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Executive Summary

Police Reform: A Continuous Improvement Process

Creating reform of a longstanding system requires urgency and cross-sector collaboration informed by people, data, and accountability measures. Since 2018, enhancing police accountability and improving police-community relations have been a high priority for the Walsh Administration and the Syracuse Common Council. The City conducted a national search for a new police chief leading to the appointment of Kenton Buckner following direct involvement and input from community stakeholders in the search. Chief Buckner immediately conducted a “top to bottom” assessment of the Department and identified areas in need of improvement through policy changes, additional training, and/or additional resources. His focus from the start was to implement 21st century police practices. He identified areas of improvement and quickly took steps to implement strategies to improve and modernize, while simultaneously mending strained relations with the community. As part of these efforts, the Department updated its policies on use of force, traffic stops, body worn cameras and interaction with transgender persons. Following a use-of-force incident in May 2019, Chief Buckner and Mayor Walsh conducted citywide listening sessions throughout the second half of 2019 to address concerns about the use of force and policing in general, and collected input on a variety of topics.

A National Movement

The murder of George Floyd touched every corner of our community. Like other communities, City of Syracuse residents mobilized and organized Black Lives Matter protests. In addition, individuals and organizations sought changes to governance policies, practices and procedures that upheld inequitable outcomes or fostered exclusive environments contributing to the social and the economic oppression of Black people and other people of color.

Government officials responded with urgency and strategic focus to address and implement comprehensive police reform. On the national level, H.R.7120 - George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2020 was introduced to Congress on June 8, 2020 and passed in the House of Representatives on June 25, 2020. The bill was received in the Senate on June 29, 2020 and remains there to date.

On the state level, New York State lawmakers passed a ten-item legislative package. A summary of the legislation can be found in Appendix M. In Syracuse, we are listening and we are acting.

A Syracuse Movement

2 Summary of NYS legislatie package can also be found online at https://docs.google.com/document/d/11DK3oE3p09V8qK3MQ-p9sej7CcA6hq5N/edit
In Syracuse, residents, government officials, and growing coalitions of voices of all ages and races came together to fight systemic racism and improve policing policy and procedures, accountability and community relationships. This time, the movement looked and felt different. It encompassed broader coalitions and more widespread support than previous protest movements. All stakeholders recognized the need for deliberate and intentional police reform. Among these was People’s Agenda for Police Reform (PAFPR), a collaboration of citizens, grassroots, state and national affiliate organizations who presented a set of demands for action to Mayor Walsh. City government leaders listened and responded.³

On June 19, 2020, Mayor Walsh issued an Executive Order on Syracuse Police Reform⁴ urgently directing his administration to take sixteen (16) actions to increase police accountability, improve transparency and strengthen police-community relations. The local provisions in the Executive Order address critical issues in the police reform movement found in national data and reports on police concerns including, but not limited to: updating the Syracuse Police Department’s (SPD) use of force policy; presence of police in schools; deployment of police on non-criminal matters; expanding the implementation of body worn and dashboard cameras; review of “no-knock” warrants; use of surplus military equipment; diversity on the police force; and training for all officers on cultural competency and the history of racism in Syracuse and the nation.

³ Mayor Walsh responds to protests - https://ourcity.syrugov.net/ourcitystories/initiative-stories/response-to-peoples-agenda-for-police-reform/
1. Review, revise and amend the policies and procedures of the SPD to ensure the principles embodied in the New York City Right to Know Act are incorporated into the department's policies and procedures, including but not limited to self-identification to citizens, provision of written identification to citizens, obtaining consent to searches, recording consent and making it available to subject.

2. Revise SPD's 2019 use of force policy to ensure that it is compliant with recent changes in New York State law, and fully consider any policy changes requested by the Syracuse community.

3. Revise SPD's current body worn camera policy to ensure that officers record the entirety of their presence on the scene of a police encounter.

4. Complete the department's efforts to obtain additional body worn cameras so that all uniformed officers assigned to patrol or who otherwise respond to citizen calls will be equipped with cameras.

5. Develop and implement a plan to deploy dashboard cameras on all SPD marked vehicles.

6. Conduct a complete inventory of all equipment acquired through military surplus programs that are in possession of the SPD; establish policies and procedures regarding the use of such equipment; and establish parameters for future procurement of such equipment.

7. Post comprehensive documents on the contract with the Syracuse Police Benevolent Association on the City of Syracuse and/or SPD's website.

8. Make SPD policies publicly available on the SPD website.

9. Develop a process to ensure legal compliance with New York State’s repeal of Civil Rights Law Sec. 50-a and related amendments to the Freedom of Information Law, which require the city to disclose copies of certain police personnel records upon request.

10. Continue to actively oppose any legal attempt to dissolve or otherwise eliminate the judicial consent decree which continues to be a critically necessary tool to improve the diversity of our police department.

11. Review the department’s procedure and approval process regarding the application of search warrants that seeks a “no-knock” provision from a court to ensure compliance with Constitutional standards.

12. Continue to improve collaboration with the Syracuse Citizen Review Board (CRB) to ensure the flow of documents and information as embodied in Local Law No. 11.

13. Develop and deliver training on the history of racism in Syracuse and the United States, both in the police academy and during in-service training, such that 100% of the membership of SPD receives this training. Additionally, deliver department-wide training in cultural competency for law enforcement.

14. Continue to review and upgrade the department’s recruitment, screening and hiring practices, with an aim to increase the diversity of the department’s membership.

15. Research and consider innovative, community-based strategies for responding to non-criminal calls, with a goal of shifting the paradigm from primary police response, to response by non-police professionals in relevant fields.

16. Develop and implement, in coordination with the Syracuse City School District, a new model for school safety and security.
A Journey: Reimagining Syracuse Policing

When you find yourself in one location with the goal of reaching another destination, you need a roadmap to get there. This plan serves as our roadmap to reimagining policing in the city of Syracuse. Nobody knows our roads like the individuals who travel on them. The Syracuse residents responded to the national policing crises by speaking up. The voices indicate that even with the best map or GPS system, you must have intentional and evolving plans to address policing and the historical practices that divide an urban community. Syracuse plans to use the proposed policing reform strategies as the roadmap in concert with larger equity strategies to ensure the community is safe for all. As we work collectively with community leaders, council members and residents, we are focused on getting to a better place.

The City of Syracuse is firmly committed to continuing its efforts to support a police department that utilizes 21st century policing practices; creates gateways that promote healthy and productive community-police relationships; and complies with Governor Cuomo’s Executive Order 203, known as the Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative.

The Reimagining Process

PURPOSE Our community’s journey must continue through the establishment of a structured system designed to oversee the overall vision of the plan as well as implementation of its strategies. The City of Syracuse Police Reform and Reinvention Plan is a fluid document, created for the purpose of on-going development and support of the Syracuse Police Department. It involves best practices consistent with nationally recognized 21st Century Policing strategies.

This plan will assess a wide variety of policing issues and challenges, evaluate where change or improvement is needed, with the support of up-to-date research, best practices and community input. The questions posed throughout the plan are drawn from guidance published by the Office of the Governor. Where work has already begun, the plan reports on that progress. Where more work is needed, the nature of that work is described.

DURATION The police reform journey never ends but continues and adapts to address multiple variables that affect the proficiency of law enforcement to address public safety while simultaneously strengthening its relationship with the community.

PIT STOPS While on the journey we’ll need to make pit stops to refuel and assess how far we’ve come; make necessary adjustments; and verify components needed for the remainder of the journey. This plan will include methodology by which we as a city and its police department can, through established metrics, continually evaluate progress and areas for improvement.
Introduction and the Collaborative Process

On June 12, 2020, Governor Andrew Cuomo issued Executive Order No. 203 requiring New York State Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative requiring:

“The local government entity which has a police agency operating with police officers as defined under 1.20 of the criminal procedure law must perform a comprehensive review of current police force deployments, strategies, policies, procedures, and practices, and develop a plan to improve such deployments, strategies, policies, procedures, and practices, for the purposes of addressing the particular needs of the communities served by such police agency and promote community engagement to foster trust, fairness, and legitimacy, and to address any racial bias and disproportionate policing of communities of color.”

NYS Executive Order 203 requires a process which:
• Reviews the needs of the community served by its police agency, and evaluate the department’s current policies and practices;
• Establishes policies that allow police to effectively and safely perform their duties;
• Involve the entire community in the discussion;
• Develops policy recommendations resulting from this review;
• Offers a plan for public comment;
• Presents the plan to the local legislative body to ratify or adopt it, and;
• Certifies adoption of the plan to the State Budget Director on or before April 1, 2021.

The City of Syracuse and its Police Department in accordance with EO No. 203 submit this Syracuse Police Reform and Reinvention Plan. The plan has been developed under guidance from the New York State Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative – Resources & Guide for Public Officials and Citizens- August, 2020 publication.

Development of this plan involves engagement on multiple levels with a wide range of stakeholders within the following timeline:

Spring – December 2020

Community Protests, Communications, Responses

Jan 2021

• Focus Groups, Online input and community meetings
• Further develop draft plan

Feb 2021

• Introduce draft plan to Common Council
• Initiate comment period

March 2021

• Collate community input and finalize plan
• Council vote
• Mayor certifies plan

April 2021

Submission to Albany

The Onondaga County Police Reform & Reinvention Collaborative

Similar to other regions in New York State, our community took a collective approach to reimagining policing and establishing countywide vision; identifying principles and guidance by which all county municipalities can establish goals of improving and reforming policing; building on efforts already underway throughout the county and individual municipalities; and exceeding the requirements of EO No. 203.

Onondaga County Executive J. Ryan McMahon II, City of Syracuse Mayor Ben Walsh, and Onondaga County District Attorney William J. Fitzpatrick joined together creating a process which enables every town, village and city to enact broad-based police reform. Our county is one in which jurisdictional lines from the community perspective can be blurry. For example, from the City of Syracuse traveling east on Erie Boulevard, one seamlessly enters the town of Dewitt; traveling west on W. Genesee Street, the Town of Solvay; east on Hiawatha Boulevard, the Town of Mattydale and south on S. Salina Street, the Hamlet of Nedrow. Just going one street over or a little further on the highway brings you to an entirely different jurisdiction. Collective vision of policing is critical as the citizenry maneuvers through our interconnected community.

Information about the Onondaga County Police Reform & Reinvention Collaborative including community forums, a community input portal and resources can be found on its website: https://policereform.ongov.net.

The members of this collaborative include individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds within our community representing the diversity of Onondaga County. The collaboration comprises diverse, multi-disciplinary and multi-jurisdictional members of the community, representing leaders of nonprofits, law enforcement, elected leaders, faith leaders, government officials, and mental health practitioners. The committees were primarily tasked with engaging community stakeholders to participate in working groups to identify best practices, policy and strategy recommendations for consideration within the overall plan.

We have created a plan based on their work, the public’s input, and law enforcement insight. The following plan is the culmination of their discussions, ideas, and ultimately the hard work of coming together to identify solutions. Committees were established on August 18, 2020 to address areas identified by EO No. 203 as strategies to be considered.

Areas Identified by Executive Order No. 203

- Use of Force Policies
- Procedural Justice
- Model Policies and Guidelines
- Systemic racial bias or racial justice in policing
- Implicit Bias Awareness Training
- De-escalation Training and Practices
- Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Programs
- Restorative Justice Practices
- Problem-Oriented Policing
- Hot Spots Policing
- Focused Deterrence
- Violence Prevention and Reduction Interventions
- Community-Based Outreach and Conflict Resolution
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
Police Structure Sub-Committee

The Police Structure Sub-Committee headed by Chief Kenton Buckner of the Syracuse Police Department has been given the critical task of developing policies around three very important issues:

- Use of Force
- Body Worn Cameras
- No Knock Warrants

In doing so, the committee brought together subject experts and solicited input from advocacy groups and the overall public in order to develop policies that were practical, inclusive, and based on 21st Century best practices.

Committee members include: SPD 1st Deputy Chief Joseph Cecile, SPD Deputy Chief Derek P. McGork, SPD Sergeant Mark Rusin, and Amanda Harrington, Esq. with the City of Syracuse Corporation Counsel.

Police/Community Relations Sub-Committee

The Police/Community Relations Sub-Committee headed by Syracuse Common Council President Helen Hudson is charged to take a deep dive into the issue of Police Community Relations. There were five distinct subjects within this committee and each of the sub-committees worked in specific areas of their expertise. With the extensive work that was either taking place or being refined they were able to offer recommendations to this important work.
Offondaga County Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative

Police-Community Relations Sub-Committee (continued)

A broad look was taken at:

- Citizen Review Board
- Right to Know Law
- School Resource Officers
- Community Engagement
- Violence Interrupters
- Hiring and Diversity

Committee members include: Rasheeda Caldwell, the Allyn Foundation; Timothy “Noble” Jennings-Bey, Street Addiction Institute; Virgil Hutchinson, CEO Freeland Investigations Services; and Oceca Keaton, Director Greater Syracuse HOPE; Ranette Releford, Administrator City of Syracuse Citizen Review Board; and Yusuf Abdul-Qadir, New York Civil Liberties Union.

Crime Analysis Sub-Committee

The Crime Analysis Sub-Committee Co-Chaired by Onondaga County Sheriff Eugene Conway and Chief Deputy Joseph Ciciarelli reviewed and defined strategies and procedures associated with crime analysis, in addition to explaining the role of the Crime Analysis Center that gathers and monitors empirical data to provide a non-biased approach to public safety.

Specific law enforcement strategies involving crime analysis that were reviewed by this group include:

- **Problem-Oriented Policing and Hot Spot Policing.** These concepts involve the identification and analysis of specific crime problems and locations, and the allocation of resources toward solving these problems based on this analysis.

- **Focused Deterrence.** This is a crime reduction strategy that aims to deter crime by increasing swiftness, severity and certainty of punishment. This concept is usually directed at a specific crime problem such as gun violence and coupled between law enforcement and the Judiciary.

- **Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED).** CPTED provides crime prevention methods to an area or specific business that deters offenders from attempting criminal activity by identifying and offering crime prevention strategies utilizing environmental design and physical factors (i.e., placement of security cameras, lighting improvements, landscaping improvements, etc.).

Committee members include: Captain Dan Brogan, Sgt. Colin Hillman, Syracuse Police Department and Dave Savlov, Esq. Deputy Director of the Onondaga County Bar Association Assigned Counsel Program.

Training Sub-Committee

The Training Sub-Committee headed by Chief Michael J. Crowell of the Manlius Police Department is tasked to explore de-escalation training and how to implement that into police training in conjunction with use of force training. The committee will be providing an outline on how today’s police officer should be trained in de-escalation techniques as well as a foundation of implementing de-escalation and use of force at all levels, including the police academy level. Training was a key component of the committee’s work; however the Committee believes that reimagining training in law enforcement, also includes educating the citizens of Onondaga County as to why police do certain things and the manner in which they do them.
The Committee believes that clarity in this area will help foster reconciliation between police and citizens, especially in communities with district police officers.

Committee members include:

- Chief Thomas Winn, Camillus Police Department
- Montanette Murphy, JCOC Office of Diversity and Inclusion
- Paul Nojaim, Ownership Representative of Salt City Market/Syracuse City Urban Partnership
- Cindy Cieloch, Town of Camillus Police Department, Retired 911
- Chief John Fall of the Town of Geddes Police Department
- Chief Tony Callisto, Syracuse University Department of Public Safety
- Dr. Cory Walack, Syracuse University Barnes Center
- Carlo Tearney, Owner of Champion Martial Arts
- Cheryl Giarrusso, Contact Community Services
- Garrett Smith, NYS Office of Mental Health
- Marla Byrnes, NYS Office of Mental Health
- Sarah Reckess, Director of the Center for Court Innovation
- Maria Lewis, City of Syracuse Office of the Mayor
- Monica Williams, Onondaga County Chief Diversity Officer
- Lt. Steve Abbott, Syracuse Police Department
- Theresa Humennyj, Director of Liberty Resources
- Lisa Alford, Onondaga County Commissioner of Adult and Long Term Care Services
- Kirsten Hubel, Hutchings Psychiatric Center
- Kristine Knutson, Contact Community Services
- Jennifer Wolf-Pruner, St. Joseph’s Hospital and NYS Office of Mental Health
- Jessica Caruso, St. Joseph’s Hospital and Onondaga County Office of Mental Health

**Alternatives to Police Response Sub-Committee**

The Alternatives to Police Response Sub-Committee is Co-Chaired by Onondaga County Legislator Linda R. Ervin and is tasked to address the problem of calls to police that involve non-criminal matters. The American Journal of Preventive Medicine estimated that 20% – 50% of fatal encounters with law enforcement involved an individual with mental illness. Locally, Comprehensive Psychiatric Emergency Program (CPEP) reports close to 30% of the presentations there involve the police.

The goal of the committee is to recommend a framework or a plan for how Onondaga County can move forward towards a proper response to such non-criminal calls by means of strengthened collaborations between law enforcement and mobile mental health crisis teams.

There are more than 14,000 criminal cases filed in Onondaga County each year, over 12,000 of which are misdemeanors. Only a small portion of these cases are eligible for Diversionary Programs and Courts such as Drug Treatment Court, Mental Health Court, Veterans Diversion Court and Court for Addiction Recovery Education (CARE Court) (Opioid Addiction). Judges, prosecutors and defense attorneys need alternative sanctions besides jail and fines to dispose of these cases.

Employing a model of restorative justice, community courts seek to counteract the harm done to the community by these low level offenses through having defendants work to strengthen the communities in which the offenses were committed.
Onondaga County Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative Sub-Committees

Community Courts can offer pre-arraignment diversion from the criminal justice system, as well as post-plea alternative sentences including community service, participating in counseling, education and social services.

The committee is also addressing the role of Community Courts and will make recommendations on how the current Community Court model in Syracuse City Court could grow and strengthen to include the ability to handle additional offenses, including misdemeanors, and geographically expanded to work with suburban and exurban Town and Village Courts. Through providing opportunities for community service and meeting needs such as GED classes and mental health counseling, we envision using the Community Court process as an opportunity to change the direction of an individual’s life, avoid costly and unnecessary incarceration, reduce recidivism, and build public confidence in our justice system.

The Committee’s goal is to offer a plan in each area that will guide policing in our County in proper directions in accordance with EO No. 203.

Members of this committee include Onondaga County Legislator District 8 Christopher J. Ryan, Onondaga County Legislator District 7 Mary T. Kuhn, Onondaga County Legislature District 16 Vernon M. Williams, Jr., DeWitt Town Councilor Sam Young, Chief Chase Bilodeau, Town of DeWitt Police Department, Commandant Herb Dunmore, American Legion Post #1642, Cimone Jordan, City of Syracuse; Bishop H. Bernard Alex, Victory Temple Fellowship Church, and Bishop Colette Mathews Carter, President Syracuse Onondaga County NAACP.

Note: While the City of Syracuse is pleased to collaborate with its partners across the County through these committees, the City is still required by EO No. 203 to develop its own police reform plan, which is reflected in this document.

Syracuse Police Department

FUNCTION AND JURISDICTION

It’s important within the context of comprehensive police reform to know the functions and jurisdiction of the Syracuse Police Department (SPD). Syracuse Police is under leadership of the department’s Chief of Police Kenton Buckner. The Chief reports directly to Mayor Ben Walsh and works under the management portfolio of Deputy Mayor Sharon Owens.

“It is the mission of the Syracuse Police Department to prevent crime, enforce the laws, and understand the needs of the community, while providing professional service with ethical treatment for everyone.”

-Mission Statement, Syracuse Police Department
In accordance with the Charter of the City of Syracuse, Chapter 14, the functions the Syracuse Police Department, headed by a chief of police, are the following:

1. Organize, administer, supervise and discipline the police force of the city.
2. Enforce traffic regulations and investigate traffic accidents.
3. Operate communication systems either separately or in conjunction with other departments.
4. Make all legal searches, seizures, and arrests and exercise all legal authority incident thereto which are conferred by the laws of the state upon police officers.
5. Members of the police department, other than, in criminal matters have all the powers of peace officers under the general laws of the state, and they shall also have the power and it shall be their duty to arrest any person found by them violating any of the penal ordinances of the city or laws of the state, and to take such person before the proper city magistrate. Such person shall be dealt with in the same manner as if he had been arrested upon a warrant theretofore duly issued by such magistrate. They shall report violations of law and ordinances coming to their knowledge in any way under regulations to be prescribed by the chief of police with the approval of the mayor. They shall also have, in every other part of the state, in criminal matters, all the powers of constables and any warrant for search or arrest issued by any magistrate of the state may be executed by them in any part of the state according to the tenor thereof without indorsement. They shall possess such other powers and perform such other duties as may be provided by law or ordinance of the council.
6. Serve all process for any criminal offense committed within the city and all process to recover or enforce any penalty for violation of city ordinances issued out of any court or by any magistrate within the city, and every process, subpoena or bench warrant issued by the district attorney of Onondaga county, relating to any offense committed within the city, and process subpoenas or warrants issued by the coroner of Onondaga county in any inquest held in the city relative to the death of any person.
7. Assist other officers, departments and boards in the enforcement of functions assigned to them.
8. Enforce all laws, including local laws and ordinances of the city, and seek to prevent the violation thereof.
9. Maintain peace, protect life, property, and all other rights and liberties of the people; and do and perform all other acts which may be assigned to it by proper authority or required by law or ordinance of the council.
The Role of the Chief of Police

The Chief of Police is the Chief Executive Officer of the Syracuse Police Department and is the final authority in all matters of department policy, operations, and discipline. The Chief of Police is accountable to the Mayor and Common Council of the City of Syracuse to:

- Oversee the department’s annual operating budget. The budget for the 2020-21 fiscal year was 47.9 million. As with municipalities across the country, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has made a significant impact on our city’s operational budget. All City departments, including SPD, were faced with significant reductions in their budgets totaling $18.3 million dollars. The Syracuse Police Department reduced its annual budget by $3.9 million dollars. These cuts included but were not limited to sworn position reductions, service contracts and overtime allocations.
- Ensure the Department’s mission is executed efficiently and effectively.
- Create a vision of the desired future state of the Department.
- Develop strategic goals and objectives.
- Empower and lead subordinates.
- Plan, organize, direct, staff, coordinate, and control all Department functions.

The Chief of Police is supported by an administrative staff, a 1st Deputy Chief of Police, up to five Deputy Chiefs, an Office of Legal Affairs, and an Office of Professional Standards. The chief is responsible for overseeing the Office of the Chief of Police, an Administrative office, and a Community Service, Investigations, and Uniform Bureau.

The Chief has oversight of a Department of 529. Of this total number, 396 are sworn police officers and 133 are civilian employees.

Biography: Police Chief Kenton Buckner

Chief Buckner was sworn as Chief of Police for the Syracuse Police Department on November 30, 2018. Prior to his appointment he served as Chief for the Little Rock Police Department from 2014 - 2018. He began his law enforcement career in 1993, and served twenty-one years for the Louisville Metro Police Department, where he rose through the ranks to the position of assistant chief, holding key operational and administrative positions before retiring in 2014.

Chief Buckner holds both Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees from Eastern Kentucky University. He is a graduate of law enforcement programs sponsored by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Southern Police Institute and the NOBLE Chief Executive Officer Mentoring Program. He most recently completed Senior Executives in State and Local Government at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. Chief Buckner is also a Commissioner for the Commission on Accreditation Law Enforcement Agencies also known as CALEA.

As a proponent of community policing, he has always worked to develop a strong relationship with community stakeholders along with local, state and federal law enforcement partners.
Public and Community Stakeholder Input

Creation of a plan requires public input from various sources. The process of public input has been ongoing. While the Walsh Administration has been seeking and considering input from the public on police-related matters for its entire tenure, the events of 2020 heightened and accelerated the need for input and change.

Community Mobilization

June 12, 2020, a statement from community organizers, advocates and activists was released urging the passage of the Syracuse Right to Know Act and other reforms as part of the People’s Agenda for Police Reform. The People’s Agenda included nine (9) items. The coalition seeking these reforms included the following members:

- Last Chance for Change
- Black Lives Matter, Syracuse
- CuseYouthBLM
- Raha Syracuse
- Syracuse Chapter of the National Action Network
- Syracuse-Onondaga NAACP
- William Herbert Johnson Bar Association of Central New York
- Central New York Chapter of the NYCLU
- Syracuse Peace Council
- Syracuse Cultural Workers
- CNY Solidarity
- Alliance of Communities Transforming Syracuse (ACTS)
- Black Leadership Coalition
- Syracuse Police Accountability and Reform Coalition (SPAARC)
- Syracuse Clergy

Representatives of the People’s Agenda for Police Reform coalition presented their demands to Mayor Walsh, Chief Buckner and city leaders on July 2, 2020 in a live streamed public meeting. Mayor Walsh committed to provide a timeline in two weeks on how the City would address the demands.

Two weeks later, on July 16, 2020, Mayor Walsh issued a response to the People’s Agenda for Police Reform. The document provided timeframes for action and relevant background and context on each of the demands. It also referenced numbered actions in the Mayor’s June 19 Executive Order on Syracuse Police Reform, presenting the City’s position on each of the demands. This responsive communication served as a new platform for accountability to the community and a foundation for continued progress.

As in all parts of our country, Syracuse residents raised their voices in protest. While other cities rioted and looted, Syracuse chose a peaceful path of expression through protest, including forty (40) days of marching by Last Chance for Change through city and county streets. It should be noted that one night resulted in looting by non-protesters. Marchers and police departments worked in a coordinated effort to ensure the safe exercise of First Amendment rights through various public demonstrations. These demonstrations expanded into various neighborhood clean-up efforts.

6 Response to People’s Agenda for Police Reform - https://ourcity.syrgov.net/ourcitystories/initiative-stories/response-to-peoples-agenda-for-police-reform/
Public Transparency
As a continued mechanism of information sharing and accountability regarding reform progress, the City launched a website tracking the City’s progress on Mayor Walsh’s Syracuse Police Reform Executive Order and its sixteen (16) action items.

Community Focus Groups
The Deputy Mayor initiated a series of focus group meetings with the purpose of engaging in conversation with specific community stakeholders around policing. They include: AccessCNY, Southside TNT, La Liga (Spanish Action League), the Westside Service Providers, Neighborhood Watch, the New American Community, and youth groups from the Allyn Foundation and Good Life Foundation.

Community Forums via Zoom
The Onondaga County Police Reform & Reinvention Collaborative hosted six community forums via the Zoom video-conference platform, with three being focused specifically on Syracuse neighborhoods On January 12, 13 and 19, 2021. These Syracuse-focused forums were hosted by Rev. H. Bernard Alex of Victory Temple Fellowship Church. Chief Buckner, Mayor Walsh and Deputy Mayor Owens attended and listened to questions, comments and suggestions from attendees, and provided feedback in return.

Other Online Input
The Onondaga County Police Reform Collaborative established a website providing information about the collaborative purpose, sub-committees, community meeting dates and a public comment portal.

In accordance with NYS EO 203, the City of Syracuse Police Reform and Reinvention Plan must be made available for public review and comment. The plan is available https://ourcity.syrgov.net/syrpolicereformdraft.

---

7  City of Syracuse Executive Order Web Portal - https://ourcity.syrgov.net/reporting-progress-01/
8  Onondaga County website for Police Reform Collaborative - https://policereform.ongov.net/
# Police Reformation Plan & Execution

## What Functions Should the Police Perform?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>&gt; Determining the Role of the Police</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should the police and the community engage with one another?</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should social service personnel be deployed instead of police...?</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&gt; Staffing, Budgeting, and Equipping the Syracuse Police Department</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the staffing needs of the police department...?</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should components of the police department be civilianized?</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should the police engage in crowd control?</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the police be “demilitarized”?</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employing Smart and Effective Policing Standards and Strategies</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&gt; Procedural Justice and Community Policing</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Broken Windows” and “Stop and Frisk”</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chokeholds and other restrictions on breathing</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of force for punitive or retaliatory reasons</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal quotas for summonses, tickets or arrests</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting at moving vehicles and high-speed pursuits</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of SWAT teams and no-knock warrants</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial recognition technology</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&gt; Law Enforcement Strategies to Reduce Racial Disparities &amp; Build Trust</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using summonses rather than warrantless arrests for specified offenses</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion programs</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based outreach and violence interruption programs</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot-Spot policing and focused deterrence</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-Escalation strategies</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can your community effectively identify, investigate and prosecute hate crimes?</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&gt; Community Engagement</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership with community organizations and faith communities</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering with students and schools</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to marginalized communities</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fostering Community-Oriented Leadership, Culture and Accountability

#### Leadership and Culture
- Does your officer evaluation structure help advance your policing goals?  
- What incentives does your department offer officers to advance policing goals?  
- Does your hiring and promotion process help build an effective and diverse leadership team?  

