Contract Deliverables
1. Community engagement
2. NEM Report
3. CFS Report
4. Alt. Responses Report
5. Final Report/ Implementation Plan

Dispatch

1. **How will resource allocation be completed at the point of the call?**
   a. Based on the call type, as currently determined by Dispatch now, but based on the Tiered Dispatch category, the calls will be routed accordingly.
2. **How does a caller know to call 911 or another number that won't allocate police resources?**
   a. At this point we are not suggesting an alternative number for community members to call. We are interested in having this discussion. We think because people are trained to dial 911, it should be 911, but are open to hearing alternative thoughts about it. It could possibly be both. We want people who are calling to deliberately ask for police response to get that and vice versa.
3. **How does the dispatcher know whether or not to dispatch police or alternate response?**
   a. Same as #1
4. **What does dispatcher training look like for handling this new way of allocating calls?**
   a. We're going to have to develop and train all new dispatchers in this new system. To make sure they are categorizing call types accurately and then dispatching them to the CERN dispatch.
   b. For example, CAHOOTS staff are required to go through 40 hours of classroom education and over 500 hours of field work that is supervised by a qualified guide. Their education consists of de-escalation methods and emergency response services. CAHOOTS personnel are able to perform wellness checks, offer mental health services and substance use resources, administer medical aid, and provide mediation assistance.
5. **Should the Berkeley Communications center be independent from BPD?**
   a. This discussion is also happening in the Measure FF Advisory Committee and there needs to be coordination among the separate efforts.

Effectiveness and Implementation

6. **How have local areas implemented the CERN Tiered Dispatch Model and what is its level of effectiveness?**
   a. This is a **reimagining** public safety process so some of the ideas, by design, are not programs that are running somewhere else. Many elements of the Tiered

Dispatch are currently in operations as detailed in the New and Emerging Models of Public Safety report.

7. **What components of the models outlined in the NEM report and the ALT report are best for Berkeley?**
   a. We identified a section pulled from NEM in the ALT report that highlights the 6 models most applicable to Berkeley. These include SCRT, CRU, MAP, the Arlington Opiate Outreach Initiative, and NYPD Staten Island's Motor Vehicle Accident Pilot Program.

8. **Have any other cities implemented CERN or anything like it? What are their results?**
   a. The full CERN model has not been implemented anywhere, but pieces of it have been, which are mentioned in the NEW report. Programs include CAHOOTS in Eugene, OR; STAR in Denver, CO; and CRU in Olympia, WA.
   b. The STAR program in Denver has not had to call police for backup once, and the CAHOOTS team needed police backup on less than 1 percent of calls in 2019.[1]
   c. A CAHOOTS evaluation done by EPD found that the diversion rate of calls for service is around 5-8%.[2]

9. **What data should be captured and tracked from a CERN implementation?**
   a. Reduction in police CFS, response time impacts, total # of calls diverted to CERN, How often are police being called to assist when CERN is the primary responder (by district, hour, shift, time of day). Same data captured by CAD, but adding percentages and volume of calls that go to CERN. Impact on arrival times.

10. **What timeline would you recommend for the steps of implementation?** This will be detailed in the Final Report

11. **Do you recommend Berkeley use the existing Police non-emergency line**
    a. Yes

12. **If a CERN implementation is successful, what will be different and/or better in Berkeley?**
    a. Quicker response times, police can focus on more serious and violent crime, which may result in reduced serious and violent crime and improved clearance rates. It may also lead to improved community satisfaction. Decrease in negative interactions between community and law enforcement. Unnecessary citizen contact and incarceration. Decreased burden on the police.

13. **What one program implemented in other cities would provide the biggest value in Berkeley and be most viable for implementation?**
    a. Refer to #7 and #8

14. **For all calls-for-service in Tiers that don't require a badge and gun, who are the responders?**
    a. NICJR is suggesting well trained staff of contracted community based organizations.

15. **Do they exist already, or would this be a new department?**

[1] https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/criminal-justice/reports/2020/10/28/492492/community-responder-model/
[2] https://www.eugene-or.gov/DocumentCenter/View/56717/CAHOOTS-Program-Analysis

a. These are community-based contracts, not government employees. CBO's would be providing services.

16. What timeline would you recommend for the steps of implementation?
   a. This will be provided in the Final Report

<u>Costs and Staffing</u>

17. What is the headcount cost per responder, including benefits? Unionized or not?
   a. This will be detailed in the Final Report

<u>General Report Feedback and Questions</u>

18. I spoke at last week's meeting about my confusion surrounding the tables and the pilot program that Mr. Chapel mentioned. I do see a (very) brief mention of the pilot (on page 39). However, the pilot is mentioned well after Table 11 that describes the CERN sub-categories. When I asked why "abandoned vehicle" was the only example given in Table 11 under Traffic, Mr. Chapel said that only "pilot" violations were included here. But that is not clear anywhere in this Table or the accompanying text. Please make sure this table either includes all relevant items (i.e., including those that wouldn't be in the pilot), or clarify that the examples listed in the Traffic and all other categories are only examples that would be part of the pilot.
   a. Table 11 is NICJR description of call types aggregated up into higher order categories. This table reflects all CFS aggregated up, not just CERN Tier 1 suggested 'pilot' CFS. The examples provided in the table are not exhaustive, but are only an example of some of the CFS in each particular category.

