy and reduce over policing of minority communities.
2. Implement an officer bystander intervention program to build a culture of zero tolerance for inappropriate use of force; reduce the number of officers who have been charged with or exhibit consistent patterns of misconduct who return to PBP.

Use of Force Changes Needed to Pittsburgh Bureau of Police Policy

While the PBP’s current use of force policy contains many industry-standard provisions and reflected nationally-accepted ideas as of the time of its enactment (2015), some of the ideas and language in the policy must be updated to more clearly and directly reflect the goals and values of our city. Deadly force must always be a last resort, and force of any kind must only be used properly and proportionally. Other provisions must be added in order to address issues not addressed by current policy.

Recommendations

1. The four overarching general principles denoting the sanctity of every human life should appear clearly and directly in PBP Use of Force policy, even if current language might imply the same ideas. The general principles are outlined in the report.
2. Ensure transparency on use of force policies. Attempt de-escalation before force can be used, unless doing so would be futile or endanger the officer or others; PBP must require officers to intervene to stop another officer from using excessive force and require reporting of all use of force.

Use of Tear Gas, Rubber Bullets, “Flash-Bang” Devices and Other Less Lethal Methods of Crowd Control

Demonstrators in Pittsburgh peacefully exercising their First Amendment rights, including members of this Taskforce, were subjected to the use of tear gas, rubber bullets, “flash-bang” devices, and the other “less lethal” weapons. These methods are not non-lethal; they can injure and, when not used properly, severely injure and occasionally do kill. They should be used only when absolutely necessary, with proper restraint, and with consistent training and tracking to ensure use under the best practices.

Recommendations

1. Using tear gas, rubber bullets, flash-bang devices, pepper spray, “bean bag” rounds, and other “less-lethal” weapons for crowd control must be significantly curtailed and used only

in life-threatening situations until such time as the next steps below are carried out and completed. If the independent organization described below does not formulate viable recommendations and issue a public report within six months of its formation, a *moratorium* will go into effect on using the PBP tactics described above. Such moratorium will remain in effect until such time as the independent organization completes its work.

2. The City of Pittsburgh will act to immediately bring in an independent organization to conduct an investigation of PBP's use of "less-lethal" weapons against demonstrators, as well as the use of kettling (crowd-control technique), review current PBP policies, procedures and training.

Achieving the type of change that is required for systemic police reform within the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police is not easy and will take time. It will take a commitment from all involved to do the hard work that needs to be done—challenging assumptions, acknowledging and taking responsibility for past actions, and finding common ground and solutions. We must realize the profound role racism plays in policing while appreciating the vital role proper policing plays in a just society. We need to support our police through better training and supervision, yet hold those who cross the line accountable for their actions. We must commend the dedication of those who, despite the dangers, become police officers while at all times demanding total transparency and accountability from those same officers. We uncovered the need for cultural change in the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police (PBP) so that institutional and systemic racism are no longer a part of the culture of the PBP. And finally, we must accept the challenge to help bring forth positive change to the City of Pittsburgh.

The time that the City of Pittsburgh invests now to address police reform and accountability will, when we get it right, benefit many generations to come. If we want to live up to our reputation of being the nation's most livable city, it starts with ensuring that all persons are treated with dignity and respect on a daily basis.

Eliminating Racial Disparities

Introduction

As a beginning point, the taskforce had available the same data and reports available to all residents of Pittsburgh: the Annual Reports of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police (PBP), who collect information on a limited number of routine police actions in a given year, with some of the data broken out to show racial, ethnic and gender differences. Even a cursory survey of these documents shows that racial disparities across these routine activities remains the rule rather than the exception in 2020, and this situation is not improving; it is getting worse. These disparities must, at the very least, be shown to be based on legitimate reasons connected to protecting the public, and not because of racial discrimination. If these legitimate public safety concerns can be addressed in a way that do not include or create racial disparities, the Bureau must change its practices to those without racially disparate impact. Actions that have a racially disparate impact for which a non-racial justification cannot be shown must be eliminated. This is the least that residents of Pittsburgh can expect from the Bureau: police actions that do not have a racially disproportionate impact that is not, in some sense, necessary to serve a greater positive purpose that cannot be achieved in any other way. The bedrock concepts of fairness and equality before the law, and the absolute entitlement of all citizens of Pittsburgh to fair, just, respectful and equal treatment in police encounters requires nothing less.

Disparities Do Not Necessarily Indicate Discrimination

Disparities are measurable outcomes that differ across various demographic groups in similar situations: in this instance, differences in treatment by the Pittsburgh Police. But disparity may not mean that unjustified discrimination is taking place. Discrimination is unequal treatment based on forbidden criteria, such as racial or ethnic group membership or gender. Disparate treatment may be explained by neutral factors that have no connection to forbidden racial or ethnic criteria: a greater number of calls for service from a predominantly African American neighborhood, for example, might explain a greater police presence in the neighborhood. But unexplained patterns of disparity, over long periods and across multiple dimensions of police work, raise red flags. At the very least, they demand 1) explanations other than race, if such are available, real, and persuasive, and if not, 2) changes in police officer and PBP behavior, to eliminate these disparities.

Sources

While working on the Eliminating Racial Disparities Subcommittee, the taskforce had access to multiple sources of information, and a number of excellent conversations and briefings. The sources included all five of the PBP's Annual Reports, from years 2015 through 2019. These reports, available online to the public, included information on a number of aspects of police actions for the year. These include everything from organization and personnel issues, to litigation and discipline, to calls for service, and some routine enforcement activities: arrests, traffic stops, frisks, field contacts,

and warrantless searches and seizures. The taskforce also received a memorandum on traffic stop activities from the PBP's Analytics Unit.

The taskforce also had access to statistical studies of PBP activities by the Allegheny County Department of Human Services, including [Use of Force 2010-2015](#), [Arrest Trends in the City of Pittsburgh](#), and others. In addition, members of the taskforce received a briefing on a new study by Dr. Ralph Bangs, former associate director of the Center for Race and Social Problems at the University of Pittsburgh's School of Social Work. Dr. Bangs graciously provided the latest draft of his study based on the PBP's own data, to the Subcommittee. Dr. Heath Johnson, head of the Analytics Unit for the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police, engaged with the taskforce Subcommittee on Eliminating Racial Disparities through a conversation with that Subcommittee's chair. In addition, members of the Subcommittee also had the opportunity for a briefing by AH Datalytics, a firm that has created and rolled out data analytics platforms and public dashboards for the New Orleans Police Department, which (because of the firm's work) is now considered one of the most transparent police departments in the nation.

Analysis

Based on the available data, racial disparities pervade every aspect of routine police enforcement activity in Pittsburgh. The central data examined here, coming from the PBP itself in its annual reports and the information the Bureau provides to the Department of Human Services, permits no other conclusion, and in most categories, these disparities are widening – that is, they are getting worse as time goes on, not better.

The Pittsburgh Bureau of Police's public data signals that the most routine enforcement activities need several changes, including: traffic stops, frisks after traffic stops, arrests, field contacts, and warrantless searches and seizures. Some activity closely related to these is either not tracked or not publicly reported. But across the categories of tabulated and published data, there exist stark evidence of racial disparities. They are best calculated and understood not through comparing the raw numbers or percentages in each categories, but as relative risk ratios: a comparison, captured in a ratio, of the chances of a member of a particular demographic group experiencing a particular police action (e.g., a traffic stop) to the chances of a member of another demographic group experiencing the same police action. The result is a calculation that allows us to say, for example "Blacks are X times more likely to experience [particular police action] than Whites are."

In the PBP data, given the limited population demographics of Pittsburgh, the most robust risk ratios compare Black and white citizens. The bottom line is that all data shown in the PBP Annual Reports show disparities and show them increasing (with just one exception – the differences in traffic stops from 2017 to 2018). For example, 19.8 percent of Black males experienced traffic stops, but only 6.5 percent of white males – a relative risk ratio of 3.0, meaning Black men were 3.0 times as likely to experience a traffic stop as white men were. After traffic stops, three percent of

Black men were frisked, as compared to .3 percent of white men – a relative risk ratio of almost 10. For arrests, 14.5 percent of Black men were arrested in 2019 but only 2.3 percent of white men, a relative risk ratio of 6.4. Comparing Black and white women also exposed racial disparities, though those were somewhat less dramatic than those for men. According to Dr. Bangs, any relative risk ratio over 1.2 that is, “Black residents being 1.2 times more likely than whites to experience a variable” in the health field would be cause for concern and the same concern should be true of police actions.

These disparities are summarized in the following chart, prepared by Dr. Ralph Bangs and used here with his permission.

SUMMARY TABLE. RATIOS OF BLACK/WHITE PER CAPITA RATES FOR PITTSBURGH POLICE ACTIONS IN 2019

| | <u>Black/White Male</u> | <u>Black/White Female</u> |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Traffic stops | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Frisks during traffic stops | 9.9 | 4.5 |
| Field contact/warrantless search & seizure | 9.2 | 4.2 |
| FCWSS for ages 19-29 (rough estimate) | 18 | 8 |
| Arrests | 6.4 | 4.8 |
| Arrets for ages 19-29 (rough estimates) | 11 | 8 |

The conclusion seems inescapable: the PBP’s routine activities show regular and substantial patterns of racial disparities across all of the Bureau’s measured and published dimensions. No one tendered any explanation to the taskforce for these disparities. That is not to say there are no explanations; rather, we can only say we received none. This leaves open the possibility – unrebutted at this point – that these disparities indicate the presence of discrimination based on race. It seems strongly in the interest of both the PBP and the City of Pittsburgh to gather more data on routine police actions, in as rigorous a way as possible; to subject this data to regular and deep analysis and to use that analysis to locate the explanations or source of this disparate treatment: what phenomena, actions, or policies are causing these disparities, if not racial discrimination. If no satisfactory non-racial data-based explanations appear plausible, and if race remains the only plausible explanation, the PBP must immediately change its policies and overall actions that create these disparities, in order to eliminate them. Dr. Bangs’ report also establishes that there are a number of

important gaps in the data collected by the PBP. Any analytics system for the Bureau must include considerably more data than is collected now.