#### Tracking and Reviewing Use of Force and Identifying Misconduct
- When should officers be required to report use of force to their supervisor?  
- Does your department review officers' use of force and/or misconduct during performance reviews?  
- Does your department use external, independent reviewers to examine uses of force or misconduct?  
- Does your department review “sentinel” or “near-miss” events...?  

#### Internal Accountability for Misconduct
- What does your department expect of officers who know of misconduct by another officer?  
- Does your department have a clear and transparent process for investigating reports of misconduct?  
- Does your department respond to officer misconduct with appropriate disciplinary measures?  
- Does your department expect leaders and officers to uphold the department's values and culture when off-duty?  

#### Citizen Oversight and Other External Accountability
- Does or should your department have some form of civilian oversight over misconduct investigations or policy reform?  
- Is there an easy, accessible and well-publicized process for members of the public to report complaints about police misconduct?  
- Are investigation outcomes reported to the complainant?  
- Are investigation outcomes reported to the public?  
- Should the department or the citizen complaint review entity, if any, accept anonymous complaints?  
- Does your local legislature engage in formal oversight of the police?  
- Is your police department accredited by any external entity?  
- Does your police department do an annual community survey to track trust?  

#### Data, Technology and Transparency
- What police incident and complaint data should be collected and shared?
How should law enforcement leverage data to drive policing strategies? 62
How can your police department demonstrate a commitment to transparency in its interactions with the public? 63
How can your police department make its policies and procedures more transparent? 63
How can your police department ensure adequate transparency in its use of automated systems and “high-risk” technologies? 63
Should your police department leverage video cameras to ensure law enforcement accountability and increase transparency? 65

**Recruiting and Supporting Excellent Personnel** 66

> Recruiting a Diverse Workforce 66

Does your agency reflect the diversity of the community it serves? 66
How can you encourage youth in your community to pursue careers in law enforcement? 67
What actions can your agency take to foster the continued development and retention of diverse officers? 69

> Training and Continuing Education 70

How can you develop officer training programs that reflect your community values and build trust...? 70
How can leadership training improve community policing...? 70
How can your police use training to avoid lethal force...? 71
How can your police use training to avoid bias incidents...? 71
How can your training program help officers effectively and safely respond to mental health crises...? 72
What practices and procedures can measure the quality and efficacy of your police department’s training programs? 72

> Support Officer Wellness and Well-being 73

What steps can you take to promote wellness...? 73
How can you effectively and proactively address mental health challenges experienced by police officers...? 73
How can you address the well-being of officers after a traumatic event? 74
Subsequent to the issuance of EO No. 203, Governor Cuomo’s office issued guidance to municipalities containing best practices in policing. Additionally, the guidance identified 13 focus areas along with questions providing municipalities with a framework to reassess and reimagine its police policies, operations and relationships:

What Functions Should the Police Perform?
- Determining the Role of the Police
- Staffing, Budgeting, and Equipping Your Police Department

Employing Smart and Effective Policing Standards and Strategies
- Procedural Justice and Community Policing
- Law Enforcement Strategies to Reduce Racial Disparities and Build Trust
- Community Engagement

Fostering Community-Oriented Leadership, Culture and Accountability
- Leadership and Culture
- Tracking and Reviewing Use of Force and Identifying Misconduct
- Internal Accountability for Misconduct
- Citizen Oversight and Other External Accountability
- Data, Technology and Transparency

Recruiting and Supporting Excellent Personnel
- Recruiting a Diverse Workforce
- Training and Continuing Education
- Supporting Officer Wellness and Well-Being

The remainder of this Plan addresses each of the 13 focus areas set forth in the New York State guidance.
What Functions Should the Police Perform?

DETERMINING THE ROLE OF THE POLICE

How should the police and the community engage with one another? It is imperative that police agencies make improving relationships with their local communities a top priority. Strong relationships of mutual trust between police agencies and the communities they serve are critical to maintaining public safety and effective policing. Cooperation from community members is an essential component to the police department’s efforts to address crime in neighborhoods. Additionally a relationship built on trust enables law enforcement and community members to collaboratively work together to identify issues and formulate solutions. Productive relationships between the police and community members dissolve when, for example:

(1) the community believes that law enforcement is not operating in a manner which deploys policies, procedures and actions in the best interest of their collective community;

(2) when officers believe that the community does not want, need or respect their work;

(3) the community believes that law enforcement does not acknowledge race, language, age, sexual orientation immigrant status, etc., and is fraught with biases within its systematic structure;

(4) when officers question a community’s commitment to its own safety.

In the wake of both national and local incidents involving police use of force and other issues, the legitimacy of the police has been questioned in Syracuse resulting in heightened levels of community activism including 40 day marches, community based coalition building and very large protest rallies. Activists are all calling for accountability.

The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) is a nonprofit police research and policy organization. PERF provides law enforcement agencies with management services, technical assistance, and executive-level education. November 23, 2020, PERF “disseminated a survey in which we asked our members to share their views about priorities for the incoming Presidential Administration. As of December 1, more than 375 responses were submitted.” Survey information can be found here.

When asked about the most important issue for 2021 and the new presidential administration: members were asked to Please choose the top 3 issues in policing that you consider most important for 2021 and beyond. Approximately 75% of respondents identified Increasing Public Trust in the Police as their first priority; more than half identified Addressing the Call for Police Reform; and just less than half identified Enhancing Officer Safety and Wellness.

Another question in the survey asked: What strategies do you consider most effective or promising in improving relationships between police and the community? What role can the federal government play in implementing those strategies?

Responses included:
Increasing face-to-face contacts between police and community members: Overwhelmingly, respondents recommended that police at all levels have more routine, face-to-face contacts with the public. They specifically mentioned “getting out of vehicles,” “taking time to build relationships,” “learning names,” and “taking time to interact instead of racing from call to call.” (Of course, such contacts have been limited since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.)

- Educating the public about policing and the police perspective on issues: Many respondents said that police must educate the public about the realities of policing, acknowledge that officers sometimes make mistakes while doing a difficult job, teach the public how to interact with police, and expand Citizen Academy-type training (and even allowing the public to use firearm/decision-making simulators).

- Transparency/Accountability/Legitimacy: Many respondents said they are implementing strategies that increase transparency about their work, including successes as well as failures. Respondents said that sharing information demonstrates accountability and increases perceptions of legitimacy of their departments.

- Facilitating discussions and listening sessions on difficult issues: Many respondents said police should hold facilitated dialogue sessions with the public and address issues that arise in their community.

The US Department of Justice Community Relations Service (CRS) works with community groups to resolve community conflicts and prevent and respond to alleged hate crimes arising from differences of race, color, national origin, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, or disability. The CRS recommends that departments engage in the following to build police-community relations:

1. Acknowledge and discuss with your communities the challenges you are facing. Controversial uses of force and other incidents can damage relationships between police and their communities. In some cases, a perceived egregious act of misconduct by a single officer in one city not only damages police-community relationships locally; it can gain nationwide attention and reduce trust of the police generally. Police should acknowledge the history of racial minorities and others who have faced injustice at the hands of the police. And police should never discount the negative experiences of individuals with the police. African-Americans in particular have a history of being marginalized and mistreated by the police, leading to a lack of trust and resentment. This history is reflected in many people’s feelings about the police.

---

10 CRS: Importance of Police-Community Relations resource: https://www.justice.gov/crs/file/836486/download
SPD acknowledges that the history of racism in the City impacts how the community views the Department, and that police officers can better serve the community if it has a better understanding of this history. To that end, Mayor Walsh’s Syracuse Police Reform Executive Order, Action No. 13, directed SPD officers to receive training on the history of racism in Syracuse and in the nation.

Additional efforts to repair the police-community relationship through education and transparency are discussed throughout this Plan.

2. Be transparent and accountable. Transparency is essential to positive police-community relationships. When a critical incident occurs, agencies should try to release as much information about it as possible, as soon as possible, so the community will not feel that information is being purposefully withheld from them. At the same time, it is also important to stress that the first information to emerge following a critical incident is preliminary and may change as more information becomes available. Police leaders should let the news media and the public know that early information may not be correct, and should correct any misinformation quickly.

On a day-to-day level, police departments should post information on their websites detailing policies on use of force, community member complaints, and other issues. This information should be easily accessible to the community. The President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing recommended that “to embrace a culture of transparency, law enforcement agencies should make all department policies available for public review and regularly post on the department’s website information about stops, summonses, arrests, reported crime, and other law enforcement data, aggregated by demographics.”

The Syracuse Right to Know Law, adopted by the Common Council in October 2020 requires quarterly reporting from the Department on all stops and consent searches, broken down demographically. More detail regarding the Right to Know Law is found later in this Plan.

Under Chief Buckner’s new initiatives, SPD will be conducting an on-scene press briefing at every critical incident, as well as a follow-up briefing in approximately 24 hours to ensure that the community is provided with information promptly with respect to critical incidents. It is also our understanding that it has been the practice of the Onondaga County District Attorney’s office to regularly conduct press briefings at the conclusion of their review of critical incidents.

Additionally, SPD created a permanent position titled “Public Information Officer” in order to provide the community with immediate feedback regarding police activities and to promote transparency and accountability with respect to day-to-day police operations. Under Walsh’s Police Reform Executive Order, Mayor Walsh directed SPD to make all policies publicly available on its website. See Walsh Executive Order, Item # 8.

The 2021 SPD Annual Report, which will be published in January 2022, will include data on the Department’s uses of force for the year 2021.
3. Take steps to reduce bias and improve cultural competency. Many civil rights leaders and police executives also recommend that officers at all levels receive training on diversity, implicit bias, and cultural competency. Many cities and towns have communities with a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds and cultures, and it is important for officers to be able to communicate effectively with, and understand the cultural norms of, these different groups.

Mayor Walsh’s Executive Order directed SPD to deliver department-wide cultural competency training. The training was scheduled for fall 2020, but was delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

4. Maintain focus on the importance of collaboration, and be visible in the community. It is important for the police to be visible in their communities and know their residents. Many people do not interact with the police outside of enforcement contexts. This can result in people developing negative associations with the police – for example, if the only contact they have ever had with police consisted of receiving a traffic citation or calling the police to report being the victim of a crime. Finding opportunities to interact with community members in a non-enforcement context helps to reduce bias on the part of community members and police officers. Getting to know community residents helps both groups to break down personal barriers and overcome stereotypes, and allows officers to learn which residents of a neighborhood are law-abiding and which ones are not. Police executives often report that law-abiding residents of high-crime neighborhoods resent it when police seem suspicious of everyone in the neighborhood, and, for example, make pedestrian stops of young men who are on their way to work or to school. Personal interactions between police officers and community members build mutual trust, which is essential to addressing neighborhood problems and reducing crime. Tools to improve police-community relations include but are not limited to:

- Adult and youth police academies
- Sports teams or “Police Athletic Leagues,”
- Ride-alongs with officers,
- Police involvement in local school activities, and
- Police participation in (or police-led) community events.

Police officials should see themselves as a part of the community they serve, and local government officials, police leaders, and community members should encourage the active involvement of officers as participants to help maintain the peace. For example, police officials may be invited to participate in peace marches, to attend local sporting events, or to attend neighborhood barbeques or outdoor community “movie nights” for kids.

In December, 2020 the Syracuse Police Department established the Director of Community Engagement, a civilian position responsible for creating opportunities to build strong partnerships which enable community trust and create avenues to listen and
be responsive to identified needs in order to improve public perception of the police.

Additionally the Director will encourage communities to take greater ownership of solving local problems and improve perceptions of safety.

The Director will serve as a liaison between SPD and various community residents and stakeholders to promote Syracuse Police Department community engagement opportunities and strategies; resolve issues and garner solution orientated ideas.

The first goal of the Director is to establish a City of Syracuse Police Athletic League (PAL) national affiliate program.

5. Promote internal diversity and ensure professional growth opportunities. Police agencies need to present policing as a profession. Departments should work to recruit people who want to become officers based on a realistic understanding that the large majority of police officers’ time is spent addressing community requests and that actual “law enforcement” is a much smaller percentage of the time. Police agencies also should step up efforts in recruiting and promotional processes to increase overall diversity in their departments by race and many other demographics. Agencies should provide regular opportunities for career growth and professional development training.

The Walsh Administration identified officer recruitment as an area of focus early in its term. The administration prioritized officer hiring, bringing in three new classes of recruits over the past 2.5 years. The administration recognizes the importance of recruitment efforts that produce diverse recruit classes reflecting the population of the community served by SPD. The Community Input Report, which summarizes an exhaustive public engagement process, and led to Chief Buckner’s hiring, highlighted enhanced recruitment of diverse populations as a priority for the community.

The Department is currently implementing a recruitment strategy with the following objectives:

• To reach a diverse group of qualified candidates, in an effort to educate and inform them of the opportunity to become a Syracuse Police Officer;
• To have the SPD reflect the ethnic, racial, and gender workforce composition of the community for whom it serves;
• To change the community’s perception of the SPD to make the career of a Police Officer more appealing.

One minority recruiting initiative that bears emphasis is a Junior Cadet Program recently announced with a city high school – the Public Leadership Service Academy at Fowler (PSLA). PSLA at Fowler is a City high school situated in the census tract that experience the highest amount of poverty in the city. PSLA offers specialized career and technical educational (CTE) opportunities in law enforcement fields, among others.
City residents with diverse backgrounds graduate from this program, but are unable to immediately sit for the police officer civil service exam because you must be twenty years old to be appointed as a police officer. The Cadet Program’s purpose is to establish a steady stream of qualified police candidates from diverse city residents using PSLA as a pipeline. SPD will offer interim employment opportunities to city residents, with a preference for PSLA graduation. Since many students graduate at the age of 18 and the minimum age for someone taking the law enforcement civil service exam is 20 ½, the program is designed to act as a bridge between graduating high school and becoming a police officer. During this program the Cadet will perform functions that are designed to help them prepare to be police officers and to work within SPD. Participants will be required to take all police officer civil service exams until they pass and are placed on the eligible civil service test. This program is still in development, but is a priority for the Department.

SPD has taken many other steps as outlined in the strategy. Notably, many of these efforts, like the Cadet Program, are aimed at reaching populations that are traditionally overlooked by the civil service testing process. For example, SPD has engaged in outreach in non-traditional recruitment settings to reach individuals who might not proactively seek out a law enforcement career. SPD attended regional cultural affairs, working with the NAACP and New American leaders. SPD also staffed informational tables at the local mall and at the local public housing authority. Many of these efforts are on hold due to COVID-19 concerns, but will be reactivated when feasible.

The New York State civil service examination process, which is run by the county in which Syracuse sits (Onondaga County) is often a barrier to entry for interested applicants. To help residents overcome this barrier, SPD planned to hold classes to assist diverse applicants to improve their score on the civil service exam and to prepare for the physical fitness exam. These proactive efforts were put on hold due to COVID-related budget cuts and social distancing requirements, but will be revisited as soon as feasible. We understand that the NYS Civil Service Commission has undertaken steps to evaluate and modify the entry level civil service examination for police officers to remove built in cultural biases and potential disparate impact on minority applicants. We hope that this new examination enhances our efforts to increase the level of diversity in the City’s police force.

The City is also working with the Collaborative Reform Initiative Technical Assistance Center (CRI-TAC) (a program offered by the U.S. Department of Justice) and the International Association of Chiefs of Police to review our recruitment, hiring, and retention strategy. See https://cops.usdoj.gov/collaborativereform.

More details related to the Department’s diversity recruitment efforts are located in the recruitment section of this plan.
Should social service personnel be deployed instead of or in addition to police officers in some situations?
The Syracuse Police Department is the first to acknowledge that not all dispatched calls require the presence of a sworn officer. Similarly it’s understood that while police officers are not trained professional mental health clinicians, it is important that they are trained to recognize the symptoms of mental health issues and how to provide initial help and access the assistance of those trained in the field in order to guide a person towards appropriate professional help.

Individuals in physical, mental health or substance abuse induced crisis require the intervention of those who have made the care of these individuals their professional career. The Onondaga County CIT Working Group has identified three pillars that should guide all law enforcement protocols that seek to improve interactions with community members who have mental health issues.

These Pillars are:

◊ Empathy & Connection

Programs and policies should strive to deepen connections to community members in need, improve relationships between law enforcement, service providers, and community members, and reaffirm our common humanity. We should strive to support community members in crisis and de-escalate situations that threaten the safety of community members and law enforcement.

◊ Community

Programs and policies should be designed, implemented and evaluated to understand how they impact all community members, with special attention paid to cultural differences, language barriers, disability, and systemic racism. Programs should be designed and implemented with the goal of improving public trust in institutions and incorporating community feedback. Community-based organizations and law enforcement should strive to link communities in crisis to familiar systems, so that community members recognize programs, people, and process and engage with those services.

◊ Accountability

Programs and policies should be regularly evaluated to understand how they work and where challenges exist. Evaluation must incorporate feedback from the community, service providers, and law enforcement agencies. Emphasis should be placed on incorporating programs and policies that are evidence-based, research-supported, collaborative in nature, and applicable to all community members. Service providers and law enforcement agencies should be prepared to hold each other accountable and identify gaps in services, with an emphasis on finding solutions together.
Recommendations

Based on these pillars, the Onondaga County CIT Working Group made the following recommendations:

1. Identify a Countywide Coordinator to implement CIT policy and training and facilitate countywide CIT Working Group
2. Support law enforcement agencies as they develop/implement model CIT policy
3. Develop a Partner Program between law enforcement and mental health treatment providers
4. Plan and implement a 911 diversion program
5. Create a menu of training opportunities
6. Identify community members who are high-utilizers of police, ambulance services, emergency medicine, crisis services, and emergency shelter services, and develop process for mental health treatment providers to reach out preemptively/prior to law enforcement contact
7. Continue to focus on utilizing the 211 and Crisis Connect hotlines to decrease non-emergency calls to 911, including outreach in the community, with other providers, and with LE
8. Formalize law enforcement participation in the countywide Zero Suicide Program
9. Develop Mental Health Supports for law enforcement agencies to address issues of workplace trauma, post-traumatic stress disorder and suicide risk

Addressing the Issue

In Mayor Walsh’s first Executive Order Action Item #15, the Mayor committed to “research and consider innovative, community-based strategies for responding to non-criminal calls, with a goal of shifting the paradigm from primary police response, to response by non-police professionals in relevant fields.”

The City of Syracuse has researched and documented models for alternatives to policing that have been implemented in cities across the country. These efforts include but are not limited to:

- Identify current police responses eligible for non-police response which may include but are not limited to: homelessness, non-criminal mental illness, noise violations, nuisance abatement, and traffic violations.

- Actively engage with the Onondaga County CIT Working Group which is working to develop a framework for mental health crisis response teams and 911 diversion programs for municipalities in Onondaga County.

- Continue to work with Onondaga County to expand the current Crisis Intervention Training to enable informed, safe encounters with citizens with mental health afflictions, substance use and/or developmental disabilities. Due to state funding constraints as a result of COVID-19 budget reductions, the focus is to identify resources to support this important program.
• To the extent permitted by applicable regulations, prioritize mental health support funding from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to identify local partners to implement policies and practices that may serve as future models for police alternative programming and services.

• Identify and implement best practice models for alternative policing, which may include, but are not limited to Eugene’s Crisis Assistance Helping Out On The Streets (CAHOOTS) model, Denver’s Alliance for Street Health Response, and Oakland’s Mobile Assistance Community Responders (MACRO) model. No model can be implemented in a “cookie cutter” approach to address identified needs and systems.

• Conduct a City-wide survey on community public safety and execute outreach to local community-based organizations to gather insight into the specific needs of the community as they relate to mental health crisis response as an alternative to police response.

• Work with government, non-profit and community stakeholders to plan, develop and implement a community-based mental health crisis response network in place of police response for certain 911 calls that fit the criteria of likely being safer and more effective with a non-police response.

• Continue to fund the Trauma Response Team, and similar local programs in order to enable preventive and preemptive services.

With respect to CIT training, SPD has made this training a more central priority. While CIT training is still completely optional in New York State, SPD has a goal of training 25% of the force.

SPD has partnered with Onondaga County and AccessCNY to train its officers along with those from the region. To date 60 officers have completed the 40 hour CIT course. They are instructed about PTSD, personality and mood disorders, substance use, suicide and more, and how to approach different scenarios. The course not only prepares officers to care for the community but to be aware of their own mental health and wellness needs.

We are already seeing the results:

• Spectrum News CNY (CIT Training): Crisis Intervention Teams Could Change the Future of Policing¹³ (January 2020)
• CNY Central: Syracuse Police Chief believes co-response to mental health calls can save lives¹⁴ (September 2020)
• Syracuse.com: Syracuse officers convince suicidal boy to drop knife, get help¹⁵ (September 2020)

To date, the program has been entirely funded by New York State. COVID-related funding issues have curtailed additional funding. The City is committed to identifying resources to support the successful program.

SPD will continue to expand CIT eligibility. Currently the CIT model requires enrolled officers to have a minimum of five years experience on the job. Course administrators believe the instruction is most effective based on the experience of officers. SPD believes that this requirement should be adjusted and Police Academy recruits be allowed the opportunity to participate in the training. While we understand the reasons for the minimum experience requirements, we believe that while recruits are receiving all other training, they can be introduced to the concepts and skill building techniques offered through CIT training. Additionally, these extraordinary young cops will be the ones most likely to respond to the CIT calls for the early part of their careers. SPD will continue to make this case to program administrators.

**What function should 911 call centers play in your community?**

The Onondaga County Department of Emergency Communications is a nationally CALEA accredited 9-1-1 Center since 2002. 911 call centers are the official “triage” center of emergency calls.

The Onondaga County Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative Crisis Intervention subcommittee on Alternatives to Police Response explored the role of the 911 center, making the following recommendations.

Explore the creation of a Co-responders Program/Response Team for Mental Health calls, modeled after CAHOOTS in Oregon. This program could utilize mental health providers to respond to 911 calls for service, working with law enforcement to de-escalate situations, provide alternatives to arrest, link community members to existing community resources, and provide field training to law enforcement officers.

- Plan and Implement a 911 Diversion Program
- Dispatch Mobile Crisis Unit to calls identified as mental health crisis calls
- Develop a 988 call line
- Redesign 911 to flag calls for service as mental health crisis and divert as appropriate
- Create Emotional Distress Call Assessment form
- Create Emotional Distress Caller Workflow
- Create a Menu of Training Opportunities
- Continue to train LE officers from various county law enforcement agencies on CIT
- Train 911 Dispatchers and additional law enforcement support staff on CIT model
- Identify a “refresher” training program for law enforcement officers who have already received CIT training to stay up-to-date
The National Alliance on Mental Illness provides guidance to citizens who are in an escalated crisis and in need of police intervention. Guidance includes:

1. While on the phone give the 911 operator as much information about the situation and the mental health state of your loved one.

2. When the police arrive, stay calm and say “this is a mental health crisis.” Let them know you have information that can assist the situation.


The Syracuse Police Department has and continues to develop collaborative relationships with mental health, substance abuse and homeless intervention specialists/programs. Currently SPD has teamed with mental health outreach response team specialists from Liberty Resources. Once on the scene, SPD reaches out to the Liberty Resource staff lead which deploys a response team. The agency’s team includes social work and clinical professionals to assess the situation and intervene. When no immediate threat of violence is present, SPD takes a secondary position unless intervention is required due to danger evolved by the distressed individual to themselves or others. SPD will take a primary position whenever a weapon is involved or threats of violence.

**Should law enforcement have a presence in schools?**

While assigning a School Resource Officer (SRO) to a school might serve as a deterrent to a potential school shooter, or provide a quicker law enforcement response in cases where a school shooting occurs, it may also escalate the consequences associated with students’ actions. SROs establish a regular law enforcement presence in schools and there is some concern their presence might result in more children either being suspended or expelled or entering the criminal justice system for relatively minor offenses.

As the U.S. Department of Justice has recognized, “the COVID-19 pandemic, along with calls for public safety reform, has changed so much in our communities. Schools across the nation are dramatically changing the way they operate. Drastic changes in state and local funding will demand changes in personnel in education, justice, health, and all other sectors. As local law enforcement budgets are impacted, community and public safety leaders will have to reimagine the roles of their officers. They will also have to decide whether and how to use SROs.” See [https://cops.usdoj.gov/html/dispatch/08-2020/sros.html](https://cops.usdoj.gov/html/dispatch/08-2020/sros.html).

Over the summer of 2020, some local protesters passionately called on the City to reassess the role of police in schools. [Mayor Walsh’s Syracuse Police Reform Executive Order](https://www.syracuse.com/news/2021/05/mayor-walshs-syracuse-police-reform-executive-order.html), Action No. 16, recognized this need to re-examine the role of SROs and ordered SPD to “Develop and implement, in coordination with the Syracuse City School District, a new model for school safety and security.”

---

On July 22, 2020, the Syracuse City School District (SCSD) Board of Education discussed School Resource Officers (SROs) at a remote work session. Then, on August 4, 2020, City and SCSD leadership met and began establishing a working group to further examine the issue. A new school safety model will be identified by June 2021.

As our community examines this issue, we must weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the optimal school safety model that meets the needs of students, staff and visitors while maintaining a productive and nurturing educational environment. If our community settles on a model that includes the continued presence of SROs in some manner, the USDOJ identifies two different models of SRO placement: “Mobile” versus “Assigned.”

The Mobile SRO Model assigns SROs not to a particular school but to an area containing multiple schools. These models help establish school-neighborhood connections while officers patrol home to school routes in neighborhoods surrounding various schools to identify issues and communicate with school officials.

The Assigned SRO Model is currently used by SPD. This model is where SROs are assigned to cover a particular school, or schools, on a regular basis. The SRO usually goes to that school daily, typically having a designated office space. The SRO may conduct patrols in the school, work with school administrators, serve as a mentor or informal counselor to students, and sometimes even teach students.

No matter the identified model, any future agreement between the City and SCSD for the presence of SROs in schools must be documented in a Memorandum of Understanding setting forth clearly defined roles and responsibilities of department staff. Any agreement must make clear that SPD staff are not engaged with schools for the purpose of managing behavior. While some behavior by students is in violation of the SCSD Code of Conduct;¹⁷ most do not violate the penal code and should not be addressed by officers. It must be made clear that the officers’ role is to address criminal acts on school grounds.

The Onondaga County Police Reform and Reinvention Police/Community Relations Sub-Committee also addressed the issues of school safety and, specifically, the presence of School Resource Officers assigned to and present in Syracuse City Schools. The committee focused on seven issues:

- Choosing a Program Model
- Defining Specific SRO Roles and Responsibilities
- Recruiting SROs
- Training and Supervising SROs
- Collaborating with School Administrators and Teachers
- Working with Students and Parents
- Evaluating SRO Programs

The Syracuse City School District (SCSD) Superintendent, in alignment with Mayor Walsh’s EO Action #16, has committed to entering into a contract with a consultant to facilitate a working group of SCSD, City of Syracuse and community stakeholders to identify an appropriate model. The workgroup will incorporate the seven identified issues into its planning.

**Staffing, Budgeting, and Equipping the Syracuse Police Department**

**What are the staffing needs of the police department the community wants?**

Community input reflects the following needs:

- Police force that reflects the diversity of the community it serves;
- Police officers that reside in the City of Syracuse;
- That officers be integrated into the community through foot patrol or other assignments that enable officers time out of patrol cars.
- Geographic assignments that enable officers to integrate into assigned neighborhood communities;
- Police officers who receive interdisciplinary training in mental health and social services, including crisis intervention training.

**Should components of the police department be civilianized?**

Yes. During Chief Buckner’s top to bottom assessment of the Department, he identified several functions within the Department staffed with sworn officers that could be converted to civilian staffing, including human resources, records, information technology, property management and the crime scene unit. Many of those positions have already been civilianized, making additional officers available for core law enforcement functions. This assessment will continue.

**Can your community reduce violence more effectively by redeploying resources from policing to other programs?**

The Department already uses some of its resources on several alternative, community-based violence reduction programs and partnerships, such as the Trauma Response Team, the Street Addiction Institute and the SNUG program (Syracuse Cure Violence.)

However, the City has heard from the community that it believes greater resources should be shifted from traditional law enforcement to alternative models. As noted elsewhere in this report, work is underway to study these models and work toward implementing the right model for Syracuse.

One tool that can help the City and the Department to understand the community's views on the deployment of financial resources is **Participatory Budgeting**. On November 23, 2020, the Common Council approved an agreement with Balancing Act for use of its online budget simulation tool. Balancing Act provides increased transparency by giving the public a deeper understanding of how public dollars are currently allocated, what outcomes are intended, and it enables residents to express preferences for how dollars should be expended.
Syracuse Police will be among the first City departments to use Balancing Act with the intent to include most departments during Fiscal Year 2022 planning.

**How should the police engage in crowd control?**
Crowd control should be viewed primarily as a partnership with the event organizers/leaders in a joint effort to ensure the safety of all individuals in or around the crowd.