19. On this topic, there are multiple "Traffic" related activities that the police currently perform or manage that are not at all incorporated into this report because this report only deals with calls for service. Most of these would not require police or police-managed presence per the criteria outlined in the report and somehow need to be included somewhere in the Reimagining process. These include: the school crossing guard program, traffic control at special events and following collisions, parking enforcement, and overseeing vehicle towing. How will these police and/or police-managed activities be incorporated into NICJR work?
   a. These are issues being addressed by the separate BerkDOT initiative that will need coordination with the Reimagining Public Safety process. But yes, NICJR will address these issues in the Final Report as ways to potentially reduce the BPD budget and reinvest in community based response.

20. During last week's call, I also asked Mr. Chapel about how he/NICJR envisions CERN Tier 1 calls that are officer-initiated working, given that this is not a dispatch issue but rather a "patrol" sort of issue (i.e., currently, police see something and respond, and I'm curious how that would be handled by non-police - would they also patrol?). Mr. Chapel's response was that this wasn't something for NICJR to come up with, but rather for the taskforce. But the final report from NICJR is supposed to include implementation recommendations, so it seems like that's

exactly one of the roles for NICJR to play. Given that program implementation is my question, I'd like to hear from NICJR how these officer-initiated Tier 1 responses would be covered under CERN.

    a. Given that it is not likely that a great level of control can be cast over officer initiated activities, it would be feasible to request or require officers to call for a CERN co-response when officers initiate non-criminal or CERN Tier 1 call types (excluding traffic vehicle code violations, until state law changes). This would allow for CERN presence for the lower-level call types. We could also make all officer initiated call types at minimum a CERN Tier 3, which calls for an officer to lead, but a CERN responder present.

21. **Concurrent to this process is the SCU process, and I would imagine that some of the Tier 1 (and Tier 2) activities described in this report would be activities that the SCU would plan to take over. It would be helpful if this document could provide a crosswalk between the SCU activities and the proposed Tier 1 and 2 activities.**

    a. Since the development process for SCU is concurrent, but divergent from the RPSTF process, it is hard to develop a crosswalk, because it is not clear at this time what types of calls SCU will be taking. SCU does not have a clear roadmap yet for which we could even attempt to develop a crosswalk.

22. **Costs for Tier 1 activities were estimated in the report by using "Median BPD Officer Salary." Could you please clarify - is this simply the mid-step (i.e., step 4) salary in the officer pay scale or is this actually the median salary of the current BPD force? These numbers could be really different (if, for example, most BPD officers are step 3 and above, actual median salary would be way higher). I'm wondering if NICJR could provide an actual median salary so we can see how different it is from what is presented and whether including actual median salary would substantively change the analysis.**

    a. Median BPD officer salary (Step 4) was used to develop Tier 1 costs.

23. **I was disappointed by the lack of nuance in the call types with respect to the need for police presence. In the NICJR report, it states that non-criminal calls (per the penal code) ended up in Tier 1 (with some later adjustment for arrest rate and alternate response warrants). But let me give two examples where the analysis seems to be off. The report lists Disturbance (415) as non-criminal (Tier 1), but this violation is in the [penal code](#) and can be considered either a misdemeanor or non-criminal and nuance needs to be applied here. Similarly, per Commissioner Ho's analysis, annoying phone calls ([653m](#)) and threats ([422](#)) are both also in the penal code and can often be associated with very serious domestic abuse crimes. I am sure there are many more instances like this. I think NICJR's analysis either requires more nuance or a more substantial definition for how all calls of these types can be lumped together in Tier 1. I'm not saying these call types can't be addressed without police, I'm just saying the methodology needs refinement or clearer explanation.**

    a. The nuance has been applied based on the final disposition of the call types highlighted in the question. By reading the incident descriptions and associated dispositions, we are able to determine which calls within each incident type were criminal or non-criminal, and most of them are non-criminal. One can not automatically associate annoying phone calls or threats via telephone with domestic violence. There may be a small number of cases where this is true, but for the majority, this is not the case.

Next Steps

24. **What is the next highest priority for Berkeley to focus on, the next-most-burning need?**
    a. This will be addressed in the Final Report

25. **How will the City of Berkeley provide the infrastructure needed to establish a customized, "robust, structured, and well-trained" team of community responders or CERN (as National Institute of Criminal Justice Reform has promised)?**
    a. The City will need to invest an appropriate number of resources and provide intensive, high quality training.

26. **How do we evaluate the capacity of organizations to participate in a CERN network, particularly for those listed in the Alternative Responses Report and Appendices C and E?**
    a. An organizations history and experience and they will have to be closely monitored during the pilot phase.

27. **How do we approach allocating/re-allocating resources to make them available for alternative emergency and non-emergency response from government departments and community-based organizations?**
    a. This will be a major issue that needs a lot of attention. The City will likely have to seek private investment (grants) for a pilot phase since it is unlikely the BPD budget can be reallocated sufficiently to fully fund the CERNs. The City should also consider using American Recovery Plan funds and if the larger Infrastructure bill is passed by Congress that is another source. NICJR will address this in more detail in the Final Report.

28. **How do we avoid criminalizing behaviour regarded as "panhandling, loitering and urinating in public" to meet needs with public health service delivery (from Alternative Responses Report in chart)?**
    a. One approach could be through city ordinances that decriminalize the public order or quality of life type of calls

29. **How do we provide emergency and non-emergency mental health, substance use, homelessness, and wellness checks services to alleviate entrenched societal problems in the short and long-term?**
    a. This process involves direct coordination with the SCU, which the City Manager's office and NICJR are in the process of.