In the briefing for the full taskforce given by Chief of Police Scott Schubert and members of his command staff, Chief Schubert conceded the existence of these racial disparities; he did not deny them or attempt to explain them away. He said, rather, that he wanted help in figuring out what to do about them and how to fix the problems that these disparities might indicate. Obtaining independent assistance for the Bureau must be a top priority; in a city with two of the most advanced universities in the world, expertise is available to be tapped.

Last, we believe that the PBP must become significantly more transparent in its collection, analysis and use of data on routine police activities. The PBP now publishes limited data, as required by law, in its Annual Report. By definition, this means that the data come from the prior year, and they are static. As a city engaged on the forefront of the information economy, Pittsburgh's residents deserve far more data, presented publicly and as closely as possible to real time. The public-facing dashboards constructed by AH Analytics for the New Orleans Police Department constitute a good example of how this can work.

The recommendations include:

1. The PBP must commit itself to identifying all racial disparities in its routine actions; to requiring independent analysis of the data that show disparities, to identify the sources of these disparities, to account for them on either racial or other grounds; and for those that stem from race (i.e., for which no non-racial explanation is plausible) to creating specific plans to eliminate these disparities within one year, through changes in policy, practice, and actions. Plans for taking action to remedy these disparities shall be available to the public, including through publication on City and PBP websites.
2. The PBP must identify and ally with an independent partner – for example, a university, free-standing think tank, or a private analytics firm with a stellar history – to perform the analysis necessary to determine which disparities are based, in whole or in part, on race or other non-justifiable categories, and to pinpoint the source of those disparities, and to recommend changes to eliminate them. The City of Pittsburgh shall make appropriate funding necessary for this independent work on an ongoing basis for at least a period of five years.
3. The PBP must fill in the gaps in its data collection by routinely collecting data on the following police activities:
 - i. Review any perceived population bias using the most recent American Community Survey five-year annual averages, not single-year Census population data.
 - ii. Collect and include in analysis and reports, data on pedestrian stops, uses of force beyond “come-along holds” and other low level uses, citations/warnings issued,

- summons issued, and misdemeanor vs. felony arrests, broken out by race and gender.
- iii. Require and include notation (by officers) and collection of data on reasons for traffic and pedestrian stops, arrests, and other police actions, including arrests by type of offense; specific factual basis for presence of probable cause and reasonable suspicion, when these standards are used for arrests, stops or searches, broken out by race and gender.
 - iv. Separate breakouts of stop, search and arrest data for Black and white juveniles vs. Black and white adults.
 - v. For all events that include searches (e.g., stops with frisks, arrests accompanied by searches, etc.), a calculation of the hit rate – the rate at which officers find contraband, the nature of contraband (e.g., illegal gun, cannabis, cocaine, etc.) and (if applicable) amount of contraband, with hit rates broken out by race and gender.
 - vi. All data categories to include Black/white relative risk or odds ratios for routine police actions.
 - vii. Issue bi-monthly public reports assessing which PBP policies, programs, activities, tactics, or strategies are producing racial disparities, whether any non-racial explanations accounts for these disparities, and what is being done to remedy the situation.
 - viii. Provide as full an amount of information on internal police complaints and discipline as current law allows. At present, the data presented in the Annual Reports are skeletal and provide too little information for a member of the public to determine whether or not officers are being held accountable for actions that violate policy or law. At a minimum, each report on discipline should include the number and types of cases referred for investigation to either the City of Pittsburgh Office of Municipal Investigations (OMI) or the City of Pittsburgh Citizen Police Review Board (CPRB), broken out by type of misconduct, the number of findings of exonerated, not resolved, sustained, or unfounded (for OMI, with a separate compilation of analogous findings by the CPRB), by types of misconduct, disciplinary actions recommended, by which agency and by type of misconduct, and disciplinary actions imposed, by type of misconduct. For individual disciplinary complaints, the report must include, for each, a short narrative of the conduct alleged, the finding made by the investigating agency, if the disciplinary complaint is sustained, the disciplinary action recommended, and the disciplinary action actually imposed. There should also be a report that includes the number of incidents of officers terminated and permitted to return to duty with back pay.
4. The PBP shall identify a partner for the construction of internal and public facing data platforms and dashboards to allow both PBP personnel at all levels and the public to understand and PBP activities, in as close to real time as is possible. This must include, at a minimum, an easily used public dashboard on routine enforcement activities that have

shown racial disparities in the past, in order to monitor progress on improving these outcomes.

Officer Wellness

The taskforce recommendations regarding officer wellness begin with a concern for law enforcement officials as human beings whose professional commitment places them in harm's way, both physically and emotionally. We are grateful for the sacrifices that they and their families make for the sake of public safety and want to support them in healthy living for their own sake, for the sake of their families, and for the sake of our community.

As indicated in President Barack Obama's Taskforce on 21st Century Policing ([Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing](#)), officer wellness is an essential component of public safety:

“The wellness and safety of law enforcement officers is critical not only to themselves, their colleagues, and their agencies but also to public safety. An officer whose capabilities, judgment, and behavior are adversely affected by poor physical or psychological health not only may be of little use to the community he or she serves but also may be a danger to the community and to other officers.

However, the most important factor to consider when discussing wellness and safety is the culture of law enforcement which needs to be transformed. Support for wellness and safety should permeate all practices and be expressed through changes in procedures, requirements, attitudes, and behaviors. An agency work environment in which officers do not feel they are respected, supported, or treated fairly is one of the most common sources of stress. And research indicates that officers who feel respected by their supervisors are more likely to accept and voluntarily comply with departmental policies. This transformation should also overturn the tradition of silence on psychological problems, encouraging officers to seek help without concern about negative consequences”.

In order to fulfil the recommendations and vision of the findings of that Taskforce, we recommend the following to ensure that officers are equipped and supported to deal with the tremendous expectations of their jobs.

Increase communication and partnership between PBP and the City of Pittsburgh's Department of Human Resources in order to more effectively serve public safety officers, employees and their families.

1. Increase communication and partnership between leadership of Pittsburgh Bureau of Police and the City's Department of Human Resources.

- Consider a specific partnership between PBP Wellness Coordinator and assigned staff member in the HR Office.
2. Examine the creation of a police-specific Employee Assistance Program (EAP) to focus on the particular needs of police and their families.
 - Study the current providers of therapy and counseling services through the EAP. If therapists who are specially trained to deal with the issues facing those in the first responder community – including police, firefighters, and EMS – are available, consider the implementation of an independent group of private therapists who are contracted through the PBP and provide services to officers free of charge.
 - Collaborate with health gurus – either specific health gurus assigned to PBP or a different partnership to alert PBP to all services offered to them and their families.

Examine the current Officer Wellness Office and consider the ways to bolster these areas of focus: mental and emotional wellness, including the unique toll it takes to serve as a first responder, physical health including controllable health and chronic health issues, alcohol or substance abuse, financial stability, marital and familial issues, including care of family/parents and spiritual wellness.

1. Consider the creation of a Public Safety/First Responders Resiliency Center to provide a “one-stop shop” for first responders (police, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians) and their families where they can receive support in all areas of wellness: physical fitness, nutrition, psychological counseling (both individual and group), physical therapy, financial education, and other large group meetings. Such a center would help with retention of personnel, fewer physical injuries, and most importantly, a reduction in disciplinary issues by ensuring that first responders are mentally and physically fit.
2. Training programs to institute a Culture of Wellness. This begins in the academy and needs to be mandatory on a regular schedule throughout an officer’s tenure in PBP.
3. Due to unique stresses police officers experience and the stigmas often associated with seeking help, it is recommended that Pittsburgh Public Safety engage an existing provider of officer wellness mobile apps to customize a mobile app for all Pittsburgh public safety officers, civilian employees and their families (as needed). The app should be customized specific to the City Pittsburgh needs, combining the best available local and national resources that are tailored for law enforcement, firefighters, dispatchers, and other public safety personnel.

Create new and modify existing programs to support a culture of community policing.

1. Create a formal structure to establish and nurture a Community/Police Spiritual Leaders Council. The shared work of the police and the spiritual leaders will help strengthen partnership between community and police and help facilitate the following results:
 - Strengthen relationships between spiritual leaders and police so that spiritual leaders can represent community concerns to police, foster food communication from police to the community and, in challenging times, serve as repairers of the breach.

- Community/Police shared engagement in spirituality
 - Recruitment strategies for the Police Academy infused by spirituality
 - Training of cadets in an understanding of the importance of spirituality
 - On-going professional development of members of the PBP in broadening their awareness of spirituality
 - Serve as a counsel to police as they develop anti-racist/multi-cultural education of cadets, professional development of officers, and police policies
 - Identify exemplary models (local and national) of spiritual leaders, police, and community partnerships for adaptation across neighborhoods and police zones.
 - Deployment of spiritual leaders at times of need to help de-escalate tensions between police and community.
2. Enhance PBP Chaplain Program to work in concert with an identified and dedicated team of local interfaith spiritual leaders educated in the impact of spirituality on de-escalation, police wellness and community policing. For purposes of definition: “Spirituality” does not denote religious practices, God, or theology but rather an inherent human awareness of the elusive impact of experience. It attributes meaning to one’s life through hope and idealism, connection with others, and awareness of experience. More specifically, “workplace spirituality recognizes that people have an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work in the context of community.” [Vicarious Traumatization and Spirituality in Law Enforcement | FBI: Law Enforcement Bulletin](#)

Reimagining Policing

Amidst calls to “defund the police” the taskforce considered the spectrum between the status quo and abolishing police departments. While we acknowledged the current status is not acceptable and that reform is necessary, we also acknowledge that the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police plays an important role in responding to and preventing crime in the city of Pittsburgh. The taskforce recommendations are not based on isolated police tactics. Rather, recommendations reflect a holistic perspective of PBP areas of service that are necessary to maintain and protect public safety and current functions that are operating well and should be strengthened or reinforced, opportunities for reallocating resources to advance racial and gender equity, better support marginalized populations, adopting models that promote improved community-police relations, de-escalation techniques, and appropriate response to human-service crisis intervention.