With this view, when the Department has advance notice of potential crowds, it attempts to contact the group organizer, establish a liaison between the group and the Department, and coordinate a traffic and/or security plan.

It is the Department's philosophy to use a measured approach based on intelligence and data, balanced with the need for public safety. While the Department's preference is always to use restraint, violence, property destruction or other violations of the law are unacceptable and must be addressed.

The Public Order Unit is only deployed upon the approval of the Chief of Police. The Public Order Unit is a specialized unit trained in crowd control and dispersal tactics for deployment in spontaneous events that are unexpected or unknown that require specialty crowd control equipment and tactics, incidents that have potential for civil disorder or addressing events that are expected to involve large-scale or serious civil disorder.

For transparency and accountability, officers equipped with body-worn cameras are required to record during crowd control situations. In the draft revisions to the Body Worn Camera Policy, released for public review and comment on October 15, “personnel assigned to crowd control situations, including protests, demonstrations, and civil disorder situations, will record with assigned BWCS unless otherwise directed by a Commanding Officer or the Chief of Police or his/her designee.”

**Should the police be “demilitarized”?**
Recognizing the perception by the community that SPD was too “militarized,” Mayor Walsh’s Police Reform Executive Order, Item #6, directed SPD to do the following: Conduct a complete inventory of all equipment acquired through military surplus programs that are in possession of the SPD; establish policies and procedures regarding the use of such equipment; and establish parameters for future procurement of such equipment.

SPD completed this process in December 2020. The analysis showed that the Syracuse Police Department does not currently possess or use any firearms or other weapons associated with the Department of Defence 1033 surplus equipment program. It has a single armored personnel carrier that is not equipped with any weapons.

---

18 Body Worn Camera policy can be found in Appendix F
In order to ensure that SPD procures items from the 1033 program that are justified by operational demand, the Department implemented a new process requiring an extra layer of approval from the Office of the Chief before a supervisor in the Department is able to procure items from the 1033 program.

With the extra approval, the Department will ensure that all items procured through the program are justified by departmental leadership and are in-line with the needs of the Department and existing rules and regulations. See below for a flowchart of the new process.
The military surplus items that SPD has procured through the 1033 program can be accessed here. The majority of the military surplus equipment procured by SPD is apparel or accessory items such as bags or backpack covers. There is only one surplus item, known as an MRAP or Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle that requires established parameters for deployment.

SPD has established procedures for the use and deployment of the MRAP and vehicles like it, including ones that have not been procured through the 1033 program. For example, in 2014, the Department procured a “BearCat,” an armored personnel carrier used by the SWAT team to provide life-saving armor in barricaded suspect call-outs, high-risk warrants, and active shooter scenarios. Although the BearCat is not considered military surplus, it still follows the same procedures as the MRAP for deployment because of the similarities in their functionality.

In the case that SPD procures an item that does not have an existing policy regarding use of the same or similar grade items, a new policy will be written.

The full excerpt from the SPD SWAT Manual that relates to the 1033-procured MRAP and SPD vehicles similar to it can be found here.  

### Employing Smart and Effective Policing Standards and Strategies

**Procedural Justice and Community Policing**

"BROKEN WINDOWS" AND "STOP AND FRISK"

The “broken windows” theory of criminology has evolved into a zero tolerance policy for low level crimes in specific geographic areas. As a result, the broad geographic area is saturated with law enforcement activity that is not necessarily tied to crime data and intelligence, and leads to the over-criminalization of low level offenses in neighborhoods with higher rates of poverty. The “stop and frisk” approach to policing can lead to excessive discretionary stops lacking the necessary legal justification.

In contrast to these approaches, the City’s guiding priority in its policing strategy focuses on data-driven policing. The Department relies on detailed and specific criminal activity data and analysis from trained criminal analysts to determine the geographical location that the Department will focus its resources. The Department also deploys resources based upon specific intelligence indicating that particular individuals or groups have a propensity for violence through documented criminal activity. Together, these approaches are known as Problem-Oriented Policing (“POP”) or Hot Spot Policing.

---

As Chief Bucker has often remarked in community meetings, the Department’s approach is to “fish with a spear rather than a net.” Broken windows and stop and frisk relate to the “net” analogy, and are not utilized by the Department.

**Discriminatory or bias-based stops, searches and arrests**
Under SPD’s Problem-Oriented Policing strategy, individual officers are instructed to focus attention on data-driven “hot places” and “hot people” in specific areas. By focusing on crime data and intelligence, rather than bias or stereotypes, the Department can avoid engaging in discriminatory policing.
 SPD regularly incorporates statistical crime analysis directly into its weekly operational meetings, at which SPD sets its policing priorities for the coming week based on crime “priority areas.” Based on the SPD’s Problem-Oriented Policing (“POP”)/Hot Spot Policing Plan, SPD utilizes this statistical analysis to establish geographic areas within the City using five years of data on: (i) shots fired, (ii) shootings with injury, and (iii) homicide by gun. SPD utilizes spatial density hot spot statistics to map priority street segments, creating a perimeter around the most severe hot spots, creating SPD’s POP areas based on its measured data. Those identified areas become the focus of the Department’s resources, across each of its operational departments, on a week by week basis.

**Chokeholds and other restrictions on breathing**
Mayor Walsh’s Police Reform Executive Order, Action #2 directed SPD to revise its use of force policy “to ensure that it is compliant with recent changes in New York State law, and fully consider any policy changes requested by the Syracuse community.”

SPD engaged in a thoughtful review of the existing policy, and, specific to the issue of chokeholds, proposed the following provision which is compliant with changes to state law.

**300.10 DEADLY FORCE LIMITATIONS AND PROHIBITIONS**

A. Chokeholds: The Department bans the use of chokeholds as a police practice in a manner consistent with the conduct prohibited by NY Penal Law §121.13-A. A chokehold is defined as either (i) a technique that applies pressure to the throat or windpipe of a person in a manner that may hinder breathing or reduce intake of air (NY Exec. Law §837-t); or (ii) a technique that applies pressure on the throat or neck of such person or blocks the nose or mouth of such person with intent to impede the normal breathing or circulation of the blood of another person (NY Penal Law §121.11).

This provision, together with the entire Draft Use of Force Policy, was released for public review and comment on October 15, 2020. It will remain open for review during this process, with the goal of finalizing and implementing the policy in 2021.

**Use of force for punitive or retaliatory reasons**
As noted above, as a result of Mayor Walsh’s Syracuse Police Reform Executive Order, Action No. 2, the Department revised its Use of Force policy and released it for public input in October 2020.

---

Under current policy and under the draft revised policy, officers are not allowed to use force as a punitive measure or for retaliatory reasons. Rather, officers are only authorized to use force when necessary to accomplish lawful objectives, including:

1. Effecting an arrest, prevent escape of a person from custody, or in defense of self or others from imminent physical force;
2. Effecting an investigatory stop or detention where there is reasonable suspicion to believe that criminal conduct has occurred or is ongoing;
3. Taking subjects into protective custody, including civil custody, when authorized by law, such as persons who are a danger to themselves or others or persons incapacitated by intoxicating agents;
4. Preventing a subject from committing suicide or inflicting serious physical injury upon themselves, provided the force shall not rise to the level of deadly physical force;
5. Assisting a licensed medical provider in providing necessary medical treatment;
6. Overcoming resistance to a lawful police order following a verbal warning.

Using force merely to punish or retaliate falls outside these authorizations and is therefore prohibited. It is worth further noting that even if use is authorized, the force must be reasonable and necessary, and must be proportionate to the threat. Overall, the draft use of force policy places a stronger emphasis on de-escalation and proportionality.

In addition, using force to punish is explicitly outlawed in the draft revised policy, as follows:

300.8 PROHIBITED USES OF FORCE

A. Generally, officers must cease using force when the officer reasonably perceives that the purpose necessitating the use of force has ended, and must continually assess the situation and changing circumstances, and adjust or discontinue the use of force appropriately.

B. In addition, force shall not be used in the following circumstances:

1. To coerce a confession from a subject.
2. To obtain physical evidence from a subject for the purpose of scientific testing, absent a court order.
3. Against subjects who are handcuffed or restrained unless it is necessary to prevent injury or escape, or to otherwise overcome resistance posed by the subject.
4. To torture, unlawfully coerce or punish a subject.
5. To attempt to remove or extract evidence from a subject who has orally injected the evidence, once the subject has placed the potential evidence in his/her mouth.

NOTE: An officer may use reasonable force to prevent the person from placing the evidence or contraband in their mouth, but such force must cease once evidence/contraband is in the mouth. Once a subject has ingested potentially harmful evidence such as narcotics, an officer shall request immediate medical attention.
6. To extract an item from the body or cavity of a subject without a warrant, except where exigent circumstances are present (for body cavity searches see the Strip Searches and Body Cavity Searches policy, Volume 1, Article 73, Section 73.14).

As noted above, public input is still being accepted prior to implementation of the revised policy.

**Informal quotas for summonses, tickets or arrests**
The Syracuse Police Department does not utilize quotas of any type, whether formal or informal, to generate a particular volume of summonses, tickets, or arrests.

**Shooting at moving vehicles and high-speed pursuits**
The issue of shooting at moving vehicles is addressed in the SPD [draft revised Use of Force policy](#), as follows:

### 300.10 DEADLY FORCE LIMITATIONS AND PROHIBITIONS

E. Shooting at a Moving Vehicle: Discharging a firearm at a moving vehicle is prohibited unless an officer reasonably believes or perceives that any occupant(s) of the vehicle are using or are about to use deadly force against the officer or another person, and the officer reasonably believes there are no other reasonable means available to avert the threat posed by the vehicle or its occupants. Due to the inherent danger of this tactic, the following additional guidance applies:

1. When confronted by an oncoming vehicle, officers should not position themselves in the path of the vehicle, and should make every attempt to move out of the path of an approaching vehicle instead of discharging their firearm at the vehicle or any of its occupants.

2. Officers should not discharge their firearm at a vehicle when it is reasonable to believe that the vehicle may contain an innocent occupant or when it is reasonably foreseeable that doing so may cause the vehicle to careen out of control and injure an innocent bystander.

3. Officers should not discharge their firearms at any part of a vehicle in an attempt to disable the vehicle.

F. Shooting from a Moving Vehicle: Discharging a firearm from a moving vehicle is prohibited unless an officer reasonably believes or perceives that the subject is using or is about to use deadly force against the officer or another person, and the officer reasonably believes there are no other reasonable means available to avert the threat posed by the subject.

Additionally [NYS Senate Bill S.2575B](#): Requires state and local law enforcement officers, as well as peace officers, to report, within six hours, when they discharge their weapon where a person could have been struck, whether they were on or off duty.

This new law requires that any law enforcement officer or peace officer who discharges their weapon, while on or off duty, where a person could be struck by a bullet from the weapon is required to verbally report the incident to his or her supervisor within six hours and prepare and file a written report within 48 hours of the incident.

Finally, the Department’s Vehicle Pursuits Policy\(^\text{22}\) was reviewed and revised in 2020.

**Use of SWAT teams and no-knock warrants**

Mayor’s Walsh’s Executive Order, Action #11, required SPD to review its procedure for the issuance of “no-knock” warrants.

By way of background, typically when police officers have a warrant to enter a property, they must knock and announce themselves before entering. However, in some cases where there is reasonable cause to believe that the giving of notice may endanger the life or safety of the police officer or another person, or if there is substantial belief that important evidence may be destroyed if an officer announces their presence before entering, an officer can be granted what is known as a “no-knock warrant.” These allow officers to enter a property without knocking or announcing themselves. Different states have varying levels of approvals needed to gain a no-knock warrant, which impacts how easy it is for an officer to obtain one.

In response to the Mayor’s executive order, SPD Executive Order No. 1 Action #11, the Syracuse Police Department created a new policy on no-knock warrants. Under this new policy, no-knock warrants require two levels of internal administrative review and approval. First, an officer must obtain approval from a command officer (i.e., lieutenant or above) prior to submitting an application to a court for a warrant containing a no-knock provision. Second, after the warrant is issued by a judge, an officer must obtain approval from the Chief of Police or a Deputy Chief prior to executing the no-knock warrant.

This new policy will ensure that no-knock warrants are not used unless they are thoroughly and carefully reviewed at the highest level of SPD.

**Facial recognition technology**

The City of Syracuse does not use facial recognition technology. As a Smart City, our technological capabilities will continue to grow. We are therefore obligated to ensure there are transparent processes that protect the privacy of our citizens. Mayor Ben Walsh’s [Surveillance Technology Executive Order](https://ourcity.syrgeov.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Executive-Order-No2.pdf)\(^\text{23}\) ensures residents know what technologies are being considered and have input on proposed uses before they are procured and deployed. The Executive Order enacts policies and procedures for oversight on procurement and ensures surveillance tools are implemented in a safe and well-governed way.

The policy goal is to create and support a scalable process allowing for citizens through their representatives to have a say in technologies that surveil the city and to ensure those technologies are implemented in a safe and well governed way.

---

\(^{22}\) Department Vehicle Pursuit Policy - in Appendix X

The Surveillance Technology Policy establishes a framework for determining if technologies being considered by city departments should be considered surveillance technologies, so that those that are considered surveillance go through an extra layer of review. The Mayor will appoint a working group composed of city staff and external stakeholders to review proposals by city departments to use data collection technology. External stakeholders will come from local organizations in social justice, technology, community engagement, as well as research institutions and partnerships.

Based on working group review, proposals that meet the definition of surveillance technology will be referred to public comment which will include public notification, a two-week online comment period and review at, at least, one Common Council committee meeting. Based on public comment and recommendations by the internal and external working group, the Mayor will determine if the technology is implemented, subject to Common Council approval to the extent required by the City Charter.

The Surveillance Technology Policy also includes mandated standards for data collection, storage, analysis, modeling and deployment. It outlines key considerations regarding informed consent; data security and retention; privacy of personally identifiable information and steps to identify and prevent unintended use of information collected.

Law Enforcement Strategies to Reduce Racial Disparities and Build Trust

Using summonses rather than warrantless arrests for specified offenses
The Department’s warrantless arrest practices are consistent with the revised Section 150.20 of the Criminal Procedure Law.

Diversion programs
Law enforcement diversion programs are implemented through the local court system. The County Court currently has seven stand-alone diversion programs. The Department partners with the local courts to execute those programs.

The Department is involved in a collaborative partnership with multiple partners operating under the TRINITY Project. Project Trinity provides intensive case management to aid at-risk youth and their families to prevent deeper attachments to street gangs and promote pro-social activities and attachments. Syracuse partners implemented Trinity in the face of increasing juvenile involvement in the city’s gang and gun crime. Trinity serves youth aged 17 and under at risk of gang association or already involved in a gang, and therefore at risk of perpetrating gun violence or being the victim of gun violence. The program is designed to complement other strategic initiatives in Syracuse and is overseen by the PSN Strategy Committee. The Strategy Committee meets monthly to provide oversight and accountability, identify and eliminate barriers to progress, develop and coordinate anti-gang/gun strategic initiatives, and report to and make recommendations to executive levels of partner agencies.

24 Project Trinity - https://finninstitute.com/project-trinity/
Additionally, SPD has an especially productive relationship with Onondaga County’s Juvenile Justice Unit. The Department works closely with the Director of Juvenile Justice & Detention Services. The Department coordinates with the Director and other partners (County Probation and Family Court) to more effectively deal with juvenile CORE offenders and other more prolific juvenile offenders. SPD formed an informal partnership with those partners for better coordination. Prior to forming this informal partnership, there was no formal mechanism in place for communication between groups. Information on arrests, criminal history, adjustment services, intervention and supervision was lost, and as a result, prolific juvenile offender cases were not being disposed of in an efficient manner.

Since the collaboration began, the most prolific offenders are being given the special attention they need, both from a rehabilitation standpoint, but also from an accountability and public safety standpoint. The Juvenile Justice team have been an integral partner in the Department’s efforts as they relate to dealing with repeat juvenile crime in the City.

**Community-Based outreach and violence interruption programs**

Syracuse is fortunate to have multiple community-based outreach programs focused on gun violence reduction.

The include but are not limited to:

- Street Addiction Institute
- Syracuse Cure Violence (SNUG)
- Good Life Foundation
- OGs Against Gun Violence
- Trauma Response Team

Street outreach programs employ a public health approach to violence intervention, beginning with the premise that gun violence is like a contagious disease, the spread of which can be interrupted. To do so, street outreach organizations provide both immediate crisis response services and long-term stabilization support to individuals and communities affected by gun violence. Street outreach programs deploy violence interrupters who help prevent shootings by identifying and immediately mediating conflicts in a community and working with individuals most at risk. Often these interrupters are former members of street groups who have credibility when speaking to at-risk individuals. These street outreach programs have been successful in reducing gun violence.

**Hot-Spot policing and focused deterrence**

Group violence intervention (GVI) programs—also known as focused deterrence programs—center on the belief that violence can be prevented if individuals believe the costs associated with the violence outweigh any potential benefits. These programs target chronic violent offenders—individuals who have been identified by law enforcement, criminal justice data, and community members—and include three sets of intervening actors: law enforcement, community representatives, and social service providers. In essence, high-risk offenders are presented with strict consequences for continued violent behavior, coupled with access to social services and ongoing support from community members, should they choose a different path.
SPD's strategy for focused policing has been based, in part, on the Gun Involved Violence Elimination (“GIVE”) model, which was recommended to it by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (“DCJS”), which relies on evidence based policing strategies. The GIVE model employs multiple strategies including:

- Problem-oriented policing (“POP”) (also referred to as hot spot policing);
- Focused deterrence — (Syracuse TRUCE)\textsuperscript{25};
- Street outreach;
- Procedural justice; and
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (“CPTED”).

The Department adopted the GIVE strategy as part of a Memorandum of Understanding (the “GIVE MOU”) it signed with the New York State Police, the U.S. Department of Justice (“DOJ”), the Onondaga County District Attorney’s Office, among other external agencies. SPD employs each of these strategies recommended by DCJS as its primary strategies to combat and reduce violent crime.

**Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)**

Community-driven crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) is a long-term gun violence reduction strategy centered on a multi-disciplinary approach of crime prevention that uses urban and architectural design and the management of built and natural environments. Simply stated it is a strategy that uses the community’s physical environment as a crime reduction tool. Recent examples include the removal of a block of overgrown trees and bushes on E. Raynor and State Streets. Community members complained about the use of the overgrowth as a location to hide weapons and drugs. SPD in collaboration with the Departments of Public Works and Neighborhood and Business Development transformed the location restoring line of sight, creating a sense of safety for neighborhood residents.

**De-Escalation strategies**

SPD is committed to the sanctity of human life, the duty for an officer to intervene, and the de-escalation of an encounter whenever feasible. The Department reflects these principles in policy and training, while also expecting the same of its officers in practice. The Department will continue to seek areas of the policy and training curriculum for further advancement of these principles.

SPD’s [draft revised use of force policy](https://finninstitute.com/syracuse-truce/) places a high priority on de-escalation. In fact, de-escalation is considered a core principle of the policy. The policy has an entire section devoted to the concept:

300.3 DE-ESCALATION

Officers shall use de-escalation techniques and tactics when it is safe and feasible to do so under the totality of the circumstances, consistent with the officer’s training. Not every potential violent confrontation can be de-escalated, but officers have the ability to impact the direction and the outcome of many situations they encounter, based on their decision-making, and the tactics they choose to employ. De-escalation applies to all encounters between officers and the public, not only those that involve force.

\textsuperscript{25} Syracuse TRUCE Program - https://finninstitute.com/syracuse-truce/
De-escalation may include the use of techniques and tactics, both verbal and nonverbal, such as verbal persuasion, body posture, command presence, commands or warnings, tactical repositioning, or any tactic or force option that in the officer’s reasoned judgment is likely to result in a lower level of force being used to accomplish the objective at hand.

Officers are not expected to compromise safety in order to de-escalate a situation if it is likely to result in harm to the officer or others.

Additionally, the section setting for the factors used to determine the reasonableness of force directs officers to consider these same factors to determine whether de-escalation is safe and feasible. See 300.7. Finally, the policy directs that officers receive periodic training on de-escalation tactics, including alternatives to force. See 300.13(B)(2).

**Can your community effectively identify, investigate and prosecute hate crimes?**

“Hate crimes” are covered in SPD’s policy on Bias-Related Incidents as follows: (Volume 1, Article 3, Section 29.00)

*Purpose* - The purpose of the policy is to assist officers in identifying incidents motivated by bias toward an individual’s race, color, national origin, ancestry, gender, religion, religious practice, age, disability, and/or sexual orientation and to provide guidance for assisting victims and apprehending offenders. For purposes of this policy the terms Bias Related Incident and Hate Crimes are used interchangeably.

*It is the policy of the Syracuse Police Department to safeguard the rights of all individuals, which are guaranteed by New York State law and the United States Constitution, without regard to a person’s race, color, national origin, ancestry, gender, religion, religious practice, age, disability and/or sexual orientation. The Department shall use every necessary resource to identify and apprehend perpetrators of bias related offenses.*

Additionally, due to their sensitivity and severity, by policy all bias-related crimes are handled by a detective in the Criminal Investigation Division regardless of the classification of crime.

**Community Engagement**

A common theme among the many suggestions related to police reform involve increased opportunities for non-law enforcement interaction between SPD and the community. Citizens reminisce of the times in the 80s and 90s of the neighborhood “beat cop”-- officers assigned to neighborhoods who literally walked the neighborhood and interacted with residents. Citizens now see the police as they speed from call to call in their patrol car. Call volume and reduced patrol staffing have contributed to this reality as officers address a constant backlog of calls requiring response.
Public facing communication
There was a need to better communicate the community engagement and outreach efforts local law enforcement agencies were currently undertaking.

While a police chief candidate in 2019, Kenton Buckner researched the City of Syracuse and Syracuse Police Department, viewing the websites and social media pages. The information on the SPD Facebook page was a series of arrest pictures. This made such a negative first impression on Chief Buckner that he established a Public Information Office with staff led by Sgt. Matt Malinowski. This office is in charge of public facing information, including media inquiries, community outreach and social media outreach. This Office has a recurring Sunday morning news segment with CNYCentral television where questions are posed to our PIO sergeant.

Citizen advisory boards and committees
In 2019, Chief Buckner created a Citizen Advisory Committee for each of the three new police districts within the City of Syracuse. Each of the committees is composed of citizen volunteers from the district, the District Captain, and many times the Chief himself. The committees allow citizens to share information and concerns directly with the command structure responsible for serving each geographical area of the City.

The Department intends to use these committees to help inspire a sense of trust, responsiveness, and accountability within the community being served. The committees meet quarterly on an ongoing basis.

Partnership with community organizations and faith communities
“Sustainable success is not possible without community partners.” - Chief Kenton Buckner

Engaging with community organizations and faith communities is a core tenant of Chief Buckner’s policing philosophy and strategy. The Department has reached out widely to engage with partners in the community including those in the non-profit, for-profit, educational and faith-based sectors to work together towards a mutually desired destination.

Examples of these partnerships are found through this report. Worth special mention are the following ongoing partnership:

• NAACP and La Liga for recruiting assistance
• Interfaith Works and Catholic Charities for translation challenges
• Cadet Program with Fowler PLSA and CNY Works
• Monthly meetings with the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance
• CIT Training with Access CNY
To place an even greater focus on community engagement, in December 2020, Mayor Walsh and Chief Buckner announced the appointment of Jimmy Oliver to be SPD's first Director of Community Engagement. Oliver, who had been Deputy Commissioner of Parks, Recreation and Youth Programs since June 2018, joined the Department in a civilian role responsible for developing, coordinating and implementing community engagement programming. He reports directly to Chief Buckner. Similarly, Chief Buckner assigned an officer to have focused responsibility for community engagement efforts - Officer Marlena Jackson.

“Jimmy Oliver’s appointment is another example of our City being intentional about improving the police department’s relationship with the community,” said Chief Buckner. “In Jimmy, we have a person with a proven track record in community engagement and strong credibility across our City.”

Oliver is charged with helping the Department to build community trust and with creating avenues to listen and respond to neighborhood needs. He will focus on improving the Department’s relationship with the Syracuse community, particularly with minority and underserved communities, advocacy groups and other key stakeholders.

Among his specific assignments will be creating a nationally-affiliated Syracuse Police Department Police Athletic League (PAL), a program dedicated to preventing juvenile crime and violence by providing mentorship, community service, athletic, recreational, enrichment and educational opportunities. He will coordinate Chief Buckner's District Advisory Group activities and will manage the work of the City of Syracuse-Onondaga County Coalition to Reduce Gun Violence. He will also collaborate with community stakeholders and the Neighborhood Watch Group of Greater Syracuse Coordinator.

**Partnering with Students and Schools**
Mayor Walsh recently announced a Cadet Program that will provide a bridge between the public safety curriculum and the Department, in partnership with CNYWorks. A more detailed description of this program is located in this report, under the recruitment heading.

The Syracuse Police Academy will be relocating to the campus of the Onondaga Community College in 2021.

**Attention to Marginalized Communities**

**LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY CITIZENS**
Communication is a vital element of effective policing and police-community relations. The ability to understand the language of the individual seeking assistance as well as that individual understanding the responding officer is critical. Language barriers prevent officers from properly ascertaining the situation and proceeding with the appropriate response. Communication barriers through language prevent limited English proficiency citizens from reaching out to the police for assistance.
Effective interpretation and translation services must be available to officers to ensure efficient communication. Effective interpretation and translation requires skill in communicating regional and country differences in how languages are written and spoken. Agencies are encouraged to use interpreters and translators who are qualified or certified by trusted services or organizations.

SPD will maintain formal agreements with agencies specializing in translation services. Effective communication goes beyond speaking the accurate dialect, it includes making a cultural connection. To ensure the ability to address both SPD will continue to build upon and identify new relationships with community “gatekeepers” able to cross the language and cultural barrier.

Additionally, SPD is pursuing a provision in its labor contract with the police union to reward officers who are proficient in other languages. This new provision is designed to help the Department recruit candidates who speak multiple languages, and encourage current officers to pursue education in other languages to achieve this proficiency. Greater numbers of multi-lingual officers will improve the Department’s ability to community with Syracuse’s diverse population.

Finally, based on the feedback from the New American community, the Department is researching the use of a new translation app, Voiance.

CITIZENS WITH COMMUNICATION DISABILITIES
SPD is committed to ensuring that individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing are treated fairly and equitably by all members of this Department. Effective communication with an individual who is deaf or hard of hearing involved in an incident, whether as a victim, witness, suspect, arrestee, or a person in need of assistance is essential in ascertaining the type of situation, the urgency of the matter, the facts of what actually occurred, the concerns of affected parties, and the most appropriate law enforcement response. Accordingly, SPD maintains a policy that outlines how its officers interact with individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing who need police services. The policy states, in relevant part:

1. Police officers encountering an individual who is deaf, hard of hearing, or has a speech disability should use appropriate auxiliary aids and services whenever necessary to ensure effective communication with the individual. If there is an incident in which a deaf, hard of hearing or individual with a speech disability may be a suspect, witness, or victim of a crime, a qualified interpreter may likely be required for responding or investigating officers to gain even the minimal information necessary to accurately assess the facts and the appropriate law enforcement response.

2. Police contact with citizens occurs most frequently during traffic stops. In situations involving drivers who are deaf, hard of hearing, or who have a speech disability, and those individuals use sign language for communication, the officer should use common gestures or written notes to initiate the exchange with the driver and should explain in writing the necessity for a stop and citation if the driver is to be charged with a traffic violation.

3. It is the policy of the Syracuse Police Department that it will furnish appropriate auxiliary aids and services whenever necessary to ensure effective communication with individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing, or who have a speech disability.
As part of the Department’s comprehensive review of its policies and procedures, this policy is being reviewed to ensure it is consistent with best practices, and that proper training is delivered to officers.

**New American Communities**
Syracuse’s diversity has blossomed in its diversity with the addition of people who emigrate from around the world (New Americans), settling here seeking opportunities for their families. Adjustment to American culture and identity and norms can be confusing for even native-born residents. Imagine the complexity of life for those moving to the United States from across the world.

Individuals seeking refuge from war-torn nations can experience the perception of public safety as blurred line between law enforcement and soldiers; this lived experience can cause distrust and fear of police and other regulative system. Additionally, federal immigration enforcement actions combined with confusion about whether and to what extent local police enforce immigration laws, potentially make New Americans more vulnerable to crime and less likely to report it to law enforcement.

Local police departments often struggle to keep pace with new challenges presented by rapidly growing and multicultural layers of ethnicity, culture, religion and language.

On January 14, 2021, Chief Buckner met with an advisory committee from the New American community. Based upon the feedback received, the Department is researching an app through Voiance for translation assistance to reduce the language barrier.

Moving forward, in order to increase mutual trust and understanding between the police and the New American community, at the direction of Chief Bucker, the Department is developing a curriculum to host a citizens police academy for New Americans.