To inform recommendations in this report, the taskforce:

1. Analyzed relevant data from Pittsburgh Bureau of Police 2019 Statistical Analysis; 911 service calls, and 211 service needs
2. Explored models operating in other cities to reallocate police priorities and funding
3. Consulted human services and community representatives
4. Reviewed materials and policies on policing

Key Findings That Informed the Recommendations in This Report

Opportunities exist to reprioritize police activities and partner with existing human services agencies on crisis intervention for non-criminal calls for service.

1. Of the top ten 911 call types, traffic stops and parking complaints represent the 3rd and 5th most frequented call type last year, respectively. These rankings were fairly consistent for the first half of 2020.
2. Responses to burglar alarms and theft reports are also among the top ten response types.
3. Crime-related activities (response and prevention) represent a majority of response types (approximately 60%), though not an overwhelming majority.

Racial disparities in policing exist. The taskforce explored data by race and gender for activities that could be potentially reallocated to other entities.

1. Pittsburgh Bureau of Police 2019 Statistical Analysis demonstrates racial disparities in traffic stops with more pronounced disparities for traffic stops ending in a frisk search.
2. While racial disparities do not prove racial discrimination, these disparities cannot be ignored.
3. Data and policy analysis is needed to identify why these disparities exist and persist.
[Ratios of Black/white per Capita Rates for Pittsburgh police Actions 2019, Dr. R. Bangs]

This analysis should address the potential role of discretionary practices at the individual officer, zone, or bureau level.

Reimagining policing builds upon existing community structures that are currently under-resourced and incorporating new models.

1. Recommendations prioritize building or strengthening structures and other service sources to handle the categories that are not related to fighting and responding to serious crime, with the goal of moving as many of these other responsibilities to others within two years.
2. County partnerships are necessary.
 - Ensure that appropriate training for 911 triage is implemented. Given such services are operated at the County level.
 - The City of Pittsburgh should serve as a leader to advocate for these changes, aiming to garner support from other municipalities in Allegheny County.
3. Pittsburgh Bureau of Police operates within a city that also contains other law enforcement agencies (for example, college and university police, Pittsburgh Public Schools, Allegheny County Police Department, and other public entities). While this taskforce is focused on PBP, we recognize that incidents can cross police departments. We recommend that:
 - a. The City of Pittsburgh leadership convene other law enforcement agencies around these principles to ensure social justice efforts are consistent within the city.
 - b. PBP structures the Memorandum of Agreement with Pittsburgh Public Schools (PPS) to remove over-policing in PPS and develop a pre-arrest diversion program.

The taskforce recommends components of the following models to reprioritize PBP activities and reallocate funding resources:

1. Crisis Assistance Helping Out On the Street (CAHOOTS), Eugene OR
2. Support Team Assisted Response (STAR), Denver CO
3. Increase the share of encounter-free traffic enforcement among non-criminal incidents
 - a. Encounter free traffic enforcement reduces direct police interaction with drivers and passengers for routine traffic stops not-related to criminal activity.

Data Support

Last year, the majority of time spent by police was on crime-related and proactive policing calls for service (59%). Nearly one-fifth of 911 calls for service with a police response are traffic-related. One quarter of 911 calls for service are related to other non-crime related activities. Trends are consistent for the first half of 2020.

Proactive policing represents a considerable percentage of time spent by police. The top ten categories of 911 call types of service in 2019 were traffic enforcement [Appendix B]. In 2019, PBP made 11,718 traffic stops involving over 20,562 people. Data provided in PBP's 2019 annual report suggest racial and gender disparities in traffic stops, with greater disparities for traffic stops that end in a frisk search:

1. Males are disproportionately represented among traffic stops (66% of individuals stopped); Black individuals are disproportionately represented among traffic stops relative to their representation in the population (44% of individuals stopped)
2. Racial disparities are more pronounced for traffic stops ending in a frisk search (blacks represent 62% of individuals stopped).

The recommendations for reimagining policing are the following:

1. Reset priorities for Pittsburgh policing.
2. Increase data collection and reporting for greater transparency with the public on disposition of nonviolent incidents, and data-informed policy decisions.
3. Implement a data-informed approach to reset policing priorities and shift appropriate activities to other entities. Use existing data sources to produce a public breakdown of how officer time is spent in responses to: serious crimes, burglar alarms (including false alarms), taking reports, traffic enforcement, checks on citizen welfare, truancy, noise complaints, etc..
4. Provide intersectional data (race, gender identity, disability, etc.) on 911 call disposition and response and police-initiated stops for the continuum – initiation to arrest.
5. Implement crisis intervention efforts to provide a non-police response or hybrid response for non-criminal incidents centered on human service needs. Examples of models as previously discussed include but are not limited to CAHOOTS and STAR.
6. Shift some traffic enforcement duties away from PBP. Models to explore that include use of technology:
 - Encounter-free traffic stops, such as Friedersdorf's (2016) recommendation to replace police direct engagement in routine traffic stops of vehicles that exhibit a violation with taking a photo of the license plate and mailing a "fix it" ticket.
 - Berkeley, CA – City Council voted to shift traffic and parking enforcement from the police bureau to a newly created Department of Transportation.
7. Reallocate PBP funding to more appropriately align human services functions currently handled by PBP.
8. Provide PBP with resources and support to effectively respond to non-criminal human service calls/needs.
9. Allocate funding from the Public Safety budget to support non-law enforcement crisis intervention partners for above recommendations. Examples include, but are not limited to community outreach, mental health interventions, school and out-of-school time activities, etc.).
10. Reallocate funding from the PBP budget to reduce non-criminal incidents that escalate to Immigration and Customs Enforcement involvement.

- An example is the VERA Institute of Justice pilot program currently operating in Philadelphia in partnership with appropriate agency partners. The program provides universal representation for people involved in immigration proceedings.
11. Reallocate PBP funding previously earmarked for activities prohibited through the Use of Force subcommittee recommendations to implement recommendations provided in this report.
 12. Work through existing programs and developing new services to respond to nonviolent incidents.
 13. Immediately join and provide ongoing staffing resources for Allegheny County's Crisis Response Stakeholder Group (CRSG)
 - i. CRSG involves 911, law enforcement, human service agencies, and community stakeholders – to develop a concrete plan for triaging 911 calls and dispatching hybrid response teams of law enforcement and human services or mental health professionals to respond to nonviolent calls.
 14. Immediately coordinate and collaborate with the Allegheny County government for 911 training to align with CRSG objectives.
 15. Reduce PBP responses to noncriminal complaints by increasing education and outreach around the appropriate “n11” to contact. 211 is a comprehensive 24/7 multi-modal resource for human service needs. 311 is for non-emergency municipal services.
 16. Adopt Allegheny County Department of Human Services Pre-arrest Diversion Model - Partner with police, community and system stakeholders on pre-arrest diversion efforts that provide opportunities for law enforcement to connect people who have underlying needs to community-based supports in lieu of arrest (e.g. LEAD).
 17. Meet the need to create a safe, equitable, and just community through improved PBP-community relations.
 18. Reduce the policing and criminalization of communities of color
 19. Budget allocations to support community-led and driven violence prevention, intervention, and interruption initiatives in partnership with law enforcement to create viable public safety alternatives.
 - i. Conduct 6-month and 12-month evaluation of the effectiveness of the newly created Office of Community Health and Safety.
 20. Implement specific policies aimed at de-escalation
 21. Review and strengthen PBP definitions of and training on de-escalation for the purpose of improving the de-escalation techniques and approaches used by PBP going forward in their training academies for cadets, and provided in the ongoing professional development of *all* officers.
 22. Increase investments in efforts that reduce community-level socioeconomic disparities (e.g. transportation, workforce development, affordable housing).
 23. PBP and Pittsburgh Public Schools (PPS) to ratify memorandum of understanding (MOU) within three months. Structure the MOU between PBP and PPS to reduce over-policing in PPS.

- i. Remove the seven discretionary offenses from Section IIA of the MOU to allow schools the discretion to determine the appropriate resolution.
- ii. PPS will not issue summary citations to youth until issues around disproportionality can be addressed and clear guidelines can be established around if/when to issue summary citations to youth.
- iii. Implement a pre-arrest diversion program (Philadelphia can serve as one example)

24. Advocate for and coordinate with a County Police Review Board.

Recruitment, Training, Education and Hiring

The taskforce explored new and innovative ways for the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police to recruit, train, educate and develop its police officers to help guarantee fair and equitable policing in the City of Pittsburgh, increase police legitimacy in the eyes of the public, and work towards creating a premier law enforcement agency whose members are reflective of the diverse communities served by PBP.

In addition, the taskforce conducted a thorough review of existing processes, policies, procedures and culture that may prevent the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police from being all that it can be. Members inquired about the obstacles, barriers, and traditions that perhaps need to be reviewed and changed. In addition, model programs that have demonstrated measurable success to increase professionalism within a police force were also considered along with plans to increase the recruitment of African Americans, other people of color and women. Innovative ways to improve police cadet training and to improve ongoing training and development of police officers were explored. Members also reviewed new and creative ways to improve community-police relations.

As a result of this important work, the taskforce recommendations are aligned with the vision of community policing that was well articulated by President Obama's Taskforce on 21st Century Policing. Community policing is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime. "Police interventions must be implemented with strong policies and training in place, rooted in an understanding of procedural justice... Community policing combines a focus on intervention and prevention through problem solving with building collaborative partnerships between law enforcement agencies and schools, social services, and other stakeholders. It must also be stressed that the absence of crime is not the final goal of law enforcement. Rather, it is the promotion and protection of public safety while respecting the dignity and rights of all. And public safety and well-being cannot be attained without the community's belief that their wellbeing is at the heart of all law enforcement activities. It is critical to help community members see police as allies rather than as an occupying force and to work in concert with other community stakeholders to create more economically and socially stable neighborhoods" [Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing](#), page 44.

While this is only a small segment of the total taskforce report, it is a tall order to fill. The skills and knowledge required to effectively deal with these issues requires a higher level of education as well as extensive and ongoing training in specific disciplines. The task force discussed these needs in depth, making recommendations for basic recruit and in-service training, as well as leadership development in a wide variety of areas:

1. Community policing and problem-solving principles
2. Interpersonal and communication skills
3. Bias awareness

4. Scenario-based, situational decision making
5. Crisis intervention
6. Procedural justice and impartial policing
7. Trauma and victim services
8. Mental health issues
9. Analytical research and technology
10. Languages and cultural responsiveness

[Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing](#), page 51.

The recommendations for recruitment, hiring, training and education of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police advance the vision of community policing as a shared endeavor between police and community. The four key categories that will support a future vision for community policing in the City of Pittsburgh should include the following key areas.

Recruitment/Hiring

It is important to have people on the PBP that represent communities that PBP proudly serves. No group of citizens based on race or ethnic background, should be locked out of PBP by discrimination. In addition to the demographics of the individuals recruited and hired, PBP must also focus on the type of personal qualities, values, beliefs and skills that the community want to see in a police officer. Therefore, it is crucial in all recruitment and hiring activities to ensure that there are demographics that represent the communities served, as well as recruits that have the qualities and values that are desired by the Pittsburgh community. A list of recommended criteria, qualities and values include:

1. Reform hiring practices to ensure that law enforcement better reflects our Pittsburgh community in terms of culture, race and gender, and includes an extensive psychological assessment aimed at weeding out persons with aggressive personalities. These practices should include the examination of the 'secondary qualifiers', including the reading test, physical fitness test, polygraph examination, and research to discern the reasons for the gap between white, Black and candidates of color. The hiring practices should also include conducting a full background check into the applicant's former police job history: disciplinary action, complaints, and reasons for separation. These records should be maintained for a period of thirty (30) years, if not permanently. The City's recruitment efforts should be continually assessed to measure their effectiveness.
2. Offer carefully selected and trained mentors to help retain all officers, particularly new female and minority officers, through their early careers. 'Recruitment Coaches' who are identified could help navigate cadet candidates through the secondary qualifiers. These

individuals could come from members of the community who have a commitment to having a more diverse police force, including former and retired police officers, who have a vested interest in developing a guardian mindset in police candidates, and who are committed to getting these individuals through the process to reach the end goal of becoming a Pittsburgh police officer. Existing officers, particularly those who have lived in the community for a number of years, should be encouraged to recruit and recommend candidates for the Police Academy.

3. Recruit officers who display a "guardian mindset" in their approach to community policing. As President Obama's Taskforce on 21st Century Policing noted: "Law enforcement cannot build community trust if it is seen as an occupying force coming in from outside to rule and control the community. As Plato wrote, 'In a republic that honors the core of democracy—the greatest amount of power is given to those called Guardians. Only those with the most impeccable character are chosen to bear the responsibility of protecting the democracy.'" This guardian approach should be reinforced through ongoing training throughout an officer's career.
4. Adopt and implement the Citizen Police Review Board (CPRB) recommendations contained in the in-depth redacted version accepted by the Recruitment subcommittee, [\(CPRB\) Recommendations](#), and consider adopting the opinion of the Ongoing Training & Professional Development - Full Recommendations from the Recruitment, Hiring, Training, Education Subcommittee CPRB whose research indicates that the 60 college credit requirement does not adversely affect the recruitment of women or minorities, and should be retained to help increase the professionalism of the force. There must be extraordinary and innovative efforts to significantly increase the percentage of Blacks and women on the Pittsburgh police force, such as devising a strong marketing campaign, supporting participation in the Civilian Police Academy, the Student Police Academy, and expanding the criminal justice program in the Pittsburgh Public Schools to attract more African American candidates. To enhance the potential for the recruitment of additional African Americans, all oral panels for the Bureau must include not less than one citizen, and should contain at least one African American.

Cadet Training

1. Seek ways to ensure that new police officers are in it for the good of the community. This could be done through a thorough interview process with new cadet candidates.
2. Institute training in the police academy that includes mental conditioning and stress avoidance and reduction, integration and recognition of stress effects with the preventative principles of stress management and practical experience. Such academy training should be presented by a professional health care practitioner specializing in the psychophysiological processes related to stress conditions, and it should be required annually, and applicable to the *entire* organization.

3. Adopt the CPRB recommendation that academy training include mental conditioning, stress avoidance and reduction, integration and recognition of stress effects, with the preventative principles of stress management and practical experience. Academy training should be presented by a professional health care practitioner specializing in the psychophysiological processes related to stress conditions, and it should be required annually and applicable to the entire organization.

Ongoing Training & Professional Development

1. Create a culture within PBP that fosters an ongoing commitment to the spirit and meaning of ‘community policing’. This goal would include requiring that officers be trained annually, with ongoing reinforcement in cultural competency, de-escalation and harm-reduction techniques and providing cultural competency training by experts in African American culture as well as those who can represent the interest of other marginalized communities. Additional cultural competency training may also include experts from as the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History; mandating training on racial, religious, and discriminatory profiling for all law enforcement; requiring training of all officers for proper use of body cameras during all calls, which would include requiring body cameras to be left on during any interaction with the public. A police officer that does not adhere to this requirement should receive some level of discipline that is severe enough to help ensure compliance.
2. Train officers to move from exclusively crime fighting to encompass other service-oriented functions and to be trained to recognize the characteristics of individuals in crisis to provide an effective positive resolution to the situation while reducing liability and the risk of injury. The various types of de-escalation practices suggested by this Recruitment subcommittee should be adopted by the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police within the training component of the Police Academy, and for the necessary ongoing training of its officers, if not already contained within the City’s training program. The goal for all officers is to be in command of as many de-escalation techniques as possible which will allow them to be well equipped to secure the scene at hand, to calmly communicate with the citizens involved and to produce positive outcomes. Training must always emphasize that the use of force should *never* be considered routine and that utmost restraint should always be used, always respecting the sanctity of all human life. Training should also emphasize that all attempts should be made to gain compliance of the subject through less-lethal means.
3. The Police Academy should calibrate its training with the City offices that track the diversity of languages spoken by residents of Pittsburgh. The intent is to provide cadets with a basic multi-cultural awareness to understand languages other than English spoken to police officers. All police officers should carry an annually updated pocket card of the following statement in multiple languages, “I am a police officer. Please follow my visual instructions to make sure that no one gets hurt. I am here to help you.”

4. Train police to understand people's limits and disabilities to process and understand police commands, particularly people with disabilities, mentally ill, and medical emergencies. This process should include at least yearly refresher courses, including role playing workshops.
5. Create policies against participation in discriminatory and hate speech, or supporting such viewpoints publicly or on social media. The taskforce understands that such policies may only pertain to on-duty conduct; however, the PBP can and must periodically review officers' personal or off-duty speech, particularly on social media. This review can help the PBP identify any conduct that may affect officers' on-duty performance. Once identified, the PBP can monitor officer interactions, up to and including arrests, so that it may intervene appropriately when it determines that conduct approaches or becomes harassment, discriminatory, or excessive in the use of force.
6. Create a policy that requires police body cams, and police car videos be activated immediately when interacting with people as a result of a police call or suspected necessary police intervention, as well enacting policies which mandate that police report other police who violate police policies. These policies and procedures must be shared, in depth, during the initial training of new police cadets, and must be reinforced on at least an annual basis, if not an ongoing basis. The PBP must be consistent in its issuance of discipline for violations of this policy.
7. Commit to have new cadets and all members of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police complete the Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Gender Expression (SOGIE) training. There should be a 'refresher' course provided to all officers on an annual basis. Training should include sensitizing officers on how to most appropriately interact with people who are, or who are perceived to be, LGBTQIA+, and training which includes the most effective ways to counter attitudes that a police officer may already possess when encountering people who they may already view in a very negative fashion. The PBP must be consistent in its issuance of discipline for discriminatory behavior based on gender identity or expression.

Community Engagement

1. Expand the Youth Connections initiative developed within the last five years, and create more community-based opportunities with such groups as the YMCA, YWCA, grass roots organizations, religious institutions, and the Pittsburgh Public Schools, where coursework on and for policing can be made more accessible to the public. Steps should be taken to actively expand the already existing community interactions through such programs as Big Brother/Big Sister programs, Cops and Hoops, and the Police Athletic League (PAL).
2. Train police officers in their informal interactions with community members to build more positive ongoing relationships between neighborhood residents and the police. Officers should be instructed on better interactions with citizens as they begin to walk their neighborhoods to build nurturing and healthy relationships. Organize programs which bring new officers and community leaders together in a 'meet and greet' program, to encourage the officers to accept that leaders frequently know what is best for their community, and/or

how they can best work together for the benefit of all. “Community Policing” should be used as the philosophy for daily operations of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police. Training should encourage every officer to be community minded, compassionate and empathetic. Community engagement can include career fairs at which HR and police representatives will interact with adults about career opportunities, while other public safety staff interact with the youth through the use of McGruff the Dog, police cars, fire trucks, and ambulances, etc. In order to further expand community engagement, the City should employ a full time liaison who will work with the community and the police to create and promote positive relationships.