**Transgender Individuals**
Transgender people today face tremendous acts of anti-trans violence in our streets, schools, homes. Transgender people of color and transgender women are disproportionately affected, by violence and discrimination. The consequences of a mishandled interaction between police and trans individuals can be severe as well as the risk associated with potential false assumptions place trans individuals at significant risk of being outing, which can ultimately result in social ostracism, unemployment, or violence. Despite being at a higher risk of assault and violence, many transgender people don’t report instances of brutality to law enforcement. It is crucial that police officers understand the experiences of trans individuals in order to address their specific concerns and protect their safety, while also avoiding potentially dangerous or dehumanizing situations. In recognition of the issues facing this segment of our community, SPD worked alongside our LGBTQIA+ community to develop and implement a [Interactions with Transgender* Individuals](https://www.syracusepolice.org/document/Interactions-with-Transgender-Individuals).
policy. The policy was drafted by a committee that included representatives of BlackCuse Pride, Legal Services of Central New York (LSCNY), Volunteer Lawyer’s Project of Onondaga County (ONVLP), Vera House, and several other community stakeholders. The purpose of the policy is to provide guidelines for the appropriate treatment of transgender*, intersex, nonbinary and gender non-conforming individuals (transgender*) who come into contact with members of the Syracuse Police Department. Through the implementation of the policy, the Department has established the expectation of respectful and professional treatment of transgender* persons and is cognizant of the fact that transgender* persons are disproportionately the victims of hate based, violent crimes.

The policy further recognizes that transgender* persons are more likely to be victims of crime rather than the perpetrators, and provides:

The Syracuse Police Department is committed to working with all diverse communities in which it serves with fairness and dignity. Members of the Syracuse Police Department shall interact with all citizens in a manner that is professional, respectful, and courteous. Personnel will not exhibit any bias, nor will they pre-judge, or discriminate against an individual or group based on their actual or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

Personnel will address members of the public using pronouns, titles of respect, and name as expressed by the individual, regardless of what is listed on their government issued identification. If members are uncertain about which pronouns are appropriate, then the employee should respectfully ask the individual. Personnel will not use language that is demeaning or degrading in content or tone, understanding that it is equally unacceptable to use non-derogatory language in a derogatory manner or tone.

The SPD’s Interactions with Transgender* Individual’s policy shall be readily accessible to the public at no cost via the Department’s website and external search engines."

**Involving youth in discussions on the role of law enforcement agencies**

On December 30, 2020, youth from Let Me Be Great #44 and the Good Life Foundation met with City staff to share their perspective on policing within the city. These perspectives were informed by historic national events as well as their own interactions with law enforcement. Some shared stories of unwarranted stops and excessive use of force that left them with feelings of distrust and fear towards police.

Youth concluded that police reform must include a more diverse police force with representation from their community. Officers from the community bring familiarity, empathy and understanding to the force and ultimately the neighborhoods they engage with. As one teen explained, knowing

a friend from high school on the police force encouraged them that there are officers that can be trusted and have integrity. Officers from the same neighborhood are more likely to approach familiar citizens with a calm demeanor and genuine goal of de-escalating situations void of assumptions and ulterior motives. In their experience, some officers enter into unfamiliar spaces carrying preconceived notions around class and race within particular neighborhoods. These biases manifest in forceful displays of authority. When this force is met with self-defense and even peace, it is often taken as resistance.
Youth shared with City staff how these negative experiences with officers discourage their generation from joining the force which creates a never ending cycle of lack of representation and poor interactions.

As a means to diversifying SPD, they would also like to see schools place equal emphasis on vocational programs and civil service pathways, as opposed to only promoting higher education. If we can get schools to successfully pipeline students into strong local jobs, we can increase diversity in the police department, local government and other positions across the city. To continue these important conversations with youth, Chief Buckner will explore the creation of an ongoing youth advisory council in 2021.

Fostering Community-Oriented Leadership, Culture and Accountability

Leadership and Culture

Does your officer evaluation structure help advance your policing goals?
SPD is currently reviewing its performance evaluation policy and practice to make it a more strategic and consistent effort that aligns with the Department’s policing goals.

What incentives does your department offer officers to advance policing goals?
The City’s most recent round of labor contract negotiations took a new approach of advocating for changes—including financial incentives—that would support the Department’s operational priorities. In particular, the City and PBA agreed on a set of wage differentials that would reward officers who achieved higher education degrees or who are multilingual. The Department believes that a police force that is better educated, and who can communicate in multiple languages, will support the Department’s goals. Specifically, officers with advanced degrees will be better equipped to understand and implement the complexities of 21st century policing, and complex layering of societal issues that impact interactions with the public.

Officers who can speak multiple languages aid the Department in communicating with the increasingly diverse Syracuse population. These incentives are still being considered as part of the process to finalize a labor contract. As the City enters into its next round of negotiations, it will continue to think creatively about how to structure these types of incentives.

Does your hiring and promotion process help build an effective and diverse leadership team?
Mayor Walsh’s focus on police-community relations and accountability began in 2018 when he entered office and began a 10 month public engagement process and search for the next police
When Mayor Walsh released the findings of a two-month study to determine what Syracuse wanted in its next police chief, he had taken the first step in letting applicants for the job know that this would be a community-led process. They were essentially being interviewed by the residents of the City of Syracuse. In fact, the residents wrote much of the job description.

The 74-page report\(^{27}\) collected survey responses, feedback from 10 community input meetings with residents, and interviews from stakeholders such as cops, elected officials, and nonprofits. It outlines the characteristics residents and stakeholders were looking for in the next chief. “We’re not trying to draw out personal qualities, but [rather] the experience and philosophy of a candidate,” Deputy Mayor Owens told syracuse.com in an interview. “We’re drawing from the public to set our baseline criteria for a new chief.”

The leading characteristics:

• Has a record of setting high standards and holding officers accountable
• Has a record of commitment to community, problem-solving, and policing
• Has a record of reducing crime and making neighborhoods safer
• Has experience working with diverse communities

This process deviated from the tradition of automatic internal promotion and engaged an open and transparent recruitment and selection process. It is the recommendation of this plan that future selections for SPD leadership positions use a similar process, to the extent permitted by New York State Civil Service Law.

What is your strategy to ensure that your department’s cultural-norms and informal processes reflect your formal rules and policies?

Policies alone cannot create change if those policies conflict with institutional culture. SPD leadership recognizes that it must take concrete steps to ensure the words set forth in policy permeate the Department’s culture. The Department uses a number of approaches to create a match between policy and action/culture including regular roll call training, informal coaching and counseling by front-line supervisors, and periodic reviews of body-worn camera footage for coaching purposes.

**Tracking and Reviewing Use of Force and Identifying Misconduct**

**When should officers be required to report use of force to their supervisor?**

The Department’s draft revised use of force policy released for public comment on October 15, 2020, addresses this issue directly. Specifically, Sections 300.4 and 300.11 of the draft provide the following:

300.4 DUTY TO INTERVENE AND REPORT

A. Any officer on the scene, who is in possession of all necessary facts, who observes another officer or supervisor using force that is not objectively reasonable shall intervene when safe and feasible. Any intervention by an officer must be reported to a supervisor, who must initiate an immediate investigation.

B. Any officer who observes another officer, including a supervisor, use force that is potentially

---

beyond that which is objectively reasonable or is against policy shall report the force to any supervisor and/or the Office of Professional Standards immediately.

300.11 REPORTING THE USE OF FORCE

A. All officers involved in a use of force incident shall immediately inform a supervisor of the event. Any use of force by an officer shall be documented promptly, completely, and accurately in an appropriate report prepared by a supervisor according to the Department’s Use of Force Reporting Procedures. The officer should articulate the factors perceived and why the officer believed the use of force was reasonable under the circumstances.

B. Upon notification of a use of force incident, a supervisor shall immediately respond to the scene and conduct an investigation as set forth in the Use of Force Reporting Procedures.

C. To collect data for purposes of training, resource allocation, analysis, and related purposes, the Department may require the completion of additional report forms, as specified in department policy, procedure, or law.

D. All officers involved in a use of force incident, investigating supervisors, evidence technicians collecting evidence of a use of force incident, and command personnel, where appropriate, shall comply with the Department’s Use of Force Reporting Procedures.

Additionally, the Department is in the process of revising the detailed Use of Force Reporting Procedures, which go into great detail regarding each officer’s role in reporting uses of force. Training will be provided on use of force, including reporting aspects, as the updated policy and procedures are rolled out in 2021.

Does your department use external, independent reviewers to examine uses of force or misconduct?

As discussed further below related to citizen oversight and other external accountability, Syracuse, unlike many other police departments, has a Citizen Review Board (CRB) as an independent reviewer of misconduct.

The CRB not only reviews complaints made directly to the CRB, but under Local Local Law 12-181, any complaint of misconduct directed to the Department is forwarded to the CRB for its independent review.

In its role as an “open citizen-controlled process for reviewing grievances involving members of the Syracuse police department,” the Syracuse CRB has the opportunity to present disciplinary recommendations to the Chief for his/her consideration during the process. See Syr. Local Law 12-181.
Additionally, the Onondaga County District Attorney's Office is a source of independent review for cases involving deadly force. In such cases, the matter is directly investigated by the Department's specialized Force Investigation Team (“FIT”), in conjunction with the Onondaga County District Attorney's Office. The results of every FIT investigation are presented to the DA's Office for determination whether presentment to a grand jury is appropriate.

Any internal investigation where there is the potential for criminal charges against an officer is forwarded to the District Attorney's Office for review.

**Does your department leverage Early Intervention Systems (EIS) to prevent problematic behavior?**

SPD utilizes professional standards tracking software in its Office of Professional Standards (OPS) that has early intervention functionality. Specifically, when an officer is involved with a certain number of complaints or uses of force, a flag is generated, and reported through the chain of command to determine if early intervention with the officer would be appropriate. OPS has begun using this functionality. Additionally, Chief Buckner is considering formalizing the use of Early Intervention Systems as part of the Department's efforts to obtain CALEA Accreditation.

**Does your department review “sentinel” or “near-miss” events? Does the department respond to questionable uses of force with non-punitive measures designed to improve officer performance?**

SPD uses its robust training program to improve officer responses to challenging scenarios, drawing on specific experiences within the Department. As part of its yearly in-service training, the training staff regularly incorporates lessons learned from the previous year in its curriculum. For example, when the Department had a series of deadly force encounters involving moving vehicles, it conducted a review and modification of its policy and incorporated the policy changes in their practical exercises.

**Internal Accountability for Misconduct**

**What does your department expect of officers who know of misconduct by another officer?**

SPD requires officers to report known observed misconduct. With respect to officers below the rank of Sergeant, the policy states: “Any member below the rank of police sergeant who is made aware of any complaint alleging member misconduct shall immediately notify their immediate supervisor, or if unavailable, a superior officer.” Volume 1, Article 4, Section 8.16. Officers at the rank of sergeant or above are required to address misconduct as part of their supervisory responsibilities.

With respect to potentially excessive use of force, officers are also expected to report such incidents to a supervisor or the Office of Professional Responsibility. This is set forth explicitly in the [draft revised use of force policy](#) released for public comment on October 15, 2020.

**300.4 DUTY TO INTERVENE AND REPORT**

A. Any officer on the scene, who is in possession of all necessary facts, who observes another
A. An officer or supervisor using force that is not objectively reasonable shall intervene when safe and feasible. Any intervention by an officer must be reported to a supervisor, who must initiate an immediate investigation.

B. Any officer who observes another officer, including a supervisor, use force that is potentially beyond that which is objectively reasonable or is against policy shall report the force to any supervisor and/or the Office of Professional Standards immediately.

Does your department have a clear and transparent process for investigating reports of misconduct?

The Department’s rules and regulations (Volume 1, Article 4, Section 8.16) mandate that certain serious and/or complex disciplinary matters, including citizen complaints, must be referred directly to OPS for investigation and report/recommendation to the Chief’s Office.

These expressly include:
• Complaints alleging criminal conduct by Department personnel;
• Complaints alleging civil rights violations;
• Complaints alleging sexual harassment by an officer against a member of the public;
• Complaints alleging excessive use of force;
• Complaints involving multiple officers of various commands;
• Allegations of a serious violation of Department policy, procedure or rules;
• Incidents in which a Use of Force Report is submitted, to determine if the use of force was justified.
• Investigations so complex that it would be impractical for supervisory personnel to undertake the task.

In the course of an OPS investigation, the assigned OPS investigator interviews witnesses and reviews any available evidence, including officers’ reports, body worn camera or surveillance video, 911 calls, booking videos, warrant applications. OPS prepares a written report and provides a recommendation as to whether the conduct is substantiated, unsubstantiated, or unfounded. Substantiated cases are forwarded to the Chief’s Office for review, together with a Disciplinary Action Report in cases where discipline is recommended.

Does your department respond to officer misconduct with appropriate disciplinary measures?

Yes. Once an investigation into misconduct or other rule violation is complete, final disciplinary decisions ultimately rest with the Chief of Police.

Following a formal disciplinary investigation that identifies a violation of a rule, policy or procedure requiring discipline, the investigating officer—either a supervisor or OPS employee—presents a finding to a Division Commander. The Division Commander overseeing the officer, the Bureau Chief and First Deputy Chief all recommend a level of discipline to the Chief. This process is documented on the Disciplinary Action Report. The Chief is free to accept or alter the recommendation. Once the Chief indicates his/her disciplinary decision, this information is transmitted to OPS to be implemented. OPS ensures the officer receives appropriate due process, including a Loudermill hearing. The Loudermill hearing allows
the officer an additional opportunity to articulate his/her position before the discipline is finally implemented. The final outcome is ultimately recorded on a document referred to as a Conduct Sheet.

What procedures are in place to ensure that substantiated complaints of misconduct and settlements or adverse verdicts in lawsuits are used to reduce the risk of future misconduct?

The Office of Legal Affairs is located in the Office of the Chief and is staffed with a Sergeant and Assistant Corporation Counsel. A primary function of this office is to monitor discipline and litigation, and ensure that any lessons learned from these incidents are translated into training and policy updates.

Does your department expect leaders and officers to uphold the department’s values and culture when off-duty?

Yes. This concept is introduced from the very start of a police officer's training, and is reflected in the Department’s General Rules of Conduct, as outlined below. Officers who are found to have engaged in conduct unbecoming an officer are investigated by the Office of Professional Standards and are subject to discipline. Officers have been suspended for off-duty conduct.

The Department will be introducing the use of Body Worn Cameras for officers working on off-duty employment, such as patrols at the Syracuse Airport. This will further help to ensure that the Department's values are upheld even when not on an officer’s primary employment with the Department.

GENERAL RULES OF CONDUCT:

A. Unbecoming Conduct
   1. Employees shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off-duty, in such a manner as to reflect the highest standards of the law enforcement profession.
   2. Employees shall so conduct themselves in both their private and public lives as to avoid bringing discredit upon the Department.
   3. Employees shall not engage in conduct on or off duty, which adversely affects the efficiency of the Department, or engage in conduct that has the tendency to impair public respect for the employee and/or the Department and/or impair confidence in the operation of the Department.
   4. Employees shall not participate in any incident involving moral turpitude in their personal and business affairs which impairs their ability to perform as employees of the Department or which causes the Department to be brought into disrepute.
   5. Any off duty employee involved in an incident in which a police investigation is initiated, regardless of jurisdiction, and in which the employee's involvement necessitates their being named in any police report, requires that the employee must notify the Duty Chief immediately of their off duty involvement in an incident. The employee may be required to submit a written report of their involvement as directed.
   6. Any employee of the Department assigned to investigate an incident in which an off duty employee is involved or concerned, shall immediately notify a supervisor. The supervisor, depending upon the seriousness of the incident, will either immediately respond to the scene or arrange to meet with the investigating officer to obtain all details. If necessary, the supervisor will notify a superior officer of the incident, and ensure that the incident is thoroughly investigated and documented, in accordance with current directives.
7. Reports regarding the involvement of an off duty employee will be submitted to the respective Bureau Chief, and a copy sent to the employee’s Division Commander.

**Citizen Oversight and Other External Accountability**

**Does or should your department have some form of civilian oversight over misconduct investigations or policy reform?**

Yes, the City of Syracuse funds and operates a civilian oversight board. Established in 1993, and overhauled in 2011, the Syracuse Common Council has jurisdictional oversight of the Syracuse Citizen Review Board (CRB.) **Syracuse Local Law 11** outlines the powers, duties and procedures of the CRB. Its defined purpose is as following:

>To establish a citizen review board to hear complaints regarding Syracuse police officers and the Syracuse police department, and which would maintain procedural due process safeguards to protect the rights of both police officers and individuals who come in contact with the Syracuse police department and its officers.

Mayor Walsh’s Police Reform Executive Order, Item #12, addressed the relationship between the Department and the CRB:

**Executive Order Action #12:** Improve Relations with the Citizens Review Board  
Continue to improve collaboration with the Syracuse Citizen Review Board (CRB) to ensure the flow of documents and information as embodied in Local Law No. 11. Further, commit to:

a. **Reviewing the disciplinary recommendations presented by the CRB prior to making a final determination of discipline of an officer; and**

b. **In cases where the Chief issues no discipline, or discipline that is lesser than is that recommended by the CRB, provide to the CRB a written explanation of the reason for such level of discipline or lack thereof.**

Since June 19, 2020 SPD and CRB representatives have held meetings to discuss how to operationalize this improved communication and have made marked progress. Further, Chief Buckner has made clear to the CRB in writing that he will not issue discipline prior to receiving a CRB recommendation so that he can fully consider that recommendation. The CRB hearing process has been temporarily suspended for the last several months due to the COVID-related closure of City buildings, but once CRB hearings resume, items 12(a) and (b) will be fully implemented.

**Is there an easy, accessible and well-publicized process for members of the public to report complaints about police misconduct?**

In order to ensure police accountability and make it easy for the public to provide feedback on
police behavior, the City provides multiple channels for citizens to register complaints about police conduct. Citizen complaints may come in through field interaction (i.e., a citizen complains to an officer or supervisor on the scene of the incident); in-person complaints to the Department; calls to 911 or the Department; or an online complaint form submitted through a designated web portal on the Department’s website. The Department maintains a standard form for recording citizen complaints. Citizens can also register their complaint directly with the Syracuse Citizen Review Board (CRB). In those instances, by local law and standard practice, the CRB forwards the complaint to OPS for investigation, who also conducts its own investigation.

**Are investigation outcomes reported to the complainant?**
The Chief of Police notifies a complainant that the investigation into their complaint is complete via letter. The specific outcome of the investigation is not reported, but any records of substantiated citizen complaints are now available to the public via the FOIL process.

The Department will evaluate this current process in 2021 and consider whether the standard post-complaint notification should be revised to include the result of the investigation.

**Are investigation outcomes reported to the public?**
The Department's Annual Report historically includes data on the activity of the Office of Professional Standards (OPS). Under Chief Buckner’s leadership, the data reported has expanded to include more detail about the nature of complaints. Moving forward, OPS will further expand its report to include more information, including the number and types of complaints received, the number of investigations completed and pending, the number of cases that result in discipline, and the level of discipline issued.

Additionally, following the repeal of New York State Civil Service Law Section 50-a, records of substantiated complaints are available to the public via the FOIL process.

**Should the department or the citizen complaint review entity, if any, accept anonymous complaints?**
SPD does accept and investigate anonymous complaints, although fully investigating such complaints can be challenging without the ability to interview the complainant.

**Does your local legislature engage in formal oversight of the police department? Should any changes be made in the legislature’s oversight powers or responsibilities?**
The Public Safety Committee of the Syracuse Common Council plays a role in oversight. Any legislation required by the Department, which includes any expenditures, is first reviewed by the Public Safety Committee, and then ultimately voted on by the entire Common Council. The Chief of Police maintains an open line of communication with the Chairperson of the Public Safety Committee.

Moving forward, in response to Right to Know legislation passed by the Common Council, the Department will make quarterly reports to the Common Council, as well as the Mayor and the public, summarizing consent searches and investigative encounters, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender and age of the involved citizen.

---
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Is your police department accredited by any external entity?
SPD has been accredited\(^\text{30}\) by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (NYS DCJS) since 1992. It is one of only 162 agencies in the state with this accreditation.

The Division of Criminal Justice Services Accreditation Program provides structure and guidance for police agencies to evaluate and improve overall performance in areas such as administration, training, and operational standards. The program encompasses four principal goals:

1. To increase the effectiveness and efficiency of law enforcement agencies utilizing existing personnel, equipment and facilities to the extent possible;
2. To promote increased cooperation and coordination among law enforcement agencies and other agencies that provide criminal justice services;
3. To ensure the appropriate training of law enforcement personnel; and
4. To promote public confidence in law enforcement agencies.”

In addition to accreditation through NYS DCJS, SPD is actively pursuing national accreditation through the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA\(^\text{31}\)). CALEA is the gold standard in accreditation for law enforcement agencies and is reserved for the limited number of agencies that comply with CALEA's rigorous set of accreditation standards. Advanced accreditation through CALEA requires compliance with more than 400 accreditation standards. Comparatively, NYS accreditation requires compliance with 111 standards. At the time of this writing, there are 11 CALEA accredited agencies in NYS.

CALEA\(^\text{31}\) accreditation provides agencies with the opportunity to meet an established set of professional standards, which require:

1. Comprehensive and uniform written directives that clearly define authority, performance, and responsibilities
2. Reports and analyses that enable fact-based and informed management decisions.
3. Preparedness to address natural or man-made critical incidents
4. Community relationship-building and maintenance
5. Independent review by subject matter experts
6. Continuous pursuit of excellence through annual reviews and other assessment measures

CALEA provides four accreditation programs: Law Enforcement, Communication, Training Academy and Campus Security. SPD is enrolled in the Law Enforcement accreditation program and is scheduled to complete the self-assessment phase no later than September 2023.

Additionally, the Syracuse Regional Police Academy is housed within the Syracuse Police Department.

---
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Steps are underway to relocate the academy from the public safety building to the Onondaga Community College campus. The academy will begin the CALEA Training Academy accreditation process in 2021.

Does your police department do an annual community survey to track levels of trust?
The President Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015) recommended: “Law enforcement agencies should track the level of trust in police by their communities just as they measure changes in crime. Annual community surveys, ideally standardized across jurisdictions and with accepted sampling protocols, can measure how policing in that community affects public trust.”

Contacts with Syracuse Police: Citizens’ Assessments (2020)
In 2019, the Syracuse Police Department contracted with the John F. Finn Institute for Public Safety to conduct a survey on residents of the City of Syracuse who had recent contacts with the police. The Finn Institute conducts social research on matters of public safety and security – crime, public disorder, and the management of criminal justice agencies and partnerships – in collaboration with municipal, county, state, and federal criminal justice agencies, and for their direct benefit.

The 2019 survey polled residents who had recent voluntary encounters with the police and evaluated their ratings of categories such as police legitimacy, satisfaction with their experience, perception of procedural justice, and treatment by the police officer.

The Finn Institute published a report in 2020 that summarized the findings of the survey. The responses to questions around some of the aforementioned themes were broken down by demographic categories such as race/ethnicity, age, and income.

2021 Community Survey on Public Safety and Policing
The City of Syracuse is currently exploring a partnership with the Syracuse University Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs XLab to launch a community survey on public safety and policing in 2021. The City’s Department of Neighborhood and Business Development, the Office of Accountability, Performance and Innovation, the Mayor’s Office, SPD, and various community partners will collaborate on the design and execution of the survey.

Data, Technology and Transparency
The Onondaga County Police Reform and Reimagination Collaborative Crime Analysis sub-committee reports the following:

The Central New York Crime Analysis Center (CNYCAC) is the law enforcement data hub in this community and is comprised of members from the Syracuse Police Department, the Onondaga County Sheriff’s Office, the New York State Police, the Onondaga County District Attorney’s Office, Syracuse University Department of Public Safety, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program (HIDTA) and the Finn Institute for Public Safety, in addition to numerous highly trained analysts that provides data-driven and intelligence-led policing efforts, as well as provides specific investigatory support for law enforcement in the counties of Onondaga, Oswego, and Madison.

In addition to New York State and local resources, the CNYCAC partnership engages assistance from
several federal law enforcement agencies to include ATF, DEA, FBI, US Probation and the United States Attorney’s Office.

To facilitate prosecutions, the Onondaga County District Attorney’s office and the United States Attorney have cross-designated assistant district attorneys to prosecute cases at the State and federal level.

New York State Department of Criminal Justice Services (NYSDCJS) provides funding, training, monitoring and support to the Central New York Crime Analysis Center, which connects with 13 regional Crime Analysis Centers throughout the New York state.

All of these centers provide investigative support and information to help police and prosecutors more effectively solve, reduce and prevent crime. Using data-driven processes approved by NYSDCJS, the Crime Analysis Center coordinates, expands, and enhances investigative services and provides real time investigative support to law enforcement agencies throughout Central New York.

What police incident and complaint data should be collected and shared with the public?

COMPSTAT Reports
The Syracuse Police Department distributes weekly Comparative Statistics (COMPSTAT) reports which are available to the public on the department’s website. In a weekly meeting of police command staff, divisional supervisors and other personnel, all parties review the data and discuss recent Part I criminal activity and proposed strategies to address the situation.

Right to Know
The Syracuse Right to Know Law, passed by the Common Council in 2020, requires the following quarterly reporting to the Mayor, Common Council and posting on the Department’s website:

Number of consent searches conducted during the preceding quarter disaggregated by the apparent race/ethnicity, gender, and age of the person searched; and the total number of instances where an officer sought to obtain a consent to search but did not obtain consent to search during the preceding quarter disaggregated by the apparent race/ethnicity, gender, and age of the person from whom such consent was sought.

Number of level one, two and three Investigative encounters conducted by officers for the previous quarter, disaggregated by precinct and further disaggregated by:

1. The apparent race/ethnicity, gender, and age of the person involved;
2. The number of persons from whom an officer requested consent to search, further disaggregated by whether consent was granted or declined;
3. The number of investigative encounters that escalated to a level three encounter;
4. The number of persons arrested or issued a criminal or civil summons;
5. The factors leading to the investigative encounter; and
6. Whether a use of force incident occurred in connection with the encounter.

The Department continues the work of constructing the forms, data collection systems, processes, policies and training that align with the law's requirements in order to be able to produce these reports in 2021.

**SPD Annual Reports**

SPD issues an annual report that summarizes the work of the Department each year. In the next annual report, which is scheduled for release in January 2022, data from the Office of Professional Standards will be expanded.

Additionally, the Department will begin including statistics on the Department's uses of force.

**How should your law enforcement agency leverage data to drive policing strategies?**

As indicated under the policing strategy discussion above, the Department works closely with the Central New York Crime Analysis Center (CNYCAC) to use crime data to inform its policing strategy and resource deployment on a regular basis. This data drives the Department's problem-oriented policing (POP) strategy.

**How can your police department demonstrate a commitment to transparency in its interactions with the public?**

The NYS Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative guidance recommends that police departments adopt policies requiring officers to identify themselves by their full name, employee identification number. Guidance further recommends the information be provided in writing to individuals they have stopped.

The recently passed Right to Know legislation requires that officers are equipped with and distribute a business card providing the recommended information in each citizen encounter. The reverse side of the card also provides instructions on how to file a complaint. This requirement will be fully operationalized by January 31, 2021, at which time officers will be equipped with business cards for distribution.

**How can your police department make its policies and procedures more transparent?**

“A lack of transparency hurts our department.” - **Chief Kenton Bucker.**

The Syracuse Police Department is committed to creating a culture of transparency. In line with this philosophy, Mayor Walsh issued two transparency related Actions Items in his [Executive Order on Syracuse Police Reform](#):

**Action No. 8** requires the Department to make its policies publicly available on the SPD website. Several draft policies have already been posted for public review, including Use of Force and Body Worn Cameras. The Department is in the process of conducting a comprehensive review of all of its policies and will publish them as the review is complete throughout 2021.

**Action No. 7** required the Department to publicize the labor contract with the Syracuse Police
How can your police department ensure adequate transparency in its use of automated systems and “high-risk” technologies?

SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY

On December 1, 2020, Mayor Walsh signed a Surveillance Technology Executive Order regarding the use of Surveillance Technology in City government, including SPD. This action responded directly to one of the demands of The People’s Agenda for Police Reform, which called for public oversight of surveillance technologies.

The Surveillance Technology Executive Order enacts policies and procedures for oversight on procurement and ensures surveillance tools are implemented in a safe and well-governed way.

The executive order directs the administration to immediately begin implementation of a six-page Surveillance Technology policy. The document was developed in the second half of 2020 under the guidance of the City’s Office of Accountability Performance and Innovation with input from multiple department heads and city staff representatives.

The policy references the use of surveillance technologies for applications such as infrastructure monitoring, public safety and criminal investigations. It defines surveillance technologies as those tools that “observe or analyze the movements, behavior or actions of identifiable individuals in a manner that is reasonably likely to raise concerns about civil liberties, freedom of speech or association, racial equity or social justice.”