3. Produce an annual public operational profile, which describes internal and external outcomes of the PBP. This document should profile the nature, outcomes and number of disciplinary actions taken, disciplinary grievances and arbitration, demotions and separations, commendations and promotions, and the educational levels of active officers. It should also indicate the number of calls responded to the incidence of officers’ use of force, arrests and conviction rates. This document of transparency would serve to influence public confidence, as well as offer prospective applicants information to evaluate personal career choices within the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police.

Relations with the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP)

The FOP Lodge No. 1 (or “FOP”) is the collective bargaining representative for a bargaining unit employed by the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police. Terms and conditions of employment are negotiated by the FOP and the City of Pittsburgh, and memorialized in the collective bargaining agreement; therefore, any subcommittee and taskforce recommendations that affect any negotiated terms and conditions of employment must be bargained by the City and the FOP. The subcommittee chair called the FOP president twice and left voicemail messages, and the taskforce co-chair contacted PBP to assist with the subcommittee’s efforts to meet with the FOP; however, the subcommittee did not receive any communications in response from the FOP.

Members of the taskforce met with an Assistant City Solicitor (or “ACS”) to discuss the collective bargaining agreement. The taskforce was particularly interested in the grievance procedure, based on expressed concerns, generally, that it seems very difficult to terminate an officer for cause. Some members of the taskforce also expressed concerns that the grievance and arbitration process seems to result in favorable outcomes for the police. The ACS explained that it is unlikely that the FOP will arbitrate a disciplinary grievance where there is an unlikelihood of success; however, there are five areas where there is room for impactful changes:

1. Increased diversity in the selection of arbitrators to include people of various ages, more women and more people of color
2. The Municipal Police Officers Education and Training Commission (MPOETC) is the licensing body of PBP officers, and it sets standards for licensing police officers. It should exercise its authority to revoke licenses for certain types of misconduct more frequently. Also, diversification of the commission will be important for that as its members are largely members of law enforcement, and it includes only one member of the public at large. This would require legislative amendments to PA Act 120
3. Expanding the PA Confidential Law Enforcement Act to require termination for misconduct that is other than a felony. This would require legislative amendments
4. PA Act 111 needs to include a public policy exception to enforcement of arbitration awards, so that an arbitration award could be vacated if it is against public policy. This would require legislative amendments; and,
5. There needs to be consistency in the schedule of discipline for policy violations so that disciplinary grievances are not based on disparate treatment.

The taskforce lacks enough information from the PBP and the FOP to make informed recommendations regarding these five areas.

In addition, the taskforce recognizes the importance of various perspectives and backgrounds in the arbitration panel, and would recommend that the City and the FOP review its panel of arbitrators and develop an intentional diversity and inclusion plan for it, if one does not already exist. If such a plan already exists, then the parties should review it for effectiveness and make the necessary changes to accomplish the goals if they are not being met.

For legislative amendments, the City and members of the public should address these matters with their State Legislators.

Finally, consistency in the schedule of discipline is the sole responsibility of the PBP. It is the inconsistency which gives rise to allegations of disparate treatment and the lack of just cause for discipline, thereby producing fertile ground for an arbitrator to reverse disciplinary action.

Transparency and Accountability

A thorough examination was conducted on the current status of accountability practices, policies and institutions in place to address the Pittsburgh Police Bureau's accountability to the public it serves and to make recommendations to the Mayor to strengthen the accountability of the PBP to the community. More specifically, work focused on assessing the current structure of accountability measures and offices within the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police, including the Office of Municipal Investigations and the Citizens Police Review Board as well as what might be lacking in the current structure. In addition, close attention was provided to guest speakers and community members who provided insight about how the system works and does not work for the community. Again and again, the team's attention returned to how data is used to ensure accountability, and we learned that it really is not being used beyond providing bulk statistics in the annual report.

It is hard to know how to improve the police force if no one is minding and mining the data and disaggregating it to look for trends and issues, especially as those trends relate to how police interact with people of color, people with disabilities, youth in our schools and members of the LGBTQIA+ community. We heard from members of these communities who shared with us the lack of trust, use of force and lack of understanding of the community that leads to over policing. The taskforce urges the Mayor to institute an Office of Data Analytics to track, analyze, and use this data to inform police policy and practice and to reduce over policing of minority communities.

Many of the recommendations revolve around better use of data to drive policy and practice. It is critical to collect, analyze, and disaggregate data to ensure greater accountability within the PBP. With that said, the following recommendations are being put forth:

1. Implement an Office/Director of Data Analytics and Policy or accomplish through a contractual arrangement, to collect, evaluate and use data to drive policy and practice to build community trust, fair policing and to reduce disparate treatment of racial minorities, people with disabilities, members of the LGBTQIA+ community and youth.
 - i. Data should be publicly available and consumable via easy to use dashboards that are regularly updated (if not updated in real time).
 - ii. Data should include the number of encounters with community members of minority and marginalized groups, including people with disabilities, type of disabilities, types of encounters/citations. Data should also include specific contacts between police and communities of color, LGBTQIA+ people, and other intersections among these marginalized groups.
 - iii. Data should also include numbers of negative outcomes, including disaggregated data to assess how police interact with minority communities noted above.
 - iv. Data collection needs to have percentages, graphs, and summaries to identify gaps in the system, where the bridge of communication is faltering in the community/police

engagement, and if more resources can be identified and funding for such resources can be achieved.

2. Implement an officer bystander intervention program like EPIC (see reference) to build a culture of zero tolerance for inappropriate use of force.
3. Some members of the community do not understand and/or trust the functioning of the Office of Municipal Investigations and the Citizen Police Review Boards. It is recommended that both offices take steps to establish a stronger connection to the public to explain how they operate and to translate data about why so few complaints regarding officer misconduct are sustained. (See [Police say Pittsburgh's internal affairs arm is thorough. Activists see little result.](#)) This may be achieved by adding one or more community liaison to the Citizen Police Review Board and by extending the authority of the CPRB to investigate complaints.
4. The new Office of Community Health and Safety may play a role in developing more transparency regarding complaints against the PBP, particularly now that this Office has oversight of the policing of protests.
5. Provide the community with more and better explanations around why the majority of complaints against officers are unfounded, not resolved and exonerated.
6. Expand the PBP's single page version (in the 2019 Annual Report) of reporting on "Officer Disciplinary Actions" to include data as well as narratives that allow citizens to understand how big of a pool of complaints these sparse data come from (i.e. 97 out of how many?), what happened in any individual case (via narratives), and the like.
7. Reduce the number of officers who have been charged with or exhibit consistent patterns of misconduct who return to PBP.
8. Expand, revitalize, and fully implement use of the Personnel Assessment and Review System (PARS), or replace PARS with another early warning system, either alternative to meet current state of the art and best practice standards. Early warning systems assist police agencies in identifying potentially problematic police officers and behaviors and focus the agency on finding remedies (counseling, re-training, etc.) before these problems cause damage to the public and/or the agency.
9. Advocate for and negotiate changes to the PBP contract or state or local law to allow for removal of officers who have demonstrated patterns of misconduct, particularly (though not only) improper use of force. The taskforce is particularly concerned about the inability or difficulty of removing officers who have demonstrated, in the City's opinion, patterns of misconduct, particularly patterns of excessive or unwarranted use of force. The taskforce's concern is heightened when issues of race arise under these circumstances. The taskforce is alarmed that the arbitration process may return officers to the PBP and the City who have violated the public trust. The taskforce expects and demands that discipline for misconduct must be applied properly and proportionately, without regard to race, gender, ethnic group, sexual preference or any other demographic category. We are concerned with frequent failure to impose discipline, including termination, upon officers whose actions endanger public safety and negatively impact the trust of the public in the PBP. Therefore, the

taskforce supports exploring every available avenue and proposal to reinforce the City and the PBP's abilities to discipline, including demonstrating conduct that violates the public trust. The collective bargaining agreement must allow the arbitrator to determine whether reinstatement of a terminated officer would violate public policy.

10. The community cannot establish trust with the police department without positive interactions and better mutual understanding of their work. To help build community trust, the PBP should implement forums or community meetings at which PBP can present information and hear citizen concerns and suggestions. Simply publishing an annual report is not enough. These community forums should especially seek to engage racial minorities, people with disabilities, immigrant communities, youth, and members of the LGBTQIA+ community as well as leaders in these historically marginalized communities.

The recommendations relating to OMI and CPRB, as well as the Office of Community Health and Safety can be implemented through their offices and through collaboration to develop the most efficient and effective ways to ensure that the public understands their individual roles and responsibilities and how the offices work together to ensure accountability. Community representatives who spoke to our taskforce do not understand the roles of these bodies and/or do not trust them. This must be addressed.

The committee also urges more transparency and clarity about how the various offices engaged in police accountability work together and separately to investigate complaints against the PBP, including OMI, CPRB and the new Office of Community Health & Safety. Some members of the community do not clearly understand the roles and constraints of these agencies or why so few complaints are sustained.

There are also some actions that the Mayor and the Police Chief should take to ensure that officers are accountable to the PBP, themselves, their colleague officers, and the community. This includes, training and programs that emphasize bystander accountability, as well as utilizing evaluation systems to monitor use of force complaints regarding officers, swiftly exiting officers with known bad conduct. The Mayor should also advocate for changes to state and local laws, as well as negotiate changes to the FOP contract (i.e. PA Act 111) to allow for removal of officers charged with misconduct rather than allow for reinstatement.

Finally, we believe that it is the culture of any organization that largely determines its direction, its internal ethics, and its interactions with the people that it serves. This is the case as much with police agencies as any other kind of organization, and the PBP is no exception. The taskforce believes that the internal culture of the PBP is just as important as any set of rules or policies PBP officers must follow, if not more so. In that spirit, the taskforce recommends the following efforts.