The Surveillance Technology plan establishes a framework for determining if technologies being considered by City departments meet the standard of surveillance. The Mayor will appoint a working group composed of city staff and external stakeholders to review proposals by City departments to use data collection technology. External stakeholders will come from local organizations in social justice, technology, and community engagement, as well as research institutions and partnerships.

Based on working group review, proposals that meet the definition of surveillance technology will be referred to public comment which will include public notification, a two-week online comment period and review at a minimum of one Common Council committee meeting. Based on public comment and recommendations by the internal and external working group, the Mayor will determine if the technology is implemented, subject to Common Council approval as required by the City Charter. The Surveillance Technology plan also includes mandated standards for data collection, storage, analysis, modeling and deployment. It outlines key considerations regarding informed consent; data security and retention; privacy of personally identifiable information and steps to identify and prevent unintended use of information collected.

Use of Unmanned Aerial Systems

Mayor Walsh EO Action #7 - https://www.syracusepolice.org/listing.asp?orgId=332
The Department maintains a policy that establishes guidelines for the use of unmanned aerial systems (UAS), including the storage and retrieval and dissemination of images and data captured by the UAS. This is a recently updated policy that incorporates industry best practices. It requires that UAS be used in “strict accordance with constitutional and privacy rights and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations.”

With respect to privacy issues, the policy provides:

“The use of the UAS potentially involves privacy considerations. Absent a warrant or exigent circumstances, operators and observers shall adhere to FAA altitude regulations and shall not intentionally record or transmit images of any location where a person would have a reasonable expectation of privacy (e.g., residence, yard, enclosure). Operators and observers shall take reasonable precautions to avoid inadvertently recording or transmitting images of areas where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy. Reasonable precautions can include, for example, deactivating or turning imaging devices away from such areas or persons during UAS operation.”

Further, the policy explicitly bans the use of UAS video surveillance equipment from the following uses:

• “To conduct random surveillance activities.
• To target a person based solely on actual or perceived characteristics such as race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, economic status, age, cultural group, or disability.
• To harass, intimidate, or discriminate against any individual or group.
• To conduct personal business of any type.”

The policy also makes clear that “the UAS shall not be weaponized.”

**Should your police department leverage video cameras to ensure law enforcement accountability and increase transparency?**

The Syracuse community has clearly expressed the desire for body-worn and dash cameras to be employed to ensure accountability.

Mayor Walsh’s Syracuse Police Reform Executive Order, Action No. #4 called for SPD to complete its work of obtaining more body-worn cameras, resulting in all uniformed officers who are on patrol or respond to resident calls being equipped with a body-worn camera. On July 13, 2020, the Common Council approved revised legislation to ensure compliance with a grant award from the U.S. Department of Justice for the procurement of body-worn cameras for use by SPD officers. By the end of 2020, the Department had completed the procurement, training and deployment of all 220 body worn cameras, outfitting every uniformed officer assigned to the patrol unit.

New and fully deployed cameras require an update to our existing body worn camera policy which instructs officers in their use. In compliance with Mayor Walsh’s Syracuse Police Reform Executive Order, Action No. 3, a [draft revision of the existing policy](#) was developed and is available to the
Developing a new policy and equipping a body worn camera program requires additional technology and staffing. The Department will assess future needs of the program to ensure its success. The Department currently has less than a dozen patrol dash-cameras, a critical gap in the support of the Department and assurance of transparency to the public. In response, Mayor Walsh’s Syracuse Police Reform Executive Order, Action No. 5 directed the Department to “develop and implement a plan to deploy dashboard cameras on all SPD marked vehicles.” A progress report of this effort can be found here. The Department will continue to pursue funding for this project.

An additional video tool used by the Syracuse Police Department are the 519 COPS cameras deployed in neighborhoods throughout the city. Launched in 2011, with the installation of 3 cameras, the program has grown exponentially. Cameras footage is used to document incidents ranging from car accidents to homicides. Currently the process for acquisition of these cameras is initiated by requests of our residents to their prospective state representatives who identify resources for purchase of cameras for designated locations.

Recruiting and Supporting Excellent Personnel

Recruiting a Diverse Workforce
Does your agency reflect the diversity of the community it serves? How can you encourage youth in your community to pursue careers in law enforcement?

“Diversity done the right way is a slow, incremental and heavy lift; it’s an effort we must attend to every day with patience.” -- Chief Kenton Buckner

The Department does not currently reflect our community’s diversity, but getting closer to this goal is a top priority for the City.

By way of background, the most recent 5-year estimate from the American Community Survey indicates that Black citizens comprise 26.56% of the City’s labor force (see United States Census Bureau, 2018 American Community Survey, Table S2301) and female citizens comprise 51.97% of the City’s labor force (see United States Census Bureau, 2018 American Community Survey, Table S2301).

As of January 2, 2021, the Department was comprised of 396 sworn police officers. Of the total officers, 65 were female and 37 identified as Black. The percentages as of June 1, 2020 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Officers</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.13%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenants</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captains</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognizing the critical importance of building a more diverse force, two of the items in Mayor Walsh’s Executive Order on Syracuse Police Reform reinforced the need to increase the diversity of the force.

First, Action No. 14 directed the Department to “continue to review and upgrade the Department’s recruitment, screening and hiring practices, with an aim to increase the diversity of the department’s membership.” There are multiple projects that have been completed or are in progress related to improvements in minority recruitment.

**Cadet Program with Fowler-PLSA**

Mayor Walsh recently announced a SPD Cadet Program in partnership with CNY Works. The purpose of the program is to establish a steady stream of qualified police candidates from city residents. This will be a program and/or job that will last no more than four years per candidate. It is designed to act as a bridge between graduating high school and becoming a police officer. Eligibility for appointment as a police officer begins when candidates reach their 20th birthday. During this program the cadet will perform functions that are designed to help them prepare to be police officers and to work within the Department, on a part-time or full-time basis.

The program will consist of 1058 hours of classroom training. There will be five hours of physical fitness training weekly, ride alongs with officers and detectives, and training activities designed to help pass the civil service test for police officer. Cadets will also receive training on the Department’s rules and regulations, implicit bias, and financial management.

Work duties may include:
- Providing technical assistance to the public at the front desk and or over the telephone
- Preparing and processing a variety of reports, forms, applications and permits
- Transporting police vehicles for service
• Assisting sworn and non-sworn employees in different divisions and sections on a rotational basis to give the cadet as broad an experience as is practical in each facet of the police services.

Candidates will be limited to residents of the City of Syracuse, and preference will be given to candidates that have graduated from PSLA Fowler’s Law Enforcement/ Emergency Management Pathway in which students learn the tactics, theory, and skills required for today’s law enforcement professional, including training in DNA analysis, surveillance expertise and white-collar crime. Preference will also be given to candidates who can speak, read, and write in one of the many foreign languages spoken by the communities that make-up Syracuse.

To maximize the likelihood that cadets make the intended transition to a position, they will be required to take every available civil service test offered for the position of police officer until they have passed and are placed on the eligible civil service list for the position of Police Officer.

**Partnership with Department of Justice's Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services**

The Department is currently working with [CRI-TAC, Collaborative Reform Initiative Technical Assistance Center](https://www.theiacp.org/projects/collaborative-reform-initiative-technical-assistance-center-cri-tac), in partnership with the Department of Justice’s Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services, which provides technical assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies throughout the United States. These services are delivered at no cost to the requesting agency.

The Syracuse Police Department contacted CRI-TAC in September of 2019, requesting technical assistance with our recruitment, hiring and retention programs. CRI-TAC provided the Department with its first technical assistance plan, which included sending Lt. Julie Shulsky and Sgt. Jason Tom to a recruitment, hiring and retention workshop in Bristol, Rhode Island in January of 2020.

After the January 2020 workshop, SPD requested a full assessment of our current recruitment, hiring and retention programs from CRI-TAC. However, the full assessment was delayed due to several reasons including the COVID-19 pandemic.

In January of 2021, CRI-TAC sent subject matter expert, retired Police Chief Patrick Oliver, to SPD for the full assessment. CRI-TAC develops solutions specifically tailored to each agency, which enables Department members to play an active role in the problem-solving process. Chief Oliver spent two days speaking with various members of the Department, civil service and community members during his assessment. Upon the completion of Chief Oliver’s assessment, CRI-TAC will provide the Department with best practices and recommendations to improve our current recruitment, hiring and retention practices.

**Expansion of Recruitment Section**

In March of 2020, the Recruitment Section expanded its recruitment team to include a larger and more diverse group of officers. Members of the recruitment team attend local cultural community events to educate minority groups about the opportunity to become a Syracuse Police Officer. Our...
team members also participate in local college career fairs to reach a diverse group of students. We are also working with Fort Drum to identify soldiers who will be exiting the military and are interested in transitioning to a career in law enforcement. The Syracuse Police Department has also partnered with the NAACP and La Liga to further explore interest from their constituents regarding becoming a Syracuse Police Officer. The Department is also actively seeking community recruiters, who will act as liaisons between potential candidates from the community and the Syracuse Police Department.

The recruitment section is also working with Access VR to participate in virtual meetings with high school seniors to educate them on the process and requirements of becoming a police officer.

**Continued Efforts to Obtain A Resident Requirement for Police Officers**

The Department believes that requiring residency for new officers will not only improve trust and understanding between the public and police officers, but will also lead to a more diverse workforce that reflects the diversity of the community. Currently, state law prohibits a residency mandate such that it can only be achieved through an agreement with the police labor union (i.e., the PBA).

To that end, Mayor Walsh will continue to pursue a residency requirement as part of the interest arbitration process that will lead to a labor contract.

On a parallel track, the City is working with its state legislative delegation to change state legislation so that the City would be permitted to mandate residency without the need for union agreement.

**Community Interview Panel**

The hiring of Police Chief Kenton Buckner incorporated the feedback of the entire community, and included an interview panel consisting of community partners. Similarly, in 2021, the Department will create a Community Interview Panel as part of the process of selecting and hiring candidates for the position of entry-level police officers.

Second, the Executive Order’s Action No. 10 directed the City to “continue to actively oppose any legal attempt to dissolve or otherwise eliminate the judicial consent decree which continues to be a critically necessary tool to improve the diversity of our police department.”

The City has been operating under a Consent Decree issued in *United States v. City of Syracuse, et al.*, Civil Act. No. 5:80-cv-00053-DNH and *Lee Alexander v. Victor S. Bahou, et al.*, Civil Act. No. 5:78-cv-00392. The Consent Decree was entered by the Honorable Howard G. Munson on March 27, 1980 with the intent to, *inter alia*, provide the City of Syracuse certain judicially-authorized tools to increase the numbers of minority police officers and firefighters employed by the City in proportions matching the demographics of the City labor force. Under the authority of the Consent Decree, over the last forty years, the City has been regularly using the Consent Decree to employ minority preferences in its police officer and firefighter hiring processes. On January 12, 2021, in response to a request by the U.S. Department of Justice to dissolve the Consent Decree, the Honorable David Hurd, United States District Court, Northern District, issued a decision and order modifying the decree. The modified decree permits the City to continue using certain hiring preferences, albeit with less flexibility. The City is re-evaluating its methods of applying hiring preferences, but is committed to continuing preferences in a
way that maximizes opportunity for minority candidates, but that also ensures compliance with all state and federal civil rights laws.

**What actions can your agency take to foster the continued development and retention of diverse officers?**

Robust efforts to *attract and hire* diverse candidates is not enough to establish a diverse police force in the long term. Attention must also be given to the *retention, development and advancement* of diverse officers. Chief Buckner has embraced the need to develop diverse leaders in the Department, and has connected multiple officers to the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE). NOBLE provides mentoring, training and networking to Black and Brown law enforcement professionals. Likewise, two Black civilian employees will be enrolled in the National Forum for Black Public Administrators.

Also, the partnership with CRI-TAC, described above, is not only analyzing and making recommendations about recruitment, but also retention and development.

**Training and Continuing Education**

The Department’s status as a NYS accredited agency requires it to maintain certain training standards. The Department strives to exceed the minimum training standards each year. These standards include 21 hours of in-service training. Topics that must be covered include: use of force, legal updates, firearms training and defensive tactics.

A commitment to education and proper training of our officers needs to be made in order to enhance performance. Increased training in use of force (defensive tactics, firearms and less lethal options) will lead to better decisions being made under stress. Training builds confidence and competency and helps to mitigate the effects of stress. An officer who is well trained and confident in their ability to employ a firearm will be less likely to implement that tool early or when it is unreasonable. In regards to defensive tactics, an officer who possesses a high level of understanding of control techniques is more likely to utilize those techniques instead of defaulting to hard hand strikes. The Department is working towards training programs to include increased defensive tactics training and reality and scenario-based training. The use of scenario-based training and reality-based training allows officers to apply tactics and techniques learned, which helps officers navigate and de-escalate a potentially hostile situation. Additionally, the Department is researching options for virtual reality training systems.

Providing our officers with cultural diversity and cultural competency training will help identify and correct any potential implicit bias. Addressing these potential biases can help foster a better understanding of different cultures and avoid or reduce potential bias. Increased training will lead to more consistency in application of investigations, stops, use of force, etc. A better trained department will be more consistent with the people it serves.

---

36 NOBLE Website - https://noblenational.org/
37 NFBPA Website - https://www.nfbpa.org/home
In order to help officers more effectively and safely respond to individuals experiencing mental health crises or struggling with substance abuse, the Syracuse Police Department is currently working towards getting 20% of its officers certified in Crisis Intervention Training. By providing officers with CIT, officers will be better prepared when responding to situations with individuals in crisis.

The efficacy of the Department's training programs is measured through testing, minimum qualification requirements, performance evaluations and report reviews.

**How can you develop officer training programs that reflect your community values and build trust between police officers and the communities they serve?**

One of the Department’s 2020 training goals was to provide our officers with cultural competency training. The Department had enlisted Dr. Robert Strauss, who is a subject matter expert in intercultural communication. Dr. Strauss was scheduled to educate our officers on cultural diversity and cultural competency. Unfortunately, due to budget restrictions, the Department was unable to accomplish this training. As we progress into 2021, the Department’s intention is to proceed with cultural diversity and cultural competency training. Moving forward with this training is dependent on budget approval.

In addition, training programs that include a civilian academy, community trainings and community dialogues will build stronger connections with community members. These training programs allow citizens to better understand the function and duties of police officers and to build relationships with members of the Department. These types of programs, which require in-person interaction, have been paused due to COVID-19 restrictions, but will be re-implemented when feasible.

**How can leadership training improve community policing and strengthen relationships between your police department and members of the public?**

The Department recognizes the importance of high quality leadership training offered by industry leaders in order to stay abreast of the best practices in community policing and community engagement, among other topics. Outside training ensures the Department keeps pace with the evolving landscape of law enforcement.

Beginning in 2019, under Chief Buckner, the Department re-instituted a practice of providing outside training for its leaders and future leaders. For example, SPD leaders have attended the FBI National Academy and International Association of Chiefs of Police Conference. Looking ahead, the Department is exploring the option of sending leaders to the Senior Management Institute for Police through the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF.)

**How can your police department use its training programs to avoid potential bias incidents and build stronger connections with communities of color and vulnerable populations?**

Mayor Walsh’s Syracuse Police Reform Executive Order, Action No. 13, directed the Department to:

“Develop and deliver training on the history of racism in Syracuse and the United States, both in the police academy and during in-service training, such that 100% of the membership of SPD receives this training. Additionally, deliver department-wide training in cultural competency for law enforcement.”
Implicit bias describes the automatic association people make between groups of people and stereotypes about those groups. Under certain conditions, those automatic associations can influence behavior—making people respond in biased ways even when they are not explicitly prejudiced.

The President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing offered the following examination on the importance and understanding of bias:

“All human beings have biases or prejudices as a result of their experiences, and these biases influence how they might react when dealing with unfamiliar people or situations. An explicit bias is a conscious bias about certain populations based upon race, gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, or other attributes. Common sense shows that explicit bias is incredibly damaging to police-community relations, and there is a growing body of research evidence that shows that implicit bias—the biases people are not even aware they have—is harmful as well.”

The dilemma associated with implicit bias is that it is linked to human behavior. Implicit bias training should be embedded in all levels of training on a recurring basis. In order to effectively address this issue it must be acknowledged and managed.

The President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing recommends that police agencies provide recruit training and in-service training on implicit bias and cultural responsiveness. It further states that research shows that individuals who are made aware of their implicit biases are motivated to implement unbiased behaviors.

The Department believes that training on cultural competency and on the history of racism will create greater awareness of this implicit bias, and give officers the tools to remove any bias from their interactions with the public. Moving forward, implicit bias will be taught even before an individual becomes an officer, by embedding this training requirement in the Department’s newly announced Cadet Program. Thus, implicit bias will be taught throughout the entirety of an officer’s career--from cadet to training academy to annual in-service.

The customized training on the history of racism in Syracuse, directed by the Mayor’s Executive Order, merits special emphasis. Equipping officers--some of whom know very little about Syracuse’s unique history--with information about how Black and Brown communities were historically treated in our community will provide a better foundation for understanding, which will help remove barriers between officers and the Black and Brown communities.

---

How can your training program help officers effectively and safely respond to individuals experiencing mental health crises or struggling with substance abuse?
As discussed elsewhere in this plan, the City is partnering with AccessCNY to continue to provide Crisis Intervention Training. In addition, the City held a meeting with AccessCNY, where it was requested that a truncated session be offered to police officers with less than five years on the job that focuses on de-escalation, knowledge of mental health conditions and information on community-based resources. The Department will continue to work with AccessCNY on developing the appropriate curriculum.

What practices and procedures can you put in place to measure the quality and efficacy of your police department's training programs?
The Syracuse Police Training Academy will apply for CALEA Accreditation in the summer or fall of 2021. This national accreditation process will ensure that the Department implements best practices in all aspects of its training program, including procedures to measure the quality and efficacy of the training programs.

Support Officer Wellness and Well-being
Police officers in their profession have the stark reality of seeing human beings at the worst times of their life and in varying levels of crisis. At any moment during their shift, officers can be involved in highly stressful encounters ranging from a substance induced individual or an armed suspect or horrible tragedies that afflict our community’s most vulnerable members. This requires police officers to be constantly vigilant and in a delayed state of stress, which can have long-term effects on their well-being.

Unfortunately too many officers avoid seeking assistance due to the perceived stigma, which include the perception of being seen as weak and fear of negative impact to career advancement as well as privacy concerns despite confidentiality policies and procedures.

It is important to note that approximately 25% of the SPD workforce occupy civilian roles. Their daily responsibilities do not entail the duties of sworn officers, however they work for an organization under intense scrutiny and are constantly engaged in emergency situations. They too endure the
stressors of the department's work and should be remembered in all wellness and well-being efforts.

What steps can you take to promote wellness and well-being within your department?
The Department has recently taken steps to create an officer wellness program. In December of 2020, Police Officer Anne Clark was selected as the Department’s Wellness Officer. The Department also purchased the new Officer Wellness app, Cordico Shield. The app is extremely beneficial to help promote wellness within the Department. To effectively and proactively address the mental health challenges experienced by officers, we need to continuously educate and have conversations about mental health and wellness along with providing skills and resources. This needs to occur starting at the academy level, to in-service training and through retirement. The wellness app provides many resources to Department members 24/7.

The Department created internal advisory committees for sworn and non-sworn personnel to give the members an opportunity for direct communication with the Chief. In these meetings, members can raise issues of concern or clarify information that has been passed down through the chain of command. Creating a direct line of communication between members, the Chief and command leadership help create understanding of the needs of members.

How can you address the well-being of an officer after a traumatic event?
Traumatic events whether singular or recurring, affect everyone differently. Some individuals may clearly display PTSD related behaviors, while many individuals exhibit more adaptive responses. The impact of trauma depends on many factors, including individual characteristics, circumstances related to the event(s) and social/cultural factors. Violence and related trauma affect our community collectively; police officers are no exception.

After a critical incident, the Department’s peer support team is notified, and holds peer-led debriefings. Trained mental health professionals are invited, and officers can share their feelings without risk of judgment in a secure setting. The debriefings also allow the officers an opportunity to be connected to more resources.

Specifically after an officer-involved shooting, the involved officers meet with a licensed mental health provider for a psychological fitness for duty screen, and if necessary, referred for additional mental health services. Additionally, the officers meet with the training staff to undergo a battery of reality based training scenarios so the officer can be evaluated and can raise any questions or concerns they have about how the incident unfolded in a non-punitive, non-threatening environment.

Looking forward, in-service training will be provided to command officers to educate them on how to deal with officers experiencing stress or who reach out for assistance.
## Moving Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed/Ongoing</th>
<th>What's Next?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Transparency and Accountability** | • Fully Implement RTK, including Reporting  
• Evaluate process for communicating investigation results to complaints  
• Expand OPS annual reporting  
• Publish SPD Policies online  
• Further pursue dash cameras  
• Create and publish annual report on use of force  
• Update the Performance Evaluation Policy and Practice |
| • Surveillance Technology Review Process  
• Body Worn Camera Deployment  
• Improved Relationship and Collaboration with the CRB  
• Publication of Police Contracts  
• Compliant with the Repeal of Civil Rights Law, Sec. 50-a; requests for police personnel and discipline files are being actively fulfilled  
• Created Office of Public Affairs  
• Increased Staffing of Internal Affairs (Office of Professional Standards)  
• Relocated Office of Professional Standards |
| **Community Engagement** | • Create youth advisory council  
• Create Police Athletic League (PAL) Chapter  
• Research Voiance app (translation)  
• Develop and host New American citizen’s academy  
• Conduct Cultural competency training  
• Create a Community Panel as part of the police hiring process |
| • Hired SPD Director of Community Engagement  
• Created Citizen Advisory Committees for Each Police District  
• Upgraded Use of Social Media for Transparency |
| **Policies and Procedures** | • Finalize, Train and Implement Use of Force Policy  
• Finalize, Train and Implement BWC Policy  
• Complete comprehensive review of all SPD policies |
| • Released Draft Revised Use of Force Policy  
• Released Draft Revised Body Worn Camera Policy  
• Revised No-Knock Warrant Procedure  
• Inventory of Military Equipment; Policy for future use and procurement  
• Added Attorney to the Chief’s Office of Legal Affairs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Completed/Ongoing</strong></th>
<th><strong>What’s Next?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Training & Wellness** | • Created Internal Advisory Committees (Sworn and Non-Sworn)  
• Applied for CALEA Law Enforcement Accreditation | • Complete CALEA Law Enforcement Accreditation  
• Begin CALEA Training Academy Accreditation Process  
• Training academy move to OCC  
• Finish the creation of an Officer Wellness Program |
| **Diversity in Hiring and Advancement** | • Enrolled officers and administrators in national peer organizations for Black Law Enforcement Executives and Administrators (NOBLE and NFBPA)  
• Successfully Opposed DOJ Motion to Dissolve Consent Decree | • Implement the Cadet program  
• CRI-TAC - Review assessment, implement suggestions for recruitment and retention  
• Offer Leadership Training - PERF  
• Obtain Residency Requirement  
• Create and implement new diversity hiring criteria compliant with modified Consent Decree |
| **Alternatives to Policing** | • Researched and documented models for alternatives to policing | • Partner with SCSD to create a new school safety model  
• Utilize the Participatory Budgeting tool, Balancing Act, during the upcoming budget planning season |
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EXECUTIVE ORDER
SYRACUSE POLICE REFORM
EFFECTIVE JUNE 19, 2020

WHEREAS, the killing of George Floyd, and the subsequent outpouring of grief and concern over police conduct nationwide has led to calls from the Syracuse community for immediate police reform; and

WHEREAS, improving police-community relations and updating key policies to reflect best practices in 21st century policing has been a priority of my administration since taking office; and

WHEREAS, under the leadership of Chief Kenton Buckner, Syracuse has already taken important steps in police reform, including but not limited to the expansion of body worn cameras and the implementation of a new body worn camera policy; the issuance of a revised use of force policy in July 2019; the restructuring and relocating of the department’s internal affairs function; enhanced focus on diversity recruitment; and the creation of citizen advisory committees; and

WHEREAS, the Syracuse Common Council has indicated its desire for police reform, and will consider legislation that seeks greater police transparency, which will complement the steps to be taken below; and

WHEREAS, I support the police reforms already passed this month by New York State, including the repeal of Civil Rights Law Sec. 50-a; and

WHEREAS, I recognize the dedication of the members of the Syracuse Police Department, and intend the steps outlined below to better equip officers with the training and policies they need to enhance their ability to protect and serve all members of the Syracuse community equally, and to build the community’s trust in our officers; and

WHEREAS, in response to the concerns of the Syracuse community, more action on police reform is urgent, necessary and appropriate; and

WHEREAS, I will engage in a robust community dialogue to further explore and consider areas for reform and improvement over the coming months beyond those set forth below, culminating in a plan and report in the spirit of and in compliance with Governor Cuomo’s Executive Order No. 203, New York State Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative;

GROWTH. DIVERSITY. OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL.
NOW, THEREFORE, as Mayor of the City of Syracuse, by the authority vested in me by the City Charter and applicable laws, and in consultation with the Chief of Police, I hereby direct the following actions as soon as practicable:

1. Review, revise and amend the policies and procedures of the Syracuse Police Department (SPD) to ensure the principles embodied in the New York City Right to Know Act are incorporated into the department’s policies and procedures, including but not limited to self-identification to citizens, provision of written identification to citizens, obtaining consent to searches, recording consent and making the record of the consent available to the subject of the search. This will be done in conjunction with legislative action by the Syracuse Common Council, which will seek to codify the Right to Know principles related to the reporting of investigative encounters.

2. Revise SPD’s 2019 use of force policy to ensure that it is compliant with recent changes in New York State law, and fully consider any policy changes requested by the Syracuse community.

3. Revise SPD’s current body worn camera policy to ensure that officers record the entirety of their presence on the scene of a police encounter.

4. Complete the department’s efforts to obtain additional body worn cameras so that all uniformed officers assigned to patrol or who otherwise respond to citizen calls will be equipped with cameras.

5. Develop and implement a plan to deploy dashboard cameras on all SPD marked vehicles.

6. Conduct a complete inventory of all equipment acquired through military surplus programs that are in possession of the SPD; establish policies and procedures regarding the use of such equipment; and establish parameters for future procurement of such equipment.

7. Post on the City of Syracuse and/or SPD’s website:
   a. The collection of documents that together comprise the most recent collective bargaining agreement with the Syracuse Police Benevolent Association (PBA); and
   b. A comprehensive summary of that collection of documents, which my administration prepared and presented to the PBA for review and acceptance in 2019; and
   c. The Tentative Agreement reached with the PBA in November 2019, which has not been approved, and which is now the subject of the impasse resolution process set forth in the New York State Taylor Law.

8. Make SPD policies publicly available on the SPD website.

9. Develop a process to ensure legal compliance with New York State’s repeal of Civil Rights Law Sec. 50-a and related amendments to the Freedom of Information Law, which require the city to disclose copies of certain police personnel records upon request.

10. Continue to actively oppose any legal attempt to dissolve or otherwise eliminate the judicial consent decree which continues to be a critically necessary tool to improve the diversity of our police department.

GROWTH. DIVERSITY. OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL.
11. Review the department’s procedure and approval process regarding the application of search warrants that seeks a “no-knock” provision from a court to ensure compliance with Constitutional standards.

12. Continue to improve collaboration with the Syracuse Citizen Review Board (CRB) to ensure the flow of documents and information as embodied in Local Law No. 11. Further, commit to:
   a. Reviewing the disciplinary recommendations presented by the CRB prior to making a final determination of discipline of an officer; and
   b. In cases where the Chief issues no discipline, or discipline that is lesser than is that recommended by the CRB, provide to the CRB a written explanation of the reason for such level of discipline or lack thereof.

13. Develop and deliver training on the history of racism in Syracuse and the United States, both in the police academy and during in-service training, such that 100% of the membership of SPD receives this training. Additionally, deliver department-wide training in cultural competency for law enforcement.

14. Continue to review and upgrade the department’s recruitment, screening and hiring practices, with an aim to increase the diversity of the department’s membership.

15. Research and consider innovative, community-based strategies for responding to non-criminal calls, with a goal of shifting the paradigm from primary police response, to response by non-police professionals in relevant fields.

16. Develop and implement, in coordination with the Syracuse City School District, a new model for school safety and security.

Given under my hand and the Seal of the City of Syracuse this nineteenth day of June in the year two thousand twenty.