1. The PBP must reject the Warrior culture of policing, prominent in many police organizations, and fully embrace the Guardian policing mindset in order to build trust and legitimacy with the public. Mayor Peduto recommended this shift in his opening remarks

charging the taskforce at its first meeting, and we agree that this should be a high priority. Notably, moving from Warrior to Guardian policing was the first recommendation (of approximate 80) made in the Final Report of President Obama's Taskforce on 21st Century Policing (2015). As explained in an article published in the Wall Street Journal in July of 2020, Warrior policing is characterized by choosing their own side, dehumanizing others as enemies, and acting on instinct. Guardian policing, by contrast, chooses the law, sees people as distinct individuals, and acts in deliberate, thoughtful fashion whenever possible. A pledge to keep procedural justice at the center of policy, training and action throughout the PBP will go a long way toward the Guardian mindset; the first-rank procedural justice training that PBP officers have received should be continued and reinforced. Examples of Guardian-type of policing can be found in President's Obama's Taskforce report.

2. Racial reconciliation efforts, begun in late 2018, must be re-energized, reconstituted, and be brought front and center for the PBP. Racial reconciliation was one of the three main pillars of the National Initiative to Create Community Trust and Justice. Pittsburgh was one of the six pilot sites for the National Initiative, and the PBP began its efforts on this pillar with a large event at the Heinz History Center on November 13, 2018. A small number of follow up events followed. These efforts must be renewed with a new vigor. Successful police change requires beginning with a full acknowledgment of the role of police in racial injustices past and present. While many current officers have had no role in present injustices, and none in the mistakes of the past in which police were the enforcement arm for vile laws and customs, they wear the same patch and uniform of the enforcers of those laws and practices. In order for African Americans and those others subject to these unjust actions to regain and build trust with the PBP, the effort to apologize for and admit prior mistakes must be full throated and sincere. Those efforts, begun with hope in 2018, have been allowed to wither.
3. The PBP must, at every turn, pledge its intolerance for misconduct by officers, and the public must see and understand that this commitment is and will be carried out. The taskforce heard from many members of the public that they were aware of incidents of misconduct by PBP officers, in which the officers were not disciplined or terminated. No member of the taskforce believes that every incident of misconduct is a firing offense or should result in criminal charges. But the public has no way at this point to know what happens to these incidents or why when they are the subject of complaints, and also sees plainly that some well-known and seemingly blatant incidents of misconduct go unaddressed. The incident at Kopy's Bar on the South Side of Pittsburgh on October 12, 2018, in which inebriated officers can be seen on video punching a restrained suspect in the face nearly twenty times, is just one example; the officers in that case were "re-assigned." The failure to communicate enough information about misconduct and resulting discipline, and the failure to impose discipline that even approaches what is appropriate, damages public trust and confidence of the public in the police.

Use of Force Changes Needed to Pittsburgh Bureau of Police Policy

Introduction

The taskforce reviewed the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police Use of Force Policy (Order 12-6, 2015), as well as use of force policies in other police departments, commitments already made by the Mayor, new City laws passed by Pittsburgh City Council, and recommendations by advocacy and law enforcement groups. While the PBP's current use of force policy contains many industry-standard provisions and reflected nationally-accepted ideas as of the time of its enactment (2015), the taskforce believes that some of the ideas and language in the policy must be updated to more clearly and directly reflect the goals and values of our city. Deadly force must always be a last resort, and force of any kind must only be used properly and proportionally. The taskforce recommends the following changes to move the PBP in that direction. Moreover, other provisions must be added in order to come to grips with issues not addressed by current policy.

The use of tear gas and "less-lethal" munitions for crowd control is dealt with in another section.

Sources

In review of this topic, there were several sources, references, and changes already made or committed to by the Mayor. Based on the review, the following were among the most important sources used.

1. Pittsburgh Police Bureau (PBP) Use of Force Policy, Order 12-6 (referenced throughout as PBP Policy)
2. [Public statement by Mayor Bill Peduto, June 4, 2020](#), stating that "the City is fully endorsing the #8cantwait campaign..."
3. The [#8cantwait Campaign](#)'s eight proposals for reform (referenced throughout as #8cantwait)
4. In addition, City Council of Pittsburgh legislation, passed several Bills on July 28, 2020, including:
 - i. [Bill 2020 0487](#) bans chokeholds; no exception for deadly force situations. Also allows people to sue for use of a chokehold.
 - ii. [Bill 2020 0405](#), creating a duty to intervene when an officer knows another officer is using unreasonable force or otherwise depriving a person of constitutional rights.
5. The Camden County (N.J.) Police Department's Use of Force Policy, developed in partnership with the Policing Project and [widely considered a national model](#); its six "Core Principles" are [here](#)
6. [Guiding Principles on the Use of Force](#) by the Police Executives Research Forum (PERF). PERF is an organization that brings together police leadership from around the nation in a

research-based effort to find data-based solutions to the toughest issues in policing. This document, published by PERF in March 2016, gave us a comprehensive menu of how to orient the use of force in a modern police department. In particular, we found Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16, 17, and 18 extremely helpful as models.

7. On June 4, 2020, Mayor Peduto endorsed all eight parts of the #8cantwait campaign. And the City Council's legislative actions banning all neck restraints and creating a duty to intervene for officers witnessing the unreasonable use of force cover two of those eight demands. Nevertheless, we include them here.

Notwithstanding, the taskforce is not confined to recommending actions already endorsed by the Mayor, the City Council or both. While we sometimes repeat what the Mayor and Council have recommended or done, we have often gone further than either one.

Recommendations

The taskforce recommends the following 14 policy changes to PBP's Use of Force Policy.

1. Four overarching general principles should appear clearly and directly in PBP Use of Force policy, even if current language might imply the same ideas. Those four general principles are:
 - i. The sanctity of every human life must be at the heart of everything the PBP does.
 - ii. Use of force, especially deadly force, should be a last resort when other alternatives are exhausted, making it both reasonable and necessary.
 - iii. PBP Use of Force policy must include a duty to request medical aid immediately when force has been used and injury results and to provide first aid immediately if they are trained to do so.
 - iv. Force, deadly or non-deadly, can only be used to accomplish specific law enforcement objectives.
2. PBP policy must ban all chokeholds and neck restraints, as now required by the Pittsburgh City Council's new legislation.
3. All uses of force must be proportional.
4. De-escalation must be attempted before force can be used, unless doing so would be futile or endanger the officer or other people.
5. De-escalation is based on effective communication that takes account of the full context and circumstances.
6. Before shooting or any use of deadly force, officers must warn the suspect unless doing so would increase the risk to the officer, the suspect, or any others.
7. PBP policy must prohibit shooting at a moving vehicle or the people or the inside the vehicle, unless someone in the vehicle is using or threatening deadly force by means other than the vehicle itself.
8. PBP policy must require officers to intervene to stop another officer from using excessive force.

9. PBP policy must require reporting of all use of force, including threats using firearms.
10. Narrow the justification for use of deadly force in PBP policy section 5.0. Amend section 5.1.1 to read, “The action is immediately necessary for the defense of human life...” Amend sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.1.2 to read that “In order to use deadly force, that action must be not only reasonable but necessary a) to defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm against the officer or another person; or b) to apprehend a fleeing person for any felony that threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury, if the officer reasonably believes that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury to another unless immediately apprehended.

The current core of the PBP’s use of force policy (see Section 5 of that policy) follows current Pennsylvania and U.S. constitutional law very closely. Those are minimum legal standards that allow more discretion and use of force justifications, and give less protection to citizens from force, than taskforce members believe is wise. The changes in this recommendation would effectively raise the standard above that Pennsylvania/constitutional minimum; they parallel a use of force law passed in California in 2019.

11. Prohibit use of deadly force against anyone who poses a danger only to themselves, including those who are sight- or hearing-impaired, otherwise disabled, or suffering from mental illness.
12. Transparency on use of force must be the rule.
13. PBP officers must be trained to utilize distance, cover and time to decrease the necessity for the use of force. To minimize the need for uses of force, especially force that could injure or kill, PBP must develop policy and training mandating the use of physical distance, cover, and time when approaching and managing certain critical incidents, especially incidents involving edged weapons. When officers can make themselves temporarily safe by maintaining distance and cover from immediate danger, they can buy more time to assess the situation and their options, bring additional resources to the scene, and develop a plan for resolving the incident without the use of force or with only the force necessary to mitigate the threat. PBP should eliminate from their policies and training all references to the so-called “21-foot rule” regarding officers who are confronted with a subject armed with an edged weapon, if any such references exist, as this standard is unfounded. Instead, officers should be trained to use distance and cover to create a “reaction gap,” or “safe zone,” between themselves and the individual, and to consider all options for responding.
14. To protect a person with a disability from police use of force, training for police must equip officers to understand a person with a disability limits and issues in understanding and responding to police commands or questions. When encountering people who officers believe to be disabled or suffering from mental illness, officers will immediately summon a trained professional to assess the situation.

Use of Tear Gas, Rubber Bullets, “Flash-bang” Devices and Other Less Lethal Methods of Crowd Control

With the first demonstrations in Pittsburgh to protest the murder of George Floyd in Minneapolis, crowds of demonstrating citizens of Pittsburgh -- the vast majority of whom were engaged in nothing more than peaceful exercise of their First Amendment rights – were subjected to the use of tear gas, rubber bullets, “flash-bang” devices, and the use of so-called “bean bag” rounds. Among those gassed and hit with these projectiles were several members of this taskforce. Their own experiences, in the midst of peaceful, constitutionally-protected activity, are testimony to at best a misunderstanding of the use of these weapons, and at worst a determination to use them to intimidate, dominate, and enforce obedience to authority in a way that does not conform to our country’s most cherished values: the freedom of expression and the freedom to gather, demonstrate and peacefully protest.