BY THE MAYOR

Benjamin R. Walsh, Mayor

ATTEST:

John P. Copanas, City Clerk

Dated: June 19, 2020
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EXECUTIVE ORDER

DIRECTING ALL CITY DEPARTMENTS TO ADOPT THE ATTACHED POLICY IN REGARDS TO THE USE OF SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1, 2020

WHEREAS, as our Nation adopts ever increasing technology, the benefits of such new technology need to be weighed against the risks, especially in regards to privacy concerns;

WHEREAS, all citizens have right to be aware of and have input on the technology adopted and used by their local government;

WHEREAS, community members have expressed concern about potential risks of the use of surveillance technology by government, and have called on elected officials to ensure effective oversight of the use of this technology;

WHEREAS, on July, 16, 2020, the Walsh Administration committed to issue a Surveillance Technology Executive Order by December 1, 2020;

WHEREAS, the Walsh administration intends that this Executive Order will implement a policy and process to ensure that any proposed surveillance technology travels through a comprehensive evaluation process which considers public input;

NOW, THEREFORE, as Mayor the City of Syracuse, by the authority vested in me by the City Charter and applicable laws, I hereby direct the all City executive departments to adopt and follow the surveillance policy attached hereto.

GIVEN under my hand and the Seal of the City of Syracuse this first day of December in the year two thousand twenty.

BY THE MAYOR

[Signature]

Benjamin R. Walsh, Mayor

Dated: December 1, 2020

ATTEST:

[Signature]

John P. Copanas, City Clerk

Office of the Mayor
233 E. Washington St.
201 City Hall
Syracuse, N.Y. 13202

Office 315 448 8005
Fax 315 448 8067

www.syrgov.net
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Surveillance Technologies

**Goal:** To create and support a scalable process allowing for citizens through their representatives to have a say in technologies that surveil the city and to ensure those technologies are implemented in a safe and well governed way.

Using data to help inform decisions in government can build efficiencies where needed and ensure projects are delivering productive outcomes for the public. Appropriate levels of oversight related to specific types of data collection and analysis are needed to ensure the privacy of community members is considered and protected, bias in automated decision making is minimized, and transparency in the use of these technologies and analytics tools is present.

Surveillance technologies are defined by the city of Syracuse as those that “observe or analyze the movements, behavior, or actions of identifiable individuals in a manner that is reasonably likely to raise concerns about civil liberties, freedom of speech or association, racial equity or social justice.” In many cases, these types of technologies are effective tools and can be used in criminal investigations, other public safety applications, or monitoring of infrastructure systems.

In order to ensure transparency, equity, and public participation around the procurement and use of these technologies, the following process is put into place for surveillance technologies going forward.

**Development of Working Group**

The working group will consist of 7 - 10 individuals responsible for maintenance of a surveillance technology inventory and the evaluation of technologies as they go through the surveillance technology process. The goal of the group will be to ensure due diligence is done on all technologies fitting the surveillance characteristics so thorough and valid recommendations can be given to the final decision maker on how any given technology will impact the City of Syracuse in a variety of areas including equity or service, efficacy of collection techniques, financial capabilities of implementation, and benefit to the taxpayer. This working group will be selected by the Mayor with recommendations from Senior Staff and the Office of Accountability Performance and Innovation (“api”).

The group is tasked with the responsibilities listed below.

**A. Creation**

1. Internal Stakeholder Selection
   a. Stakeholders to be selected by the Mayor
   b. One representative from api
   c. One representative from IDEA
   d. One representative from IT
2. External Stakeholder Selection
   a. Stakeholders to be appointed by the Mayor
   b. Up to five to seven stakeholders from a variety of community groups in City of Syracuse
      i. Must include at least one member from each of the following types of organizations: social justice, technology, community outreach, research institution/partnerships (NuAir, universities)

B. Responsibilities

1. Determination of whether surveillance technology falls into one of two categories: First category will have characteristics that if met automatically define a technology as surveillance. Second category will have characteristics that if a certain percentage are met the technology will be considered surveillance.
2. Initial audit defining technologies currently used or owned by the City as surveillance or not. These technologies will be grandfathered into the system and not go through the voting process, will simply be tracked for public dissemination.
3. Regular meetings to review proposed technologies, define these technologies as surveillance or not, and give recommendations about whether systems that are deemed to be surveillance technology should be implemented.
4. Upkeep and maintenance of the technology audit list. The audit list will track all technologies that go through the group, any recommendations by the group, all drafts and final documentation about those technologies, and the final approval.

C. Recommendations

1. api will work with the working group once they have been selected by the Mayor and present initial recommendations around definition of surveillance characteristics and process structure.
2. Recommendations provided by the working group will be presented in a standardized format designed by the working group
3. It is recommended that the working group develops Service Level Agreements to ensure a swift but effective process.

Process

A. Departments interested in the use of a data collection technology must submit to the working group for a determination of whether it qualifies as a “Surveillance Technology”

1. Surveillance Technology Definition:
a. Technology whose primary purpose is to observe or analyze the movements, behavior, or actions of identifiable individuals in a manner that is reasonably likely to raise concerns about civil liberties, freedom of speech or association, racial equity or social justice. Identifiable individuals also include individuals whose identity can be revealed by license plate data when combined with any other record.

2. Exemptions:
   a. Technology that is used to collect data where any individual knowingly and willingly provides the data.
   b. Technology that is used to collect data where individuals were presented with a clear and conspicuous opt-out notice.
   c. Technologies used for everyday, normal course of business office use.
   d. Body-worn cameras (refer to existing BWC policy).
   e. Cameras installed in or on a police vehicle (refer to existing policy).
   f. Cameras installed pursuant to state law authorization in or on any vehicle or along a public right-of-way solely to record traffic violations (data collected would be used exclusively for traffic enforcement purposes).
   g. Cameras installed on City property solely for security purposes.
   h. Cameras installed solely to protect the physical integrity of City infrastructure, such as cameras at water reservoirs.
   i. Technology that monitors only City employees in the performance of their City functions.

3. Technologies that will not be considered and are effectively banned from use in the City of Syracuse
   a. Any technologies using biometric, facial recognition, or whole-body gesture analysis
   b. Predictive policing algorithms

B. Preliminary form completion

Draft form can be found at this link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/NXTSQFQ
For a complete list of questions please reach out to the api team.

C. Determination of surveillance by working group

Working group will review the proposed technology and determine whether the technology meets the definition of surveillance technology or not. If the technology is deemed not to constitute surveillance technology, it proceeds straight to the City’s standard procurement process. If the technology is determined to meet the threshold of surveillance it will continue on to the public comment period.
D. Public comment period (if deemed surveillance technology)
   1. Preliminary form is posted online for at least two weeks with form for comments available
   2. Preliminary form is presented in a press release from the Mayor’s office the day it is also posted online.
   3. Preliminary form is presented at at least one Common Council committee meeting

E. Final form completion
   1. Following the public comment period, the preliminary form is finalized, including any comments that came in during the public comment period.
   2. Final draft is provided to the working group for review.

F. Working group review and recommendation
   1. A working group (see above for details) made up of a diverse range of community members will convene to review surveillance technology documents and make recommendations, specifically considering harm a technology may cause underrepresented groups.
   2. Working group reviews the document, offers comments, and returns the document to the City department.

G. Approval and Oversight
   1. The Mayor’s Office will decide whether to allow the use of the proposed surveillance technology.
   2. If the surveillance technology is approved by the Mayor, the implementation of the technology proceeds through the City’s standard procurement and contracting process, including any necessary Common Council approvals.
   3. Finalized documents are made available to the public.

Surveillance Technology Mandated Standards

Building predictive models and automated decision making tools can create efficiencies in government and can enable more proactive work to happen. The model, though, is only as good as the data that feeds it. Predictive models are based on historical data, so if the data has been biased in the past, it will create a model that is biased for the future. For instance, in the case that the City was trying to predict which streets have potholes, relying on where potholes have been complained about would be problematic because community members in some neighborhoods report more potholes than in other neighborhoods. The model would predict based on that history of complaints that were filled, not actually where the potholes exist. In the
case where predictions are being made about people, issues like bias about race, ethnicity, and economic status can come into play, too, and have adverse effects.

Prior to any data project that includes automated decisions or predictive analytics, the following questions should be considered, answered, and submitted to the Chief Data Officer for approval as part of the project charter.

A. Data Collection

1. Informed consent: Any human subjects have been given informed consent, where subjects affirmatively opt-in and have a clear understanding of the usage of data to which they consent.
2. Collection bias: Consider and document sources of bias that could be introduced during data collection and survey design and any steps taken to mitigate those.
3. Limit PII exposure: Consider and document ways to minimize exposure of personally identifiable information (PII) for example through anonymization or not collecting information that isn't relevant for analysis.

B. Data Storage

1. Data security: Develop a plan to protect and secure data (e.g., encryption at rest and in transit, access controls on internal users and third parties, access logs, and up-to-date software).
2. Right to be forgotten: Create an easily accessible and publicly navigable mechanism through which an individual can request their personal information be removed.
3. Data retention plan: Develop a schedule or plan to delete the data after it is no longer needed including a timetable and rationale for data deletion.
4. Use UUIDs to ensure dissemination and analysis of data is not identifiable through PII.

C. Analysis

1. Missing perspectives: Consider and document ways to address blindspots in the analysis through engagement with relevant stakeholders (e.g., checking assumptions and discussing implications with affected communities and subject matter experts).
2. Dataset bias: Examine the data for possible sources of bias and take steps to mitigate or address these biases (e.g., stereotype perpetuation, confirmation bias, imbalanced classes, or omitted confounding variables).
3. Honest representation: Ensure visualizations, summary statistics, and reports are designed to honestly represent the underlying data.
4. Privacy in analysis: Ensure that data with PII are not used or displayed unless necessary for the analysis.
5. Auditability: Ensure the process of generating the analysis is well documented and reproducible if issues are discovered in the future. This requires a full methodology so that even when data has been removed by request or process statute solutions can be developed to remedy those issues.

D. Modeling

1. Proxy discrimination: Ensure that the model does not rely on variables or proxies for variables that are unfairly discriminatory.
2. Fairness across groups: Test model results for fairness with respect to different affected groups (e.g., tested for disparate error rates) and determine whether that fairness (or unfairness) is due to the data, the model, the scenario, or something else. Document the outcome.
3. Metric selection: Consider the effects of optimizing for our defined metrics and consider additional metrics.
4. Explainability: Explain and document in understandable terms a decision the model made in cases where a justification is needed.
5. Communicate bias: Communicate the shortcomings, limitations, and biases of the model to relevant stakeholders in ways that can be generally understood.

E. Deployment

1. Redress: Discuss with the organization a plan for response if users are harmed by the results (e.g., how does the data science team evaluate these cases and update analysis and models to prevent future harm). Ensure there is a documented process in place to address this harm.
2. Roll back: Ensure there is a way to turn off or roll back the model in production if necessary.
3. Concept drift: Complete testing and monitor for concept drift to ensure the model remains fair over time.
4. Unintended use: Document and act upon steps to identify and prevent unintended uses and abuse of the model and have a plan to monitor these once the model is deployed.
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RESPONSE TO THE PEOPLE'S AGENDA FOR POLICE REFORM

July 16, 2020

Since taking office two and a half years ago, Mayor Walsh has made enhancing police accountability and improving police-community relations in the City of Syracuse an urgent priority. From including community stakeholders in the selection of a new police chief to seeking input on the body worn camera policy to conducting a public forum on frustrations with use of force, Mayor Walsh and Chief Buckner have offered a more inclusive and open process to police reform.

Positive progress has been made but much more needs to happen. And faster than before. The Walsh Administration welcomes this challenge.

A coalition of organizations has advanced the People’s Agenda for Police Reform. It comprises nine demands of the City of Syracuse regarding changes to policing in our community. Representatives of the People’s Agenda organizations presented their demands to Mayor Walsh, Chief Buckner and city leaders on July 2, 2020 in a live streamed public meeting. Mayor Walsh committed to provide a timeline in two weeks on how the City would address the demands.

The following document provides timeframes for action and relevant background and context on each of the demands. It references numbered actions in the Mayor’s June 19 Executive Order on Syracuse Police Reform. It also presents the City’s position at this time on each of these demands. It is a new platform for accountability to the community and a foundation for continued progress.
Legislate and Implement the Syracuse Right to Know Act

THE WALSH ADMINISTRATION AGREES WITH THIS DEMAND.

In accordance with the June 19 Executive Order (Action #1), the Administration committed to: Review, revise and amend the policies and procedures of the Syracuse Police Department (SPD) to ensure the principles embodied in the New York City Right to Know Act are incorporated into the department’s policies and procedures, including but not limited to self-identification to citizens, provision of written identification to citizens, obtaining consent to searches, recording consent and making the record of the consent available to the subject of the search. This will be done in conjunction with legislative action by the Syracuse Common Council, which will seek to codify the “Right to Know” principles related to the reporting of investigative encounters.

The Executive Order authorizes the Syracuse Police Department to implement the administrative functions of Right to Know. Effective and timely implementation will require officer training on new policies and procedures and the completed acquisition of body worn cameras for all uniformed officers to record applicable consent searches. Full implementation may also be impacted by Council legislation.

TIMELINE

► 1. Administrative implementation will be completed by January 15, 2021.
► 2. The Administration defers to the Syracuse Common Council on the timeline for legislative action.
Taking additional action to revamp SPD’s new use of force policy as detailed by SPAARC’s analysis and provided to the administration in July 2019

THE WALSH ADMINISTRATION AGREES WITH THIS DEMAND.
In accordance with the June 19 Executive Order (Action #2), the Administration committed to: Revise SPD’s 2019 use of force policy to ensure that it is compliant with recent changes in New York State law, and fully consider any policy changes requested by the Syracuse community.

The Syracuse Police Department is again reviewing the Syracuse Police Accountability and Reform Coalition (SPAARC) analysis for proposed modifications to its Use of Force Policy. In addition to the SPAARC analysis, other references will include but are not limited to: Governor Cuomo’s Executive Order specific to S.6670-B (Benjamin) “Eric Garner Anti-Chokehold Act” which establishes criminal penalties for use of chokeholds; NYS Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) pending guidelines, including any that will impact SPD’s current NYS DCJS certification; and SPD’s current process to obtain national certification from the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA).

TIMELINE

▶ 1. The Syracuse Police Department Use of Force Policy will be updated by October 15, 2020.
Enhance the SPD body camera policy to require officers to turn cameras on at the beginning of their shift, for data and footage from body cameras to be FOILable and not highly redacted, and prohibit officers from reviewing body camera footage when writing their reports, among other needed changes

THE WALSH ADMINISTRATION AGREES WITH THIS DEMAND WITH CLARIFICATIONS.

In accordance with the June 19 Executive Order (Action #3), the Administration committed to: SPD will revise its current body worn camera policy to ensure that officers record the entirety of their presence on the scene of a police encounter.

Regarding the issue of when body-worn-cameras (BWC) are on and recording, they are powered on at the beginning of the officer’s shift, but they do not continuously record. Recording for an entire shift, in one continuous stream, does not allow for the integration of information from the E-911 center to the video. The integration of E-911 information is the mechanism that allows the Department to label, store, and retrieve footage from a particular incident or call. This process, made possible with E-911 integration, is crucial to the management of the BWC evidence and the supervision of officers.

Administratively, the labeling of each individual clip of evidence allows for the appropriate retention period to be set so the evidence is not erroneously purged from our system. With respect to officer supervision, the Department - in its most recent contract with Axon - requested the addition of Axon’s “Performance” program. The “Performance” program, when used in conjunction with the E-911 integration, allows the Department to audit an officer’s compliance with the recording requirements of the Department policy. Moreover, the “Performance” program randomly selects officer video clips to be reviewed by his/her direct supervisor. Both programs increase accountability and provide for increased officer performance. Without the E-911 integration, which is accomplished through the appropriate management of an officer’s ability to turn on and off the recording function, the Department will lose significant administrative oversight.

BWC footage is available under a FOIL request to the Office of Corporation Counsel, however, the City does not release records including BWC footage if the record is part of an active investigation. The current practice of redaction mirrors the redaction process utilized for paper documents, both of which are governed by Article 6 of the Public Officers Law (§§ 91-99). The City recognizes the important balance of protecting privacy rights with the public’s right to access government records and evaluates each request on a case-by-case basis. The City adopted guidelines for BWC redaction in April 2019. The guidelines call for redaction, by blurring faces/images or muting sound in whole or part, when the footage captures the following: medical treatment or facilities; interior of private residences; restrooms; SPD computer screens; officer field notes; citizens’ forms of identification (i.e. driver’s license); severe injuries and fatalities; law enforcement investigative techniques that should remain confidential; scenes of sexual assaults, domestic violence or stalking; faces and voices of crime victims, witnesses, informants and minors; and conversations between police officers that fall under the inter-agency communications exception in the FOIL statute.
The Department recognizes that a police officer’s report is the official record of a call for service and needs to be as accurate as possible. The Syracuse Police Department, in both policy and training, has emphasized that the video captured on a BWC is not a replacement for an officer’s independent recollection of the event. Recognizing this, as a matter of practice, when an officer is involved in a shooting, the Department does not show the officer his/her BWC footage until after they have provided a written statement. In other instances, officers are allowed to review BWC footage prior to completing a report. This practice will be reviewed.

In accordance with Mayor Walsh’s Executive Order (Action #4), the Administration committed to: SPD will complete the department’s efforts to obtain additional body worn cameras so that all uniformed officers assigned to patrol or who otherwise respond to citizen calls will be equipped with cameras.

On Monday July 13, 2020 the Syracuse Common Council approved modified legislation to ensure accurate compliance with a grant award from the US Department of Justice for procurement of body worn cameras for use by Syracuse Police Department officers and will implement the following time table:

- Purchase and acquisition of 113 cameras by August 28, 2020.
- Construction of physically secured equipment docking space by September 18, 2020.
- Coordination of BWC equipment technology software registration with AXON company, and Onondaga County 911 (CAD) integration by September 18, 2020.
- Training of officers on the use of individually assigned (i.e. not shared) body-worn cameras. Each officer is assigned BWC by October 25, 2020.

**TIMELINE**

1. SPD’s body worn camera policy will be updated by October 15, 2020.
Publicize the PBA union contract as is, while engaging in a community driven and centered renegotiating process to include recommendations for discipline by the Citizens Review Board when they sustain findings of misconduct;

THE WALSH ADMINISTRATION AGREES WITH THIS DEMAND WITH CLARIFICATIONS.

In accordance with the June 19 Executive Order (Action #7), the Administration committed to: Post on the City of Syracuse and/or SPD’s website:

a) The collection of documents that together comprise the most recent collective bargaining agreement with the Syracuse Police Benevolent Association (PBA);

b) A comprehensive summary of that collection of documents, which my administration prepared and presented to the PBA for review and acceptance in 2019; and,

c) The Tentative Agreement reached with the PBA in November 2019, which has not been approved, and which is now the subject of the impasse resolution process set forth in the New York State Taylor Law.

The clarifications pertain to contract negotiations because, as noted above, the Administration and PBA are currently in the midst of the impasse resolution process. During that process, neither side can lawfully introduce new proposals. An arbitrator will review each parties’ existing proposals and issue a binding decision as to what the terms of the next contract will be. With respect to officer discipline, the Administration has taken the position that discipline is not a subject that can or should be negotiated with the PBA, but is reserved to the Chief. This issue is currently being litigated in state court. Moreover, the City has recently advocated for state legislation that would confirm that officer discipline is not a subject that can or should be negotiated with the union.

TIMELINE

▸ 1. The PBA contract and related documents have been published on www.syracusepolice.org and www.ourcity.syrgov.net/policerelations;
Pass legislation to strengthen and enhance the Syracuse Citizens Review Board such that its recommendations for sustained findings are enforceable, while maintaining the board as a citizen driven accountability board;

**THE WALSH ADMINISTRATION MUST DEFER TO THE COMMON COUNCIL FOR THIS DEMAND.**

In accordance with the June 19 Executive Order (Action #12), the Administration committed to:

*Continue to improve collaboration with the Syracuse Citizen Review Board (CRB) to ensure the flow of documents and information as embodied in Local Law No. 11; Reviewing the disciplinary recommendations presented by the CRB prior to making a final determination of discipline of an officer; and, In cases where the Chief issues no discipline, or discipline that is lesser than is that recommended by the CRB, provide to the CRB a written explanation of the reason for such level of discipline or lack thereof.*

The Citizen Review Board (CRB) was created by the Common Council via Local Law, and is overseen by the Common Council. Changes to the Council-created CRB require legislative action. During the live streamed meeting with PAFPR July 2, 2020, Council President Hudson stated that she would convene a meeting between PAFPR representatives and the Common Council.

We defer to the Common Council regarding this action.

The Administration has worked and will continue to work with the CRB to improve process, communication and cooperation between the CRB and SPD.

**TIMELINE**

1. Implementation of the Executive Order (Action #12) will be completed by August 14, 2020.
Demilitarize the SPD and use the Ferguson Report as a guide and minimum standard;

THE WALSH ADMINISTRATION AGREES WITH THIS DEMAND.

In accordance with the June 19 Executive Order (Action #6), the Administration committed to:

- a) Conduct a complete inventory of all equipment acquired through military surplus programs that are in possession of the SPD;
- b) Establish policies and procedures regarding the use of such equipment; and
- c) Establish parameters for future procurement of such equipment.

Information and data in response to questions posed at the July 2, 2020 meeting regarding military surplus equipment and unmanned systems (drone) operations in accordance with the 2013 Common Council resolution will be addressed as components of policy development and implemented as follows:

**TIMELINE**

- 1. Inventory of equipment will be completed by September 15, 2020;
- 2. Deployment Policy and Procedures will be completed by December 1, 2020;
- 3. Procurement Policy will be completed by December 1, 2020.
Redirect resources away from SPD to reinvest in human and other services, and reduce the oversized role policing has in our community;

THE WALSH ADMINISTRATION AGREES WITH THIS DEMAND WITH CLARIFICATIONS.

In accordance with the June 19 Executive Order (Action #15), the Administration committed to:

- Research and consider innovative, community-based strategies for responding to non-criminal calls, with a goal of shifting the paradigm from primary police response, to response by non-police professionals in relevant fields.

The current SPD budget funds police response to a wide range of situations, from high priority violent conflicts, to investigations of criminal activity, to domestic disputes and mental health issues. The Administration recognizes that the core focus of SPD must be on law enforcement; and that other city departments and community agencies are better equipped to manage and resolve non-criminal activities. Accordingly, we are committed to moving responsibilities and, where appropriate, spending allocations from SPD to those best able to achieve results. These efforts include but are not limited to:

- Identify current police responses eligible for non-police response which may include but are not limited to: homelessness, non-criminal mental illness, noise violations, nuisance abatement, and traffic violations.
- Continued work with Onondaga County to expand the current Crisis Intervention Training to enable informed, safe encounters with citizens with mental health afflictions, substance use and/or developmental disabilities.
- Identify and implement best practice models for alternative policing, which may include but is not limited to Eugene’s Crisis Assistance Helping Out On The Streets (CAHOOTS) model, Denver’s Alliance for Street Health Response, and Oakland’s Mobile Assistance Community Responders (MACRO) model.
- Continue to fund the Trauma Response Team, and other local programs.

The Administration also recognizes that citizens must have a voice in city spending and that the annual budgeting process may appear to be complicated. Taxpayers deserve an accessible and comprehensive path to financial transparency and accountability.

The Budget and Finance Departments will deploy a participatory budgeting tool both online and, if possible, in-person. The initial focus will be on SPD funding and the entire city budget will be included when Fiscal Year 2022 planning begins.
The participatory tool will allow residents to clearly see how spending is currently allocated and to voice their opinion on changes that should be made, recognizing that the final budget is ultimately approved by the Common Council. Additionally, the participatory budgeting tool will provide the mechanism to identify alternative policy options such as those identified and apply tangible cost parameters.

It is important to acknowledge the City’s fiscal position as a result of COVID-19. The pandemic is projected to reduce revenues (driven largely by sales tax reductions) by as much as $35 million over two fiscal years. Under the contingency budget plans for expense reductions being considered, all city departments including SPD will see a significant reduction in their budgets. These cuts will in turn reduce funds available for reallocation.

### TIMELINE

1. Identify SPD responsibilities and, where appropriate, spending reallocations and initiate participatory budget planning to begin December 1, 2020.
Research, draft, introduce and pass legislation for public oversight of surveillance technologies, including but not limited to a ban on biometric and facial recognition technologies;

**THE WALSH ADMINISTRATION AGREES WITH THIS DEMAND.**

The Administration will issue a Surveillance Technology Executive Order to: Institute a policy requiring all departments to bring potential surveillance technology before the Common Council for review and approval prior to the procurement process.

A committee of both internal and external stakeholders will be established to review any proposed technologies that may fit the criteria of surveillance. Proposed technologies will be subject to a multi-step process including a public comment period, and will ultimately conclude with a vote by the Common Council prior to the procurement process. The goal of this process is to ensure that proposed surveillance technology travels through a comprehensive evaluation process which considers public input.

**TIMELINE**

1. A Surveillance Technology Executive Order will be issued by December 1, 2020.
Work with the Syracuse City School District to remove all school resources officers out of schools, and invest savings in counselors and other supportive staff.

THE WALSH ADMINISTRATION MUST DEFER TO THE SYRACUSE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT ON THIS DEMAND.

In accordance with June 19 Executive Order (Action #16), the Administration committed to: Develop and implement, in coordination with the Syracuse City School District, a new model for school safety and security.

TIMELINE

► 1. The Syracuse City School District (SCSD) will conduct a remote work session Wednesday July 22, 2020 at 4:30 p.m. to discuss the topic of School Resource Officers (SROs) in schools. The Walsh Administration commits to meet with SCSD officials during the week of August 3rd to discuss the outcomes of the July 22 session and determine next steps in the process of establishing a new safety and security model.
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GENERAL ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 19, OF THE REVISED GENERAL ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF SYRACUSE, AS AMENDED, ENTITLED POLICE DEPARTMENT, TO CREATE A NEW SECTION 19-9 TO BE ENTITLED RIGHT TO KNOW

BE IT ORDAINED, that Chapter 19 of the Revised General Ordinances of the City of Syracuse, as amended, entitled Police Department is hereby amended to add a new Section 19-9 that shall read as follows:

Section 19-9. Right to Know

Declaration of Legislative Intent and Findings. WHEREAS, the Common Council finds that people of and in the City of Syracuse are unaware of their constitutional right to privacy when interacting with law enforcement officers. The Council further finds that mistrust of law enforcement officers based on real or perceived discrimination hinders law enforcement efforts and is a threat to public safety. In adopting this law, it is the intention of the Common Council to protect the peoples of and in the City of Syracuse’s constitutional rights by instituting an affirmative obligation on law enforcement officers to inform those people of their privacy rights when being searched by the police, and to create greater transparency in law enforcement practices. It is also the intention of the Common Council to increase transparency in police practices and to build trust between police officers and members of the public by providing the public with notice of the reasons behind their encounters with the police, and a written record of their interactions with the police in situations that do not result in an arrest or summons. In doing so, it is the Common Council’s intention to protect the personal privacy of all people within its
borders, to shield police officers from false claims of wrongdoing, to contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of our criminal justice system, and to rebuild trust between the Syracuse Police Department and the residents they are sworn to serve.

Chapter 19 of the Revised General Ordinances of the City of Syracuse is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 19-9.- Right to Know

(a) Definitions. As used in this section the following words shall have the following meanings:

Department. The terms “department” shall mean the police department of the City of Syracuse.

Law enforcement activity. The term “law enforcement activity” means any of the following activities when conducted by an officer:

1. Noncustodial questioning of individuals;
2. Stops where an officer has an individualized, reasonable suspicion that the person stopped has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a crime and where a reasonable person would not feel free to end the encounter at will;
3. Frisks;
4. Searches of persons or property, including vehicles;
5. Roadblock or checkpoint stops,
6. Home searches;
7. Investigatory questioning of victims or witnesses to crimes; and

8. Traffic stops.

**Noncustodial questioning.** The term “noncustodial questioning” means the questioning of an individual during an investigation into criminal activity, where such individual has not been detained and is free to end the encounter at will.

**Officer.** The term “officer” means a sworn police officer of the department.

(b) Upon initiation of a law enforcement activity, an officer shall:

1. Identify himself or herself to the person who is the subject of such law enforcement activity by providing his or her name, rank and command;

2. Provide to such person an explanation of the reason for such law enforcement activity;

(c) At the conclusion of a law enforcement activity that does not result in an arrest or summons, the officer shall:

1. Offer a business card to such person provided that where such person is a minor, the officer shall offer such a business card to the minor or, if present at the scene, to a parent, legal guardian, or responsible adult;

2. Offer to provide to such person the information set forth in paragraph 1 of subdivision b on a hand-written card, when such officer does not have an adequate number of pre-
printed business cards on his or her person at the time of such law enforcement activity; and

3. Offer to provide to such person the information set forth in paragraph 1 of subdivision b verbally and allow sufficient time for such person to record such information when such officer does not have an adequate number of pre-printed business cards or hand-written cards on his or her person at the time of such law enforcement activity.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision c, an officer shall offer a business card to any person requesting identifying information, or provide such information verbally to such person and allow such person sufficient time for such person to record such information when such officer does not have an adequate number of pre-printed business cards or hand-written cards on his or her person at the time of such law enforcement activity.

(e) The Chief of Police, or the Commissioner of Public Safety, shall develop a plan to ensure that officers have an adequate number of business cards prior to engaging in any law enforcement activity and that such cards be replenished within 30 business days after such cards become available.

(f) Any business cards used by an officer to identify himself or herself to a person who is the subject of law enforcement activity shall be pre-printed and include, at a minimum:

1. The name, rank, shield number, and command of such officer; and
2. The address and phone number for the citizen review board and an indication that the subject of the law enforcement activity may contact the citizen review board to submit comments or complaints about the encounter.

3. The address and phone number for the department’s internal affairs unit and an indication that the subject of the law enforcement activity may contact the internal affairs unit to submit a complaint about the encounter.

(g) The Chief of Police or the Commissioner of Public Safety shall develop and provide policy, rules and regulations for its officers, whether in uniform or civilian clothing, with respect to obtaining voluntary, knowing, and intelligent consent prior to the search of a person, or a person’s vehicle, home or property, for a search that is based solely on a person’s consent to such search, when such search is not conducted pursuant to a warrant, any other exception to the warrant requirement under applicable law, or probable cause, or when such search is not incident to a lawful arrest. Such guidance shall specify conduct for:

1. Articulating, using plain and simple language delivered in a non-threatening manner, that the person who is subject of the search is being asked to voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently consent to such search, and explaining that such search will not be conducted if such person refuses to provide consent to such search;

2. Securing such consent without threats or promises of any kind being made to such person;
3. Affirming that such person understands the information communicated pursuant to paragraph 1;

4. Refraining from conducting such search where such consent has not been obtained; and

5. Utilizing interpretation services when seeking consent to conduct a search of a person with limited English proficiency or such person’s vehicle, home, or property, including but not limited to the use of bilingual officers and telephonic interpretation, prior to conducting such search.

(h) An officer who seeks consent to conduct a search that is subject to the policy, rules and regulations developed and provided pursuant to subdivision (g) shall:

1. Create an audio and/or video record of the information communicated pursuant to such guidance and such person’s response to such information, or a written record reflecting the information communicated pursuant to such guidance to be signed by the person if such person understands the information and consents to a search unless the person refuses to sign. Any such refusal must be documented by the officer;

2. Document the time, location, and date of such search, and the apparent race/ethnicity, gender, and age of the person who was the subject of such search, and such officer’s name, command, and shield number; and
3. Provide the person who is the subject of the search written instructions on how to obtain a copy of such record created pursuant to paragraph 1 of this subdivision. Upon receiving a request from such person for a copy of such record, the department shall acknowledge receipt of such request within 5 business days of receiving such request. Such acknowledgement shall include a date by which the department will provide such record or the basis for the denial of such request, provided that such date shall not be longer than 45 days from the date of receipt of such request. If the department is unable to provide such copy or denial to such person within 45 days due to extenuating circumstances, it shall provide such record or denial within 15 days of such 45 days and provide the basis of such circumstances.

(i) Notwithstanding any other provision in this section, an officer shall not be required to comply with this section where:

1. Such officer is engaged in an approved undercover activity or operation, and law enforcement activity is taken pursuant to such undercover activity or operation; or
2. An emergency exists requiring immediate action by the officer to respond to an imminent and substantial risk of physical injury to the officer or any other person or imminent and substantial damage to property, or to forestall the imminent escape of a suspect or imminent destruction of evidence.
3. During searches predicated upon entrance to a public building or facility, location, event or gathering, and where such person’s entrance into any such location constitutes implied consent to be searched under an exception to the warrant requirement.

(j) Nothing in this section or in the implementation thereof shall be construed to restrict or limit any activity or proceeding regulated by the criminal procedure law or any other state law.

(k) The Chief of Police or the Commissioner of Public Safety shall develop rules and regulations to enforce compliance with this section.

(l) Commencing within 30 days of the end of the quarter beginning on January 1, 2021, and within 30 days of the end of every quarter thereafter, the department shall post on its website a report of the data collected pursuant to paragraph 2 of subdivision (h), specifically the total number of consent searches conducted during the preceding quarter disaggregated by the apparent race/ethnicity, gender, and age of the person searched; and the total number of instances where an officer sought to obtain a consent to search but did not obtain consent to search during the preceding quarter disaggregated by the apparent race/ethnicity, gender, and age of the person from whom such consent was sought.

(m) Severability. If any portion of this General Ordinance is, for any reason, declared unconstitutional or invalid, in whole or in part, by any court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed severable, and such unconstitutionality or invalidity shall not affect the
validity of the remaining portions of this general ordinance, which remaining portions shall continue in full force and effect.

§19-10. Reporting on Investigative Encounters

(a) Definitions. As used in this section, the following terms have the following meanings:

1. Level one investigative encounter. The term “level one investigative encounter” means an officer’s request for information based on an objective credible reason to approach.

2. Level two investigative encounter. The term “level two investigative encounter” means a common law right of inquiry based on an officer’s founded suspicion that criminal activity is afoot.

3. Level three investigative encounter. The term “level three investigative encounter” means a stop and/or frisk based on an officer’s reasonable suspicion that an individual has committed, is committing or is about to commit a felony or misdemeanor.

4. Officer. The term “officer” means a peace officer or police officer as defined in the Criminal Procedure Law who is employed by the city of Syracuse.

(b) Commencing within 30 days of the quarter beginning on January 1, 2021, and within 30 days of the end of every quarter thereafter, the police chief or commissioner of public safety shall
submit to the council and the mayor and post to the department’s website a report containing the following information concerning investigative encounters conducted by officers for the previous quarter:

1. The total number of level one investigative encounters based on objective credible reasons that escalated to a level two or three investigative encounter;

2. The total number of level two investigative encounters based on founded suspicion; and

3. The total number of level three investigative encounters based on reasonable suspicion.

(c) The information required pursuant to subdivision a shall be disaggregated by precinct and further disaggregated by:

1. The apparent race/ethnicity, gender, and age of the person involved;

2. The number of persons from whom an officer requested consent to search, further disaggregated by whether consent was granted or declined;

3. The number of persons arrested or issued a criminal or civil summons;

4. The factors leading to the investigative encounter; and

5. Whether a use of force incident occurred in connection with the encounter.

(d) The information required pursuant to this section shall be stored permanently and shall be accessible from the department’s website, and shall be provided in a format that permits
automated processing. Each report shall include a comparison of the current reporting period to the prior four reporting periods, where such information is available.

(c) The Chief of Police or the Commissioner of Public Safety shall develop rules and regulations to enforce compliance with this section.

(f) Severability. If any portion of this General Ordinance is, for any reason, declared unconstitutional or invalid, in whole or in part, by any court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed severable, and such unconstitutionality or invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this general ordinance, which remaining portions shall continue in full force and effect.

and

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that this ordinance shall take effect December 14, 2020;

and

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that all Sections of Chapter 19 of the Revised General Ordinances, as amended not expressly revised by this ordinance shall remain in full force and effect as written.
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300.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

A. This policy provides guidelines on the reasonable use of force. The authority to use force is a matter of critical concern, both to the public and to the law enforcement community, and is a serious responsibility that must be exercised judiciously. Officers are involved on a daily basis in numerous and varied interactions and, when necessary, may use objectively reasonable force in carrying out their duties consistent with the parameters outlined in this Use of Force Policy.

B. All officers are obligated to guide their actions according to their training and this policy, whose core principles include commitment to the utmost respect for the sanctity and dignity of human life, employment of de-escalation whenever safe and feasible, the duty to intervene when witnessing the use of excessive force, the preservation and advancement of community trust and public safety, and adherence to constitutional principles. In granting officers the authority to use reasonable force, the Department acknowledges its responsibility to train, monitor and evaluate officers to ensure awareness of the use of force authorizations and limitations set forth in this policy.

C. Violations of this Policy will lead to corrective action and/or discipline, up to and including termination of employment.

300.2 DEFINITIONS

Definitions related to this policy include:

A. **Deadly Force** - Force reasonably anticipated and intended to create a substantial likelihood of causing death or very serious injury. This includes force that, under the circumstances, is readily capable of causing death or serious physical injury.

B. **De-escalation** - Taking action or communicating, verbally or non-verbally, during a potential force encounter in an attempt to reduce the intensity of conflict, stabilize a situation or reduce the immediacy of a threat so that more time, options, and
resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary.

c. **Safe and Feasible** - Reasonably capable of being carried out under the circumstances to successfully achieve the lawful objective or arrest without increasing risk to the officer or another person.

d. **Force** - The application of physical techniques or tactics, chemical agents, or weapons to another person. It is not a use of force when a person allows him/herself to be searched, escorted, handcuffed, or restrained

E. **Imminent** - Ready to take place; approaching; impending. Note that imminent does not mean immediate or instantaneous.

F. **Intervene** - To verbally or physically interact with another officer so as to prevent or alter a result or course of events.

G. **Objectively Reasonable** - An objective standard used to judge an officer’s actions. Under this standard, a particular application of force must be judged through the perspective of a reasonable officer facing the same set of circumstances, without the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, and be based on the totality of the circumstances that are known to that officer at the time the force was used.

H. **Necessary** - Force is necessary if it is required in order to make an arrest, investigatory stop, or lawful detention and it is objectively reasonable given the totality of circumstances known to a reasonable officer on the scene.

I. **Reasonable Belief** - Those facts and circumstances within the knowledge of the individual which would make a reasonable and prudent person tend to believe that the facts and circumstances are true.

J. **Serious Physical Injury** - Physical injury that creates a substantial risk of death or causes death or serious and protracted disfigurement, protracted impairment of health, or protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily organ. (NY Penal Law § 10.00(10))

K. **Totality of the Circumstances** - All facts and circumstances known to the officer at the time, taken as a whole, including the conduct of the officer and the subject leading up to the use of force.
Syracuse Police Department

USE OF FORCE (DRAFT)

300.3 DE-ESCALATION

A. Officers shall use de-escalation techniques and tactics when it is safe and feasible to do so under the totality of the circumstances, consistent with the officer’s training. Not every potential violent confrontation can be de-escalated, but officers have the ability to impact the direction and the outcome of many situations they encounter, based on their decision-making, and the tactics they choose to employ. De-escalation applies to all encounters between officers and the public, not only those that involve force.

B. De-escalation may include the use of techniques and tactics, both verbal and non-verbal, such as verbal persuasion, body posture, command presence, commands or warnings, tactical repositioning, or any tactic or force option that in the officer’s reasoned judgment is likely to result in a lower level of force being used to accomplish the objective at hand.

C. Officers are not expected to compromise safety in order to de-escalate a situation if it is likely to result in harm to the officer or others.

300.4 DUTY TO INTERVENE AND REPORT

A. Any officer on the scene, who is in possession of all necessary facts, who observes another officer or supervisor using force that is not objectively reasonable shall intervene when safe and feasible. Any intervention by an officer must be reported to a supervisor, who must initiate an immediate investigation.

B. Any officer who observes another officer, including a supervisor, use force that is potentially beyond that which is objectively reasonable or is against policy shall report the force to any supervisor and/or the Office of Professional Standards immediately.

300.5 USE OF FORCE

A. Officers shall use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the objective facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.

B. The reasonableness of force will be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene at the time of the incident, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight. Officers must often make split-second decisions about the amount of force that reasonably appears necessary in a particular situation. Therefore, any evaluation of reasonableness must consider the fact that officers must assess the situation with limited information and in circumstances that are tense, uncertain and rapidly evolving.
C. Officers should continually assess the totality of the circumstances as the situation changes, and adjust the use of force appropriately to ensure the level of force remains proportionate to the perceived threat. Authorized use of force should cease when the officer reasonably perceives that the purpose necessitating the use of force has ceased.

D. Given that no policy can realistically predict every possible situation an officer might encounter, officers are entrusted to use well-reasoned discretion in determining the appropriate use of force in each incident. Any exercise of discretion must remain consistent with training.

E. While the ultimate objective of every law enforcement encounter is to avoid or minimize injury and advance public safety, nothing in this policy requires an officer to retreat or be exposed to possible physical injury before applying reasonable force.

300.6 USE OF FORCE AUTHORIZATION

A. Officers are authorized to use objectively reasonable force when necessary to accomplish lawful objectives, including:

1. Effecting an arrest, prevent escape of a person from custody, or in defense of self or others from imminent physical force;

2. Effecting an investigatory stop or detention where there is reasonable suspicion to believe that criminal conduct has occurred or is ongoing;

3. Taking subjects into protective custody, including civil custody, when authorized by law, such as persons who are a danger to themselves or others or persons incapacitated by intoxicating agents;

4. Preventing a subject from committing suicide or inflicting serious physical injury upon themselves, provided the force shall not rise to the level of deadly physical force;

5. Assisting a licensed medical provider in providing necessary medical treatment;

6. Overcoming resistance to a lawful police order following a verbal warning.
300.7 FACTORS USED TO DETERMINE THE REASONABLENESS OF FORCE

A. When determining whether de-escalation is safe and feasible, whether or not to apply force, and the amount and type of force that is reasonable and necessary, the following factors should be taken into consideration, including:

1. The immediacy and severity of the threat to officers or others, including the potential for injury to officers and others;

2. The seriousness of the suspected offense or reason for contact with the subject;

3. The level of the subject’s resistance, whether the subject is attempting to evade arrest by flight, or is attacking the officer;

4. Dynamics between the officer and subject (e.g., age, size, physical condition, skill level, injuries sustained, level of exhaustion or fatigue, the length or duration of the encounter, the number of officers available vs. Subjects, etc.);

5. Whether the subject exhibits any pre-assault indicators, such as verbal aggression, posture change, physiological changes consistent with stressor events, target glance, undirected over-compliance, aggression directed at another person or an inanimate object, kinetic body movements, physical non-compliance, defensive or offensive physical posturing, or any combination;

6. A subject’s escalation of verbal, physical, or emotional response;

7. The relative physical leverage, or position of physical advantage or disadvantage, created by the proximity or positioning of the officer and subject;

8. Nature and/or location of the incident, including whether a domestic disturbance or dispute is involved;

9. Unique characteristics of the subject, including their mental state or capacity; whether they exhibit any effects of drug or alcohol use; their ability to understand and comply with officer commands; and whether they are a member of a vulnerable class (child, elderly, disabled, visibly pregnancy);

10. The subject’s proximity of weapons or dangerous improvised devices;

11. The degree to which the subject has been effectively restrained and his/her ability to resist despite being restrained;
12. The availability of other options and their possible effectiveness;

13. The risk and reasonably foreseeable consequences of escape;

14. The apparent need for immediate control of the subject or a prompt resolution of the situation;

15. Whether the subject’s conduct no longer reasonably appears to pose an imminent threat to the officer or others;

16. Environmental factors, for example, elevation, lighting, spatial confinement, weather, presence and proximity of others;

17. Prior contacts and whether the subject is known to have a propensity for violence;

18. Any other exigent circumstances, which include such circumstances that would cause a reasonable person to believe that a particular action is necessary to prevent physical harm to an individual, the destruction of relevant evidence, the escape of a suspect, or some other consequence improperly frustrating legitimate law enforcement efforts;

19. Any other conclusions that can be drawn about the subject, circumstances, or environment, which a reasonable officer perceives as a result of training or experience to pose a threat of harm.

300.8 PROHIBITED USES OF FORCE

A. Generally, officers must cease using force when the officer reasonably perceives that the purpose necessitating the use of force has ended, and must continually assess the situation and changing circumstances, and adjust or discontinue the use of force appropriately.

B. In addition, force shall not be used in the following circumstances:

1. To coerce a confession from a subject.

2. To obtain physical evidence from a subject for the purpose of scientific testing, absent a court order.

3. Against subjects who are handcuffed or restrained unless it is necessary to prevent injury or escape, or to otherwise overcome resistance posed by the subject.
4. To torture, unlawfully coerce or punish a subject.

5. To attempt to remove or extract evidence from a subject who has orally injected the evidence, once the subject has placed the potential evidence in his/her mouth.

**NOTE:** An officer may use reasonable force to prevent the person from placing the evidence or contraband in their mouth, but such force must cease once evidence/contraband is in the mouth. Once a subject has ingested potentially harmful evidence such as narcotics, an officer shall request immediate medical attention.

6. To extract an item from the body or cavity of a subject without a warrant, except where exigent circumstances are present (for body cavity searches see the Strip Searches and Body Cavity Searches policy, Volume 1, Article 73, Section 73.14).

C. For additional limitations and prohibitions related to the use of deadly force, refer to Section 300.10 below.

### 300.9 USE OF DEADLY FORCE

A. Deadly force is a measure to be employed only in the most extreme circumstances. An officer may use deadly force only when it is objectively reasonable under the totality of the circumstances.

B. Use of deadly force is considered objectively reasonable when:

1. The officer reasonably believes or perceives the subject has a weapon or is attempting to access a weapon and it is reasonable to believe the subject intends to use it against the officer or third person(s).

2. The officer reasonably believes or perceives the subject is capable of causing serious bodily harm or death to the officer or third person(s) even in the absence of a weapon and it is reasonable to believe the subject intends to do so.

3. It is necessary to protect the officer or third person(s) from what is reasonably believed or perceived to be an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm.

4. It is necessary to prevent the escape of a fleeing subject when the officer has probable cause to believe that the subject has committed, or intends to commit, a felony involving serious bodily harm or death and the officer reasonably
believes that there is an imminent risk of serious bodily harm or death to the officer or third person(s) if the subject is not immediately apprehended.

C. Officers shall warn of their intent to use deadly force where safe and feasible.

300.10 DEADLY FORCE LIMITATIONS AND PROHIBITIONS

A. **Chokeholds**: The Department bans the use of chokeholds as a police practice in a manner consistent with the conduct prohibited by NY Penal Law §121.13-A. A chokehold is defined as either (i) a technique that applies pressure to the throat or windpipe of a person in a manner that may hinder breathing or reduce intake of air (NY Exec. Law §837-t); or (ii) a technique that applies pressure on the throat or neck of such person or blocks the nose or mouth of such person with intent to impede the normal breathing or circulation of the blood of another person (NY Penal Law §121.11).

B. **Property Destruction**: Officers shall not use deadly force against subjects to prevent the destruction of property.

C. **Warning Shots**: Officers shall not fire warning shots.

D. **Drawing or Displaying Weapons**: Officers may only draw and display firearms where there is a reasonable belief there is a possibility of danger to the officer or others, or to ensure the safety of any person.

E. **Shooting at a Moving Vehicle**: Discharging a firearm at a moving vehicle is prohibited unless an officer reasonably believes or perceives that any occupant(s) of the vehicle are using or are about to use deadly force against the officer or another person, and the officer reasonably believes there are no other reasonable means available to avert the threat posed by the vehicle or its occupants. Due to the inherent danger of this tactic, the following additional guidance applies:

1. When confronted by an oncoming vehicle, officers should not position themselves in the path of the vehicle, and should make every attempt to move out of the path of an approaching vehicle instead of discharging their firearm at the vehicle or any of its occupants.

2. Officers should not discharge their firearm at a vehicle when it is reasonable to believe that the vehicle may contain an innocent occupant or when it is reasonably foreseeable that doing so may cause the vehicle to careen out of control and injure an innocent bystander.
3. Officers should not discharge their firearms at any part of a vehicle in an attempt to disable the vehicle.

F. **Shooting from a Moving Vehicle:** Discharging a firearm from a moving vehicle is prohibited unless an officer reasonably believes or perceives that the subject is using or is about to use deadly force against the officer or another person, and the officer reasonably believes there are no other reasonable means available to avert the threat posed by the subject.

**300.11 REPORTING THE USE OF FORCE**

A. All officers involved in a use of force incident shall immediately inform a supervisor of the event. Any use of force by an officer shall be documented promptly, completely, and accurately in an appropriate report prepared by a supervisor according to the Department’s Use of Force Reporting Procedures. The officer should articulate the factors perceived and why the officer believed the use of force was reasonable under the circumstances.

B. Upon notification of a use of force incident, a supervisor shall immediately respond to the scene and conduct an investigation as set forth in the Use of Force Reporting Procedures.

C. To collect data for purposes of training, resource allocation, analysis, and related purposes, the Department may require the completion of additional report forms, as specified in department policy, procedure, or law.

D. All officers involved in a use of force incident, investigating supervisors, evidence technicians collecting evidence of a use of force incident, and command personnel, where appropriate, shall comply with the Department’s Use of Force Reporting Procedures.

**300.12 MEDICAL TREATMENT / EVALUATION**

A. Once it is reasonably safe to do so, officers shall immediately request medical assistance for any person who exhibits signs of physical or mental distress, has sustained visible injury, expresses a complaint of injury or continuing pain, or was rendered unconscious.

B. An officer should take steps to obtain medical attention for a person who reasonably appears to be mentally ill and is behaving in a manner that is likely to result in serious harm to the person or to others.
C. Any individual exhibiting signs of physical or mental distress after an encounter should be continuously monitored until the individual can be medically assessed.

D. Individuals shall not be placed on their stomachs for an extended period, as this could impair their ability to breathe.

E. Officers shall render emergency first aid within the limits of their individual skills, training and available equipment until professional medical care providers arrive on the scene.

F. The on-scene supervisor or, if the on-scene supervisor is not available, the primary officer shall ensure that any person providing medical care or receiving custody of a person following any use of force is informed that the person was subjected to force.

G. Individuals who exhibit extreme agitation, violent irrational behavior accompanied by profuse sweating, extraordinary strength beyond their physical characteristics, and imperviousness to pain (sometimes called “excited delirium”), or who require a protracted physical encounter with multiple officers to be brought under control, may be at an increased risk of sudden death. Calls involving these persons shall be considered medical emergencies. Officers who reasonably suspect a medical emergency should request medical assistance as soon as practicable and have medical personnel stage nearby if the scene is not yet secure.

H. Officers should document requests for medical or mental health treatment, refusals of medical or mental health treatment, as well as efforts to arrange for such treatment. Any refusal, whenever practicable, should be witnessed by another officer and/or medical personnel. If a recording is made of the contact or an interview with the individual, any refusal should be included in the recording, if possible.

I. The on-scene supervisor shall notify the Duty Chief through the chain of command where any subject requires treatment at a hospital.

300.13 TRAINING

A. Officers will receive annual in-service training on this policy and demonstrate their knowledge and understanding.

B. Subject to available resources, officers should receive periodic training on:

1. Guidelines regarding vulnerable populations, including but not limited to children, elderly, pregnant persons, and individuals with physical, mental, or intellectual disabilities.
2. De-escalation tactics, including alternatives to force.

3. Application of use of force and conflict strategies as required by the New York State Use of Force Model Policy (Executive Law § 840).

4. Firearms qualification, proficiency and training, defensive tactics, constitutional use of force principles, threat assessment, reality-based training, Taser training, and verbal and non-verbal communication skills.

**300.14 USE OF FORCE ANALYSIS**

At least annually, the Department should prepare an analysis of use of force incidents. The analysis should be submitted to the Chief of Police. The analysis should include a needs assessment and provide recommendations regarding training, equipment, and policy. The analysis should not contain the names of officers, suspects, or case numbers.

**300.15 POLICY AVAILABILITY**

This policy shall be readily available to the public upon request and shall be posted on the department website.

**300.16 PROHIBITED USE OF POLICY**

This policy is for internal use only to provide operational guideposts and does not, and is not intended to, define any applicable legal standard, but in many instances defines conduct that exceeds current standards. Nothing in this policy is intended to create or does create an enforceable legal right, duty of care, or private right of action. Any corrective action or discipline taken in response to violation of this policy is subject to the exclusive discretion of the Office of the Chief of Police.
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BODY WORN CAMERAS (Draft)

424.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

A. This policy provides guidelines for the use of Body Worn Cameras ("BWCs") by Officers of the Syracuse Police Department (the "Department") while in the performance of their duties.

B. The goal of the BWC program is to enhance public trust in the Department by providing greater transparency into officer actions. Recording law enforcement interactions between officers and members of the public provides valuable information for officer accountability and effective criminal investigations.

C. This policy does not apply to mobile audio/video recordings, dashboard cameras, interviews or interrogations conducted at any Department facility, authorized undercover operations, wiretaps or concealed listening devices.

424.2 POLICY

A. The Department will assign each officer in the Uniform Bureau, including Sergeants, with a BWC for use during the performance of their duties.

B. For purposes of this policy, a law enforcement activity is any activity where the officer is on duty and is pursuing a law enforcement objective or purpose. Law enforcement activities generally include activities such as calls for service, detentions/stops of persons and vehicles, field interviews, service of warrants, arrests, transports, pursuits, all investigatory activities, and any use of force. Law enforcement activities do not include administrative duty time or on-duty activities that do not involve civilian interaction, except as otherwise specified in this policy.

B. An officer assigned to secondary employment is considered on duty for purpose of this policy, and shall use the Department-assigned BWC during the secondary employment shift consistent with this policy.

424.3 OFFICER RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Prior to going into service, each officer is responsible for ensuring that the officer is equipped with their assigned BWC, and that the BWC is charged and in good working order. If the BWC is not in working order or if the officer becomes aware of a malfunction
at any time, the officer shall promptly report the failure to their supervisor and obtain a functioning device as soon as reasonably practicable. The supervisor shall document any instance where an officer is on-duty without an operational BWC in an Interdepartmental Memo.

B. Officers shall wear the BWC in a conspicuous manner or otherwise notify persons that they are being recorded, whenever reasonably practicable.

C. Officers assigned a BWC shall turn the device into the ON position for the officer’s entire shift.

D. Officers shall document the existence of a recording in any report or other official record of the contact, including any instance where the BWC malfunctioned or the officer de-activated the recording. Officers shall include the reason for de-activation.

E. Officers shall place their BWCs into docking stations at the end of their shift and shall not remove BWCs from the Department facility while off duty.

424.4 ACTIVATION OF THE BWC

A. A BWC that is in the ON position is not recording until activated. Therefore, officers must activate the BWC immediately at the start of each law enforcement activity, unless it is not safe and feasible. Where immediate activation is not safe and feasible, the officer shall activate the BWC as soon as possible.

B. Once activated, the BWC shall remain activated continuously until the entire law enforcement activity concludes, or until the situation no longer fits the criteria for activation.

C. Recording of a law enforcement activity is required even if the event is out of view of the camera.

D. The following law enforcement activities shall always be recorded:
   1. Dispatched calls, starting before the officer arrives on the call to ensure adequate time to activate the BWC;
   2. Vehicle and pedestrian stops;
   3. On-view infractions and criminal activity;
   4. Investigatory stops and arrests;
   5. Other investigatory activities;
   6. Searches and inventories of vehicles, persons, or premises;
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7. Handling and counting of currency;
8. Transports (excluding ride-alongs and passengers for meetings);
9. Following or riding in ambulances or medic units that are transporting persons involved in an event to a medical facility;
10. Vehicle and foot pursuits;
11. Questioning victims, suspects, or witnesses (This does not include conversations with persons merely wishing to pass on information about general criminal activity not tied to a specific event);
12. Interviews by supervisors in the course of a use of force investigation.

E. Recording may be stopped during administrative duty time including significant periods of inactivity such as report writing or other prolonged breaks where the officer is not directly participating or interacting with the public.

424.5 ACTIVATION DURING SPECIAL OPERATIONS

A. Officers shall activate BWCs during raids, search warrant executions, and arrest warrant executions, and continue to record in accordance with this policy.

B. Officers assigned to crowd control situations, including protests, demonstrations, and civil disorder situations, shall record unless otherwise directed by the Chief of Police or their designee.

C. Officers assigned to a Command Post shall not record with a BWC in a Command Post.

424.6 PROTECTING PRIVACY AND DIGNITY

A. There may be circumstances when the respect for an individual’s privacy or dignity outweighs the need to record a law enforcement activity. In these circumstances, the officer is permitted to exercise limited discretion to decide to not record or cease recording. This discretion may only be applied when a reasonable officer would conclude that such privacy interests outweigh any legitimate law enforcement interest in recording. Such circumstances may include natural death scenes, death notifications, child victim interviews, cultural or religious objections to being recorded, and when the use of BWC would impede or limit the cooperation of a victim or witness.

B. Requests by the public to stop recording should be considered using this same criterion. Recording should resume when privacy is no longer at issue unless the circumstances no longer fit the criteria for recording.
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C. An officer who exercises discretion to not record due to privacy interests shall document this decision in the incident report, and articulate the facts and circumstances that led to this decision.

424.7 RECORDING PROHIBITIONS AND LIMITATIONS

A. Officers shall not record in the interior of restrooms, jails, courtrooms, or grand jury rooms.

B. Officers shall not record in the interior of medical, mental health, counseling, or therapeutic facilities unless for the following specified law enforcement purposes:

1. Crimes in progress;
2. Taking resistant arrestees into custody;
3. Ongoing or impending use(s) of force;
4. Recording an allegation of misconduct against a member of the Department;
5. Supervisor interviews or arrestees for use of force investigations and arrest screenings.