Given the events we have seen in Pittsburgh, the taskforce feels great concern about the use of these methods for crowd control for citizen protests. We feel it is a matter of the greatest urgency to make sure that these methods are used only when absolutely necessary, with proper restraint, and consistent with best practices.

It should be noted that the laws governing war, to which the United States is a signatory, forbid the use of chemical munitions in armed conflict. Use of a tear gas on American streets for riot control purposes is exempted, but would seem to break with well-established norms when used against peaceful protesters. In addition, exposure to tear gas may have both short- and long-term health effects. Exposure to the chemicals in tear gas (which may include dioxin, a component of Agent Orange) disturbs normal physiological, respiratory and neurological function in an otherwise healthy person. There is no telling what effects repeated exposure may have. But we know this: tear gas *was* used in the recent demonstrations; according to taskforce members who were present, tear gas canisters were fired into crowds and at individuals. Crowds of Pittsburgh citizens, exercising their First Amendment rights, the vast majority of them doing so peacefully, were gassed.

Rubber bullets – which, while not made of lead or other metals, are projectiles fired from weapons – can injure and maim. A federal lawsuit has already been filed in Pittsburgh, alleging that the use of rubber bullets (as well as other “less lethal” munitions and tear gas) injured plaintiffs and violated their First Amendment rights. Jonathan D. Silver, “Federal Lawsuit Accuses Peduto, Top Pittsburgh Officials of Constitutional Violations in Dispersing East Liberty Protest,” Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, June 29, 2020, at [Federal lawsuit accuses Peduto, top Pittsburgh officials of constitutional violations in dispersing East Liberty protest](#). According to multiple reports, people have lost eyes or eyesight in demonstrations since May 25 across the U.S. as a result of injury from

rubber bullets. See e.g., Donovan Slack, et al., “Less-Lethal Weapons Blind, Maim and Kill. Victims Say Enough Is Enough,” USA Today, Denver Post, others, July 25, 2020, at [Less-lethal weapons blind, maim and kill. Victims say enough is enough](#). (citing “dozens maimed or hurt” nationwide in demonstrations after George Floyd’s death). The proper use of rubber bullets requires that they be shot toward the ground, from which they ricochet toward the persons, with some of their energy absorbed to make them less dangerous; a member of this taskforce has told us that rubber bullets were fired directly at persons. Aiming at persons can result in serious injuries. According to one scientific review, “A review published in 2017 in the BMJ Open examined 26 papers on rubber bullet injuries, covering a total of 1,984 injuries. It found that 300 of those injuries resulted in permanent disabilities, especially if the bullet struck the head or neck. Within this group, 53 people (or 3 percent) died from rubber-bullet related injuries.” R. J. Haar, V. Iacopini, et al., “Death, Injury and Disability from Kinetic Impact Projectiles in Crowd-Control Settings: A Systematic Review,” BMJ Open, Dec. 2017, at [Death, injury and disability from kinetic impact projectiles in crowd-control settings: a systematic review](#).

All of these weapons – and make no mistake, they are weapons – are classified as “less-lethal.” Note the wording: they are not called “non-lethal” weapons. This is a deliberate choice. These methods are not non-lethal; they can and occasionally do kill. They should be used only when absolutely necessary, with proper restraint, with consistent training and tracking to ensure use under the best practices.

As a taskforce, we do not know if an internal or other investigation is underway into the use of tear gas and the other weapons described here in the recent demonstrations. But the reasons for concern seems more than obvious. Therefore, the taskforce recommends the following.

1. The use of tear gas, rubber bullets, flash-bang devices, pepper spray, “bean bag” rounds, and other “less-lethal” weapons typically used by the PBP for crowd control must be significantly curtailed and used only in life-threatening situations until such time as the next steps below are carried out and completed. If the independent organization described below does not formulate viable recommendations and issue a public report within six months of its formation, a moratorium will go into effect on using the PBP tactics described above. Such moratorium will remain in effect until such time as the independent organization completes its work.
2. The City of Pittsburgh will act to immediately bring in an independent organization, one not affiliated with law enforcement in Western Pennsylvania, to generate recommendations and a report for the following purpose:
 - i. Investigating the use of tear gas and all other “less-lethal” weapons in the demonstrations of late May and early June of 2020, as well as the use of kettling (the purpose of the investigation, will not include the investigation of individual officers for their actions, but only the actions of the PBP as an agency, with any

- investigations of individuals to be carried out by the PBP, OMI, the CPRB, or by other agencies with applicable jurisdiction;
- ii.** Reviewing the current policies, procedures and training of the PBP for use of all of these weapons, to see whether or not these conform with current industry standards and best practices;
 - iii.** Making recommendations for how any of the PBP's policies, procedures, and training must change conform to come up to industry standards and best practices; and
 - iv.** The publication of a report on these items to be made public. To the extent that the report advises banning any particular crowd control device or tool, it will be banned.
3. The use of "kettling" or other tactics designed to contain or trap protesters must end. Kettling is a crowd-control technique used by the police. Also known as "trap and detain," police use this tactic to surround protesters in a confined space so they cannot leave and cannot obey orders to disperse. Once police block people from getting out, failure to disperse may be used as a pretext for arrest. Use of this tactic in this fashion may allow police to assert control, but it also enhances the danger of violence and subjects protesters who would otherwise leave peacefully to arrest. A tactic with these downsides must be confined to the few situations in which it might be used to calm and defuse violence, not to escalate it or create new criminal charges and more resentment of police actions. If it cannot be limited to such situations through a defined policy (pursuant to the independent organization's investigation -- see Fourth recommendation, below) that does not allow its use against protesters not using violence, it must cease.
 4. The Pittsburgh Bureau of Police (PBP) will revise its policies and procedures to reflect the findings of the independent investigation, and to revamp its training to reflect these new policies and procedures.
 5. All PBP officers, starting with command staff, will be retrained on these new policies with said revamped training. No officer at any level who has not been retrained will be deployed to any situation during which crowd control devices may need to be used.
 6. New policies will be reviewed annually.

Upon the completion of the forgoing steps, the moratorium may be lifted to the extent that these methods have not been banned as inappropriate for any use.

Presenters and Presentations

Dr. anupama jain, Executive Director of the Pittsburgh Gender Equity Commission

Beth Pittinger, Executive Director of the Pittsburgh Citizens Police Review Board

Chris Ragland, Commander of Pittsburgh Police Zone 1

Ciora Thomas, President and Founder of SisTers PGH

Darryl Holts, Senior Systems Advocate of Disability Rights PA

Minister Darnell Drewery, Community Advocate & Senior Community Specialist at Center for Victims

Dr. Emma Lucas-Darby, Chair of the Pittsburgh Citizens Police Review Board

Erin Bruni, Director of the Pittsburgh Office of Municipal Investigations

Erin Dalton, Allegheny County Department of Human Services, Deputy Director Office of Analytics, Technology and Planning

Ernest W. Withrow, Pittsburgh Chapter President, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE)

Ghadah Makoshi, Community Advocate on School Policing - ACLU Pennsylvania

Jason Lando, Commander of Pittsburgh Police Zone 5

Dr. Joseph A. McMillan, Past National President, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE)

Jessica Benham, Director of Development of Pittsburgh Center for Autistic Advocacy

Jose Diaz, Senior Director YMCA of Greater Pittsburgh, Adjunct Professor at the University of Pittsburgh

Dr. Joseph A. McMillan, Past National President, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE)

Dr. Kathi Elliot, CEO of Gwen's Girls and Founder of Black Girls Equity Alliance

Kheir Mugwaneza, Senior Project Manager of Allegheny Health Network, Member of Welcoming Pittsburgh

Laura Drogowski, Critical Communities Manager for the City of Pittsburgh Office of Equity

Lavonnie Bickerstaff, Assistant Chief of Pittsburgh Bureau of Police

Lindsay Powell, Assistant Chief of Staff to Mayor William Peduto, City of Pittsburgh

Lynda Williams, National President, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE)

Matt Brown, Allegheny County Department of Emergency Services

Maurita Bryant, Retired Assistant Superintendent, Allegheny County Police Department

Michael Gay, Community Resource Officer in Pittsburgh Police Zone 5

Mike Burford, Sergeant in Pittsburgh Police Zone 1

Monica Ruiz, Executive Director, Casa San Jose

Paris Pratt Sr., Assistant Special Agent in Charge, U.W. Drug Enforcement Administration, Pittsburgh District Office

Robert Swartzwelder, President, Fraternal Order of Police

Sara Goodkind, Associate Professor of the School of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh

Scott E. Schubert, Chief of Pittsburgh Bureau of Police

Theodore W. Johnson, Chairman of Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole

Tiffany Kline-Costa, Sergeant with Pittsburgh Bureau of Police Community Engagement Office

Tiffini Simoneaux, Youth and Education Manager for the Mayor's Office of Equity and Staff Representative for the Mayor's LGBTQIA+ Advisory Council

Wendell D. Hissrich, Director of the Public Safety Department

Dr. Yinka Aganga-Williams, Executive Director of Acculturation for Justice, Access and Peace Outreach (AJAPO)

AH Datalytics

Hilltop Community Advisory Working Group

No Cop Money PA

References

Allegheny County Emergency Operation Center 911 Calls for Service Data, January 1, 2020 - June 30, 2020 and January 1, 2019 - December 31, 2019.

Andrew, Scottie, “A California city could be one of the first to remove police from traffic stops.” *CNN* July 13, 2020.

Asher, Jeff and Ben Horwitz, “How Do the Police Actually Spend Their Time?” *The New York Times* June 19, 2020.

Allegheny County Department of Human Services, Crisis Response Stakeholder Group Summary

Camden County Police Department January 28, 2013; Use of Force.

Campaign ZERO | joincampaignzero.org – Model Use of Force Policy (Buffalo PD Policy, San Francisco PD Policy, Seattle PD Policy).

City of Berkeley CA Council memorandum, “Reimagining Transportation for a Racially Just Future.” July 14, 2020.

City of Pittsburgh Department of Public Safety Bureau of Police 2019 Statistical Report.

Crisis Assistance Helping Out On the Streets CAHOOTS). White Bird Clinic.

Elliot, Kathy, Sara Goodkind, Ghadah Makoshi. “Impact of Policing on Youth: Data and Recommendations,” *Gwendolyn J. Elliott Institute Black Girls Equity Alliance* July 27, 2020.

Friedersdorf, Conor. “End Needless Interactions with Police Officers During Traffic Stops.” *Politico* July 8, 2016.

Hilltop Community Advisory Working Group, “Recommendations to Mayor Williams Peduto’s Community Task Force on Policing”. October 5, 2020.

“House to Pass Sweeping Police Reform Legislation”, by Cristina Marcos and Mike Lillis, June 25, 2020, 06:00 am EDT.

“How Colorado found the political will to pass a sweeping police reform law in just 16 days” , SB 217, signed into law on Friday, would have been unimaginable a month ago (Ales Burness, *The Denver Post*, June 19 2020 at 9:57 am and updated June 19, 2020 at 8:26 pm.

Keeping Each Other Safe: An Assessment of The Use of Peer Intervention Programs to Prevent Police Officer Mistakes and Misconduct, Using New Orleans' EPIC Program As A Potential National Model Jonathan Aronie and Christy E. Lopez, *Police Quarterly*, 0(0) 1–27, 2017

Mavandadi, V; Bieling, P.J.; Madsen, V (2016-08-01) Effective Ingredients of Verbal De-escalation: validating an English modified version of the de-escalating aggressive behavior scale, *Journal of Psychiatric Mental Health Nursing*.

“MIL-OSI (Military Office of Special Investigations) USA: Herrera Beutler Introduces Police Reform Bill in House” Washington, D.C June 18, 2020 – Congressman Jaime Herrera Beutler introducing companion legislation in the House to Sen. Tim Scott’s bill, the JUSTICE Act, to create long-lasting improvements to policing practices:

https://jhb.house.gov/uploadedfiles/staumn_049_xml.pdf; section by section analysis:

https://jhb.house.gov/uploadedfiles/justice_act_section_by_section_pdf.pdf (2020, aimed at addressing police misconduct and racial injustice and prompted weeks of protests and civil unrest).

“Improving Police Accountability and Transparency” The Council of the District of Columbia: “The Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Emergency Amendment Act of 2020”.

Mohamed, Alaa, Jordan Fields, and Hersh Merenstein, “Police Reforms City Research prepared for Community Police Reform Task Force, Unbundling Sub-Committee.” July 22, 2020.

“Pennsylvania Lawmakers Begin Passing Police Reform Bills”, by Associated Press, June 24, 2020 at 5:48 pm, by Mark Scolforo and Marc Levy, Associated Press.

“Pennsylvania Police Reform Bills Unanimously Pass Through House on ‘Historic Day’”, by Natasha Brown, June 24, 2020 at 4:43 pm, Harrisburg, PA.

Stevens, Tim, “Recruitment/Hiring Recommendations from the Recruitment, Hiring, Training, Education Subcommittee”. October 5, 2020.

Stevens, Tim, “Community Engagement Recommendations from the Police Reform Taskforce Subcommittee”. October 5, 2020.

Stevens, Tim, “Ongoing Training & Professional Development - Full Recommendations from the Recruitment, Hiring, Training, Education Subcommittee”. October 5, 2020.

President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing. 2015. Final Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Published 2015. https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf

The Apex Officer's Virtual Reality Training that addresses de-escalation situations
([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/De-escalation#The Memphis Model](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/De-escalation#The_Memphis_Model)).

The Memphis Model developed by the Memphis Crisis intervention Team (CIT) 2008.

The General Assembly of Pennsylvania House Resolution No. 903 Session of 2020, June 24, 2020:
A Resolution petitioning the Governor to call a special session of the General Assembly to address
police accountability and police violence.

United Way of Southwestern PA, PA 2-1-1 Southwest Contact Request Categories June 1,
2019-June 30, 2020.

US Conference of Mayors. August 14, 2020 Virtual Meeting. "Report on Police Reform and
Racial Justice" <https://www.usmayors.org/issues/police-reform/>.

Woods, Baynard and Brandon Soderberg, "Baltimore tried reforming the police. They fought every
change." *The Washington Post* June 18, 2020.

Various models and definitions of de-escalation practices in law enforcement, Price & Baker 2012;
Richards (2007); Bell (2018).

Appendices

Appendix A Table 1. Categories of 911 Calls for Service by Percentage of Time Spent, January-December 2019

| Call Category | Percent of Total |
|--------------------|------------------|
| Crime Related | 37% |
| Proactive Policing | 21% |
| Traffic Related | 18% |
| Other | 24% |

Source: Allegheny County Emergency Operation Center 911 Calls for Service Data, January 1, 2020 - June 30, 2020 and January 1, 2019 - December 31, 2019.

Appendix A Table 2. Top 10 Rank of 911 Calls for Service by Number of Calls

| Service Call Type | Rank | |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Jan-Dec '19 | Jan-Jun '20 |
| Neighborhood Patrol | 1 | 1 |
| Police Park and Walk | 2 | 2 |
| Traffic Stop | 3 | 3 |
| Burglar Alarm | 4 | 4 |
| Parking Complaint | 5 | 6 |
| Welfare Check | 6 | 7 |
| Domestic Violence | 7 | 8 |
| Disorderly Person | 8 | 10 |
| Theft Report | 9 | NA |
| Accident - No Injuries | 10 | NA |
| Business Check Watch | NA | 5 |
| Ordinance Complaint | NA | 9 |

NA indicates not a top 10 call service type

Source: Allegheny County Emergency Operation Center 911 Calls for Service Data, January 1, 2020 - June 30, 2020 and January 1, 2019 - December 31, 2019.

Appendix B Table 1. Traffic Stops by Race and Gender, 2019

| | Female | Male | Not Provided* | Total |
|----------------|--------|-------|---------------|-------|
| Asian | 123 | 261 | | 384 |
| Black | 3070 | 5894 | 1 | 8965 |
| Hispanic | 37 | 204 | | 241 |
| White | 3627 | 6477 | 2 | 10106 |
| Unknown | 59 | 149 | 10 | 218 |
| Other | 114 | 525 | | 639 |
| No Description | | | | 22 |
| Total | 7030 | 13510 | 13 | 20575 |

Source: City of Pittsburgh Department of Public Safety Bureau of Police 2019 Statistical Report, p 36.

Appendix B Table 2. Frisk Search of Traffic Stops by Race and Gender, 2019

| | Female | Male | Not Provided* | Total |
|----------------|--------|------|---------------|-------|
| Asian | 0 | 1 | | 1 |
| Black | 132 | 917 | | 1049 |
| Hispanic | 2 | 15 | | 17 |
| White | 86 | 300 | | 386 |
| Unknown | 0 | 4 | | 4 |
| Other | 0 | 13 | | 13 |
| No Description | | | | |
| Total | 220 | 1250 | 0 | 1470 |

Source: City of Pittsburgh Department of Public Safety Bureau of Police 2019 Statistical Report, p 37.

Notes:

*Gender breakdown not provided in the annual report

Data provided in the annual report sums to more than 20562. Rates by race and gender are based on totals provided.

“N11” Numbers Overview

[2-1-1](#): [Community](#) services and information

[3-1-1](#): [Municipal government](#) services, non-emergency number

[4-1-1](#): [Directory assistance](#)

[5-1-1](#): [Traffic information](#) or police non-emergency services

[6-1-1](#): [Telephone company \(telco\) customer service](#) and repair

[7-1-1](#): [TDD](#) and [Relay](#) Services for the [deaf and hard of hearing](#)

[8-1-1](#): Underground public [utility location](#) (United States);⁴⁴ non-emergency health information and services (Canada)

[9-1-1](#): [Emergency services](#) ([police](#), [fire](#), [ambulance](#) and [rescue](#) services)

(4-1-1 and 6-1-1 are commonly used within the United States, but not officially assigned by the Federal Communications Commission.)

In addition, 9-8-8 is currently in the process of being adopted as the number for the [National Suicide Prevention Hotline](#). The change will fully go into effect on July 16, 2022.

The designation for special use in the North American Numbering Plan (NANP) prevents N11 use as [area code](#) or central office prefix, eliminating nearly 8,000,000 telephone numbers from assignment.

The assigned use of each N11 can vary for the various countries included in the NANP, but 9-1-1 is mandated in the [United States](#) and [Canada](#), while the availability of the other N11 codes varies by location. 7-1-1 and 9-1-1 access is mandated by [law](#) in the United States, even within private networks.

4-1-1 and 6-1-1 are supported by the service provider for the calling phone, but not all carriers provide these services. 4-1-1 and 6-1-1 (formerly 8-1-1) are typically blocked within enterprise or [private branch exchange](#) (PBX) systems, including cellular telephone service purchased for an enterprise system, since 4-1-1 calls generally incur a fee and the service is now readily accessible by other means, and 6-1-1 services are managed by the enterprise in which the phone resides.

Other community services are provided through 2-1-1, but only if a [nonprofit organization](#), such as [United Way of America](#), or the local government operates it locally. Likewise, local, state or provincial government may, but do not uniformly, operate traffic information using 5-1-1.

8-1-1 was made mandatory in the United States in 2007; however, it has not been universally implemented.

7-1-1 is funded through the [TRS Fund](#), which telephone companies are mandated to maintain to provide Relay Services for the Deaf and Hearing Impaired.

Source: PA 2-1-1 Southwest, United Way of Southwestern PA