C. Officers shall not record a victim of a sex offense.

D. Officers assigned to the Emergency Response Team (ERT) (e.g. SWAT, Bomb Unit, Crisis Response Unit etc.) shall not record operational briefings unless directed by a supervisor.

E. Officers may, in their discretion, choose not to record meetings or conversations with compensated confidential informants, street sources, or non-compensated informants.

F. Officers are not required to wear or use BWCs while engaged in undercover activities, decoy operations, plainclothes surveillances, or other non-uniform and covert police activities.

G. BWCs shall not be used where an explosive device may be present.

424.8 DOCUMENTATION OF BWC RECORDINGS

Officers will document the existence of pertinent BWC recordings in various Department reports and forms in accordance with training. When a BWC is utilized during a law enforcement activity, officers shall note the following statement on the first line of the narrative section of the incident report: “This incident was captured on a Body Worn Camera”. Officers shall also note on the arrest and other related reports when recordings were made during the incident in question. BWC recordings are not a replacement for written reports.
424.9 PROHIBITED USE OF BWCs AND RECORDINGS

A. Officers are prohibited from using BWCs for personal use and are prohibited from making personal copies of recordings created while on-duty or while acting in an official capacity.

B. Officers are prohibited from using BWCs while off duty.

C. Officers shall not duplicate or distribute BWC recordings, except for authorized legitimate Department business purposes. All such recordings shall be retained at the Department.

D. Officers shall not post BWC recordings on the internet, social media sites, or distribute to the media, or otherwise disseminate BWC recordings in any way.

E. Officers are prohibited from using personally owned recording devices for law enforcement purposes.

F. Recordings shall not be used by any officer for the purpose of embarrassment, harassment or ridicule.

G. Officers shall not alter, tamper with, delete, damage, or destroy any BWC or BWC recording or attempt to do the same unless assigned as a BWC Program Coordinator and specifically authorized to do so by Department policy.

424.10 RETENTION OF RECORDINGS

All recordings shall be retained for the applicable period set forth in the Department’s Record Retention Schedule, but in no event for a period less than 180 days.

424.11 RELEASE OF BWC FOOTAGE

Requests from outside the Department for the release of BWC recordings shall be processed in accordance with the Disclosure of BWC Recordings Procedure.

424.12 REVIEW OF BODY WORN CAMERA VIDEOS

A. Officers may review and use BWC recordings only for official Department duties, which include the following:

   1. Officers may view BWC recordings from their assigned BWC if available to assist in accurate report writing.

      **NOTE:** The purpose of using BWC recordings in writing reports is to maximize the accuracy of the report – not to replace the officer’s independent recollection and perception of an event.
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2. Conducting criminal investigations;
3. Conducting supervisory duties;
4. Preparing for testimony relating to their official police duties;
5. Training upon approval of the Commanding Officer of the Training Division, the Commanding Officer of a Specialized Unit, or the Chief of Police or their designee;
6. Assist with training and evaluation in the Department's Field Training and Personnel Evaluation Programs;
7. Performing other official SPD duties as authorized by Department policy or by the Chief of Police or their designee.

B. Supervisors/Command staff may review BWC recordings:

1. To review an officer’s performance and/or professional development;
2. To facilitate training of an officer;
3. To Investigate meritorious conduct or reports of misconduct.

C. Department Investigations of Officers:

1. Department personnel assigned to the Office of Professional Standards (“OPS”) will be given direct access to the BWC System and are authorized to access and copy BWC recordings as needed to perform their duties.

   NOTE: Prior to being disciplined for performance issues or misconduct, officers will be permitted to view any BWC footage that was used by the Department in its investigation of the conduct, as well as specific BWC footage that the Officer believes is reasonably related to their performance issue or misconduct that is the subject of the Department investigation.

424.13 PROGRAM & POLICY COMPLIANCE

A. At least on a monthly basis, command officers or supervisors will randomly review five BWC recordings per subordinate to ensure that the equipment is operating properly, that the officers are using the devices appropriately and in accordance with policy, and to identify and document any areas in which additional training or guidance is required.

B. If any deviation from policy is discovered, the supervisor’s findings will be documented on an Inter-Department Memo and forwarded up the chain of command.

424.14 OFFICER PRIVACY EXPECTATION

All recordings made by officers on any Department-issued device at any time, and any recording made while acting in an official capacity of this Department, regardless of ownership of the
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device it was made on, shall remain the property of the Department. Officers shall have no expectation of privacy or ownership interest in the content of these recordings.

424.15 BWC PROGRAM COORDINATOR

A. The Chief of Police or the authorized designee will designate a coordinator responsible for:

1. Establishing procedures for the security, storage and maintenance of data and recordings;
2. Establishing procedures for accessing data and recordings;
3. Establishing procedures for logging or auditing access;
4. Establishing procedures for transferring, downloading, tagging or marking events.
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Vehicle Pursuits

307.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this policy is to establish Departmental procedures governing vehicle pursuits, pursuit tactics and the use of roadblocks. Syracuse police officers have the sworn responsibility to protect the life and property of all persons within the City of Syracuse and to apprehend law violators. Indiscriminate and uncontrolled vehicle pursuits for the purpose of apprehending fleeing subjects violates this sworn responsibility by endangering the life of the officer, the suspect being pursued, other drivers, the public and property. Given that no policy can realistically predict every possible situation an officer might encounter, members are entrusted to use well-reasoned discretion when operating in a pursuit, and shall operate with due regard to the safety of the public.

It is the policy of the Syracuse Police Department that vehicle pursuits shall be limited to those instances when, in the officer’s judgment, the danger created by the possible escape of the fleeing suspect outweighs the danger created by a pursuit, and no reasonable alternative exists.

307.1.1 DEFINITIONS

Definitions related to this policy include:

**Blocking or vehicle intercept** - A slow-speed coordinated maneuver where two or more pursuing vehicles simultaneously intercept and block the movement of a suspect vehicle, the driver of which may be unaware of the impending enforcement stop. The goal is containment and preventing a pursuit. Blocking is not a moving or stationary road block.

**Boxing-in** - A tactic designed to stop a suspect’s vehicle by surrounding it with law enforcement vehicles and then slowing all vehicles to a stop.

**Ramming** - The deliberate act of contacting a suspect’s vehicle with another law enforcement vehicle to functionally damage or otherwise force the suspect’s vehicle to stop.

**Roadblocks** - A tactic designed to stop a suspect’s vehicle by intentionally placing a law enforcement vehicle or other immovable object in the path of the suspect’s vehicle.

**Terminate** - To discontinue a pursuit or stop chasing fleeing vehicles.

**Tire deflation device** - A device designed to puncture the tires of the pursued vehicle. This controlled deflation will cause a reduction in speed, thus allowing the pursuing officers to gain control over the suspect.

**Trail** - Following the path of the pursuit at a safe speed while obeying all traffic laws and without activating emergency equipment. If the pursuit is at a slow rate of speed, the trailing vehicle will maintain sufficient distance from the pursuit vehicles so as to clearly indicate an absence of participation in the pursuit.
Vehicle pursuit - An event involving one or more law enforcement officers attempting to apprehend a suspect, who is attempting to avoid arrest while operating a vehicle by using high-speed driving or other evasive tactics, such as driving off a highway, turning suddenly or driving in a legal manner but willfully failing to yield to an officer’s emergency signal to stop.

307.2  POLICY

It is the policy of this department to weigh the importance of apprehending suspects who unlawfully flee from law enforcement against the risks associated with vehicle pursuits, however, given that no policy can realistically predict every possible situation an officer might encounter, officers are entrusted to use well-reasoned discretion in determining when it is appropriate to initiate or terminate a pursuit as well as the tactics used during the pursuit.

307.3  OFFICER RESPONSIBILITIES

Vehicle pursuits should only be conducted using authorized police department emergency vehicles that are equipped with emergency lighting and sirens.

Officers shall drive with reasonable care for the safety of all persons and property. However, officers may, when in pursuit of a suspect and provided there is no unreasonable risk to persons and property (Vehicle and Traffic Law § 1104):

(a) Stop, stand or park in violation of the rules of the road.

(b) Proceed past a steady red signal, a flashing red signal or a stop sign, but only after slowing down as may be necessary for safe operation and it is clear and safe to proceed.

(c) Exceed the maximum speed limits so long as life and property are not endangered.

(d) Disregard vehicle and traffic regulations except for those specifically forbidden under this policy.

307.3.1  WHEN TO INITIATE A PURSUIT

A member is authorized to engage in a motor vehicle pursuit if the officer reasonably believes that the suspect has committed or is about to commit any felony or a violent misdemeanor against a person.

Factors that shall be considered, both individually and collectively, when deciding to initiate or continue a pursuit include, but are not limited to:

(a) The seriousness of the known or reasonably suspected crime and its relationship to community safety.

(b) The importance of protecting the public and balancing the known or reasonably suspected offense and the apparent need for immediate capture against the risks to officers, innocent motorists and others.
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(c) The safety of the public in the area of the pursuit, including the type of area, time of day, the amount of vehicular and pedestrian traffic (e.g., school zones) and the speed of the pursuit relative to these factors.

(d) The pursuing officers’ familiarity with the area of the pursuit, the quality of radio communications between the pursuing vehicles and 911 center dispatchers/supervisor, and the driving capabilities of the pursuing officers under the conditions of the pursuit.

(e) Whether weather, traffic and road conditions unreasonably increase the danger of the pursuit when weighed against the risks resulting from the suspect’s escape.

(f) Whether the identity of the suspect has been verified and whether there is comparatively minimal risk in allowing the suspect to be apprehended at a later time.

(g) The performance capabilities of the vehicles used in the pursuit in relation to the speed and other conditions of the pursuit.

(h) Emergency lighting and siren limitations on unmarked police department vehicles that may reduce visibility of the vehicle, such as visor or dash-mounted lights, concealable or temporary emergency lighting equipment and concealed or obstructed siren positioning.

(i) Vehicle speeds.

(j) Other persons in or on the pursued vehicle (e.g., passengers, co-offenders and hostages).

(k) The availability of other resources, such as air support assistance.

(l) Whether the pursuing vehicle is carrying passengers other than on-duty police officers. Pursuits shall not be undertaken with an arrestee in the pursuit vehicle.

307.3.2 WHEN TO TERMINATE A PURSUIT

Pursuits should be terminated whenever the totality of objective circumstances known or which reasonably ought to be known to the officer or supervisor during the pursuit indicates that the present risks of continuing the pursuit reasonably appear to outweigh the risks resulting from the suspect’s escape.

When a supervisor directs the pursuit to be terminated, officers will immediately terminate the pursuit.

The factors listed in this policy on when to initiate a pursuit will apply equally to the decision to terminate a pursuit. Officers and supervisors must objectively and continuously weigh the seriousness of the offense against the potential danger to innocent motorists, themselves and the public when electing to continue a pursuit.

In addition to the factors that govern when to initiate a pursuit, other factors should be considered in deciding whether to terminate a pursuit, including:
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(a) The distance between the pursuing vehicle and the fleeing vehicle is so great that further pursuit would be futile or require the pursuit to continue for an unreasonable time or distance.

(b) The pursued vehicle’s location is no longer definitely known.

(c) The pursuing vehicle sustains damage or a mechanical failure that renders it unsafe to drive.

(d) The pursuing vehicle’s emergency lighting equipment or siren becomes partially or completely inoperable.

(e) Hazards posed to uninvolved bystanders or motorists.

(f) The danger that the continued pursuit poses to the public, the officers or the suspect, balanced against the risk of allowing the suspect to remain at large.

(g) The identity of the suspect is known and it does not reasonably appear that the need for immediate capture outweighs the risks associated with continuing the pursuit.

307.3.3 PROHIBITED ACTIONS

The following actions are prohibited by Members during a vehicle pursuit:

(a) Ramming suspect vehicles.

(b) Boxing in or surrounding a suspect vehicle (marked and unmarked units may be used to box in an unaware suspect in order to avoid a pursuit).

(c) Overtaking, driving next to, or forcing suspect vehicles off the roadway.

(d) Creating roadblocks. Roadblock is defined as any method, restriction (including a partial restriction), or obstruction, used or intended for the purpose of preventing free passage of motor vehicles on a highway or street, in order to effect the apprehension of an actual or suspected violator in a motor vehicle.

(e) Discharging a firearm from a moving vehicle during an on-going pursuit.

(f) Entering an Interstate highway against the normal flow of traffic.

(g) Pursuits with an arrestee in the pursuit vehicle.

(h) Engaging in a pursuit in a specialized vehicle (i.e. evidence technician van, prisoner transport vehicle, other specialty unit vehicles).

307.4 PURSUIT VEHICLES

When involved in a pursuit, unmarked police department emergency vehicles should be replaced by marked emergency vehicles whenever practicable.

Vehicle pursuits should be limited to three police department emergency vehicles (two pursuit vehicles and the supervisor vehicle). However, the number of vehicles involved will vary with the circumstances.
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An officer or supervisor may request that additional vehicles join a pursuit if, after assessing the factors outlined above, it appears that the number of officers involved would be insufficient to safely arrest the number of suspects. All other officers shall stay out of the pursuit but should remain alert to its progress and location. Any officer who drops out of a pursuit may then, if necessary, proceed to the pursuit termination point at legal speeds, following the appropriate rules of the road.

307.4.1 MOTORCYCLES

Best Practice

When involved in a pursuit, police department motorcycles should be replaced by marked emergency vehicles as soon as practicable.

307.4.2 VEHICLES WITHOUT EMERGENCY EQUIPMENT

Best Practice

Officers operating vehicles not equipped with emergency lights and siren are prohibited from initiating or joining in any pursuit. Officers in such vehicles may provide support to pursuing vehicles as long as the vehicle is operated in compliance with all traffic laws. Those officers should discontinue such support immediately upon arrival of a sufficient number of authorized emergency police department vehicles or any air support.

307.4.3 PRIMARY PURSUIT VEHICLE RESPONSIBILITIES

Best Practice

The initial pursuing officer will be designated as the primary pursuit vehicle and will be responsible for the conduct of the pursuit unless they are unable to remain reasonably close to the suspect's vehicle. The primary responsibility of the officer initiating the pursuit is the apprehension of the suspect without unreasonable danger to him/herself or others.

The primary pursuing officer should notify the 911 center dispatchers, commencing with a request for priority radio traffic, that a vehicle pursuit has been initiated, and as soon as practicable provide information including, but not limited to:

(a) The location, direction of travel and estimated speed of the suspect’s vehicle.
(b) The description of the suspect’s vehicle including the license plate number, if known.
(c) The reason for the pursuit.
(d) The use of firearms, threat of force, violence, injuries, hostages or other unusual hazards.
(e) The number of occupants and identity or description.
(f) The weather, road and traffic conditions.
(g) The need for any additional resources or equipment.
(h) The identity of other law enforcement agencies involved in the pursuit.

Until relieved by a supervisor or a secondary pursuing officer, the officer in the primary pursuit vehicle shall be responsible for broadcasting the progress of the pursuit. Unless circumstances reasonably indicate otherwise, the primary pursuing officer should, as soon as practicable,
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relinquish the responsibility of broadcasting the progress of the pursuit to an officer in a secondary pursuit vehicle or to air support joining the pursuit to minimize distractions and allow the primary pursuing officer to concentrate foremost on safe pursuit tactics.

307.4.4 SECONDARY PURSUIT VEHICLE RESPONSIBILITIES

The second officer in the pursuit will be designated as the secondary pursuit vehicle and is responsible for:

(a) Immediately notifying the 911 center dispatchers of their entry into the pursuit.
(b) Remaining a safe distance behind the primary pursuit vehicle unless directed to assume the role of primary pursuit vehicle or if the primary pursuit vehicle is unable to continue the pursuit.
(c) Broadcasting information that the primary pursuing officer is unable to provide.
(d) Broadcasting the progress of the pursuit, updating known or critical information and providing changes in the pursuit, unless the situation indicates otherwise.
(e) Identifying the need for additional resources or equipment as appropriate.
(f) Serving as backup to the primary pursuing officer once the suspect has been stopped.

307.5 PURSUIT DRIVING

The decision to use specific driving tactics requires the same assessment of the factors the officer considered when determining whether to initiate and/or terminate a pursuit. The following are tactics for officers who are involved in the pursuit:

(a) Officers, considering their driving skills and vehicle performance capabilities, will space themselves from other involved vehicles such that they are able to see and avoid hazards or react safely to unusual maneuvers by the fleeing vehicle.
(b) Because intersections can present increased risks, the following tactics should be considered:
   1. Available officers not directly involved in the pursuit may proceed safely to controlled intersections ahead of the pursuit in an effort to warn cross traffic.
   2. Pursuing officers should exercise due caution and slow down as may be necessary when proceeding through controlled intersections.
(c) The pursuit of a vehicle on an Interstate highway against the normal flow of traffic is prohibited. If a pursued vehicle enters an Interstate highway traveling the wrong way, the primary unit will notify the dispatcher. Additional units shall be dispatched to attempt to locate the vehicle from the lane(s), with the normal flow of traffic and by covering exit/entrance ramps where the pursused vehicle may attempt to exit.
   1. Request assistance from available air support.
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2. Maintain visual contact with the pursued vehicle by paralleling the vehicle while driving on the correct side of the roadway.

3. Request other officers to observe exits available to the suspect.

   (d) Notify the New York State Police or other law enforcement agency if it appears that the pursuit may enter its jurisdiction.

   (e) Officers involved in a pursuit should not attempt to pass other pursuing vehicles unless the situation indicates otherwise or they are requested to do so by the pursuing officer and with a clear understanding of the maneuver process between the involved officers.

307.5.1 PURSUIT TRAILING

Best Practice

In the event that initial pursuing officers relinquish control of the pursuit to another agency, the initial officers may, with the permission of a supervisor, trail the pursuit to the termination point in order to provide information and assistance for the arrest of the suspect and reporting the incident.

307.5.2 AIR SUPPORT ASSISTANCE

Best Practice MODIFIED

At the request of the supervisor, and when available, air support assistance may be requested. Once the air support crew has established visual contact with the pursued vehicle, they should assume communication control over the pursuit. The primary and secondary ground pursuit vehicles, or involved supervisor, will maintain operational control but should consider whether the participation of air support warrants their continued close proximity and/or involvement in the pursuit.

The air support crew should coordinate the activities of resources on the ground, report progress of the pursuit, and provide officers and supervisors with details of upcoming traffic congestion, road hazards or other pertinent information to evaluate whether to continue the pursuit. If officers on the ground are not within visual contact of the pursued vehicle and the air support crew determines that it is unsafe to continue the pursuit, the air support crew may recommend terminating the pursuit.

307.5.3 OFFICERS NOT INVOLVED IN THE PURSUIT

Best Practice

Officers who are not involved in the pursuit should remain in their assigned areas, should not parallel the pursuit route and should not become involved with the pursuit unless directed otherwise by a supervisor. Uninvolved officers are authorized to use emergency equipment at intersections along the pursuit path to clear intersections of vehicular and pedestrian traffic to protect the public. Those officers should attempt to place their vehicles in locations that provide some safety or an escape route in the event of an unintended collision or if the suspect intentionally tries to ram the police department vehicle.

Non-pursuing members needed at the pursuit termination point should respond in a non-emergency manner, observing the rules of the road.
The primary pursuit vehicle, secondary pursuit vehicle and supervisor vehicle should be the only vehicles operating under emergency conditions (emergency lights and siren) unless other officers are assigned to the pursuit.

### 307.6 SUPERVISORY CONTROL AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Supervisory and management control will be exercised immediately over all vehicle pursuits involving officers from this department.

The field supervisor of the officer initiating the pursuit, or if unavailable, the nearest field supervisor, will be responsible for:

(a) Immediately notifying involved officers and the 911 center dispatchers of supervisory presence and ascertaining all reasonably available information to continuously assess the situation and risk factors associated with the pursuit. This is to ensure that the pursuit is conducted within established department guidelines.

(b) Engaging in the pursuit, when appropriate, to provide on-scene supervision.

(c) Exercising management and control of the pursuit even if not engaged in it.

(d) Ensuring that no more than the required law enforcement vehicles are involved in the pursuit under the guidelines set forth in this policy.

(e) Directing that the pursuit be terminated if, in their judgment, it is not justified to continue the pursuit under the guidelines of this policy.

(f) Ensuring that assistance from air support, canines or additional resources is requested, if available and appropriate.

(g) Ensuring that the proper radio channel is being used.

(h) Ensuring that the Patrol Lieutenant is notified of the pursuit, as soon as practicable.

(i) Ensuring the notification and/or coordination of outside agencies if the pursuit either leaves or is likely to leave the jurisdiction of this department.

(j) Controlling and managing Syracuse Police Department officers when a pursuit enters another jurisdiction.

(k) Preparing a post-pursuit review and documentation of the pursuit as required.

### 307.6.1 PATROL LIEUTENANT RESPONSIBILITIES

The Patrol Lieutenant shall monitor and continually assess the situation and ensure the pursuit is conducted within the guidelines and requirements of this policy. The Patrol Lieutenant has the final responsibility for the coordination, control and termination of a vehicle pursuit and shall be in overall command.

The Patrol Lieutenant shall review all pertinent reports for content and forward them to the Commanding Officer.
Vehicle Pursuits

307.7  ONONDAGA COUNTY 911 CENTER

If the pursuit is confined within the City limits, radio communications will be conducted on the primary channel unless instructed otherwise by a patrol supervisor. If the pursuit leaves the jurisdiction of this department or such is imminent, involved officers should, whenever available, switch radio communications to a tactical or emergency channel most accessible by participating agencies.

307.7.1  RESPONSIBILITIES

Upon notification or becoming aware that a pursuit has been initiated, the 911 center dispatchers are responsible for:

(a) Clearing the radio channel of non-emergency traffic.
(b) Coordinating pursuit communications of the involved officers.
(c) Broadcasting pursuit updates as well as other pertinent information as necessary.
(d) Ensuring that a field supervisor is notified of the pursuit.
(e) Notifying and coordinating with other involved or affected agencies as practicable.
(f) Notifying the Patrol Lieutenant as soon as practicable.
(g) Assigning an incident number and logging all pursuit activities.

307.8  LOSS OF PURSUED VEHICLE

When the pursued vehicle is lost, the involved officers should broadcast pertinent information to assist other officers in locating the vehicle. The primary pursuing officer or supervisor will be responsible for coordinating any further search for either the pursued vehicle or suspects fleeing on foot.

307.9  INTERJURISDICTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

When a pursuit enters another agency's jurisdiction, the primary pursuing officer or supervisor, taking into consideration the distance traveled, unfamiliarity with the area and other pertinent facts, should determine whether to request the other agency to assume the pursuit.

Unless entry into another jurisdiction is expected to be brief, it is generally recommended that the primary pursuing officer or supervisor ensure that notification is provided to each outside jurisdiction into which the pursuit is reasonably expected to enter, regardless of whether the jurisdiction is expected to assist.

307.9.1  ASSUMPTION OF PURSUIT BY ANOTHER AGENCY

Copyright Lexipol, LLC 2021/01/22, All Rights Reserved. Published with permission by Syracuse Police Department
When pursuing a vehicle into another jurisdiction a supervisor will decide as to whether or not the pursuit should continue. If the pursuit is terminated the supervisor will ensure that notification is made through the 911 center to the relevant jurisdiction, including but not limited to:

(a) The reason for the pursuit
(b) The highest crime
(c) Any additional risk factors

Notification of a pursuit in progress should not be construed as a request to join the pursuit. Requests to or from another agency to assume a pursuit should be specific. Because of communication limitations between local law enforcement agencies, a request for another agency’s assistance will be made by a supervisor monitoring the pursuit.

307.9.2 PURSUITS EXTENDING INTO THIS JURISDICTION

The agency that initiates a pursuit shall be responsible for conducting the pursuit. Officers from this department should not join a pursuit unless specifically requested to do so by the pursuing agency, with approval from a supervisor, and provided the pursuit complies with department policy. The exception to this is when a single vehicle from the initiating agency is in pursuit. Under this circumstance, an officer from this department may, with supervisor approval, immediately join the pursuit until sufficient vehicles from the initiating agency join the pursuit or until additional information is provided allowing withdrawal from the pursuit.

When a request is made for this department to assist or take over a pursuit that has entered the jurisdiction of the Syracuse Police Department, the supervisor should consider:

(a) The public’s safety within this jurisdiction.
(b) The safety of the pursuing officers.
(c) Whether the circumstances are serious enough to continue the pursuit.
(d) Whether there is adequate staffing to continue the pursuit.
(e) The ability to maintain the pursuit.

As soon as practicable, a supervisor or the Patrol Lieutenant should review a request for assistance from another agency. The Patrol Lieutenant or supervisor, after considering the above factors, may decline to assist in or assume the other agency’s pursuit.

Assistance to a pursuing agency by officers of this department will conclude at the City limits, provided that the pursuing agency has sufficient assistance from other sources. Ongoing participation from this department may continue only until sufficient assistance is present.

In the event that the termination point of a pursuit from another agency is within this jurisdiction, officers shall provide appropriate assistance including, but not limited to, scene control, coordination and completion of supplemental reports and any other assistance requested or needed.
307.10 PURSUIT INTERVENTION

Best Practice MODIFIED NYSLEAP - 8.4 - 43.4 (F), 43.5

Pursuit intervention is an attempt to stop the suspect’s ability to continue to flee in a vehicle through tactical application of technology, tire deflation devices, blocking or vehicle intercept, boxing-in, ramming or roadblock procedures.

307.10.1 WHEN USE IS AUTHORIZED

Best Practice NYSLEAP - 8.4 - 43.4 (F)

Whenever practicable, an officer shall seek approval from a supervisor before employing any intervention to stop the pursued vehicle. In deciding whether to use intervention tactics, officers/supervisors should balance the risk of allowing the pursuit to continue with the potential hazards arising from the use of each tactic to the public, the officers and persons in or on the pursued vehicle. With this in mind, the decision to use any intervention tactic should be reasonable in light of the circumstances apparent to the officer at the time of the decision.

307.10.2 USE OF FIREARMS

Best Practice MODIFIED

The use of firearms to disable a pursued vehicle is not generally an effective tactic and involves all the dangers associated with discharging firearms. Officers are prohibited from discharging their firearms from their moving vehicle during an ongoing pursuit.

307.10.3 INTERVENTION STANDARDS

Best Practice MODIFIED NYSLEAP - 8.4 - 43.4 (F), 43.5

Tire deflation devices should be deployed only after notification of pursuing officers and the supervisor of the intent and location of the intended deployment, and in a manner that:

(a) Should reasonably only affect the pursued vehicle.
(b) Provides the deploying officer adequate cover and escape from intentional or unintentional exposure to the approaching vehicle.
(c) Takes into account the limitations of such devices as well as the potential risk to officers, the public and occupants of the pursued vehicle.
(d) Takes into account whether the pursued vehicle is a motorcycle, a vehicle transporting hazardous materials or a school bus transporting children.

The tire deflation device shall not be deployed on two wheeled vehicles unless the use of deadly force can be legally justified. Only officers trained in the use of the tire deflation device are authorized to deploy it.

Members shall not engage in, nor will police vehicles be used, for the following purposes:

(a) Ramming suspect vehicles.
(b) Boxing in or surrounding a suspect vehicle (marked and unmarked units may be used to box in an unaware suspect in order to avoid a pursuit).

(c) Overtaking, driving next to, or forcing suspect vehicles off the roadway.

(d) Creating roadblocks. Roadblock is defined as any method, restriction (including a partial restriction), or obstruction, used or intended for the purpose of preventing free passage of motor vehicles on a highway or street, in order to effect the apprehension of an actual or suspected violator in a motor vehicle.

See procedure for TIRE DEFLATION DEVICES

307.11 CAPTURE OF SUSPECTS

Best Practice

Proper self-discipline and sound professional judgment are the keys to a successful conclusion of a pursuit and apprehension of evading suspects. Officers shall use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.

Unless relieved by a supervisor, the primary pursuing officer should coordinate efforts to apprehend the suspect following the pursuit. Officers should consider the safety of the public and the involved officers when formulating plans for setting up perimeters or for containing and capturing the suspect.

307.12 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Best Practice MODIFIED

All appropriate reports shall be completed to comply with appropriate laws and policies or procedures.

(a) The primary pursuing officer shall complete appropriate crime/arrest reports.

(b) The supervisor shall complete a thorough investigation regarding the vehicle pursuit.

(c) Upon completion of the investigation, a Blue Team entry will be completed and forwarded to the appropriate patrol lieutenant. Contained within the Blue Team entry shall be the supervisor’s findings regarding whether or not the vehicle pursuit was in accordance with department policy and training.

(d) The Blue Team entry should include, at a minimum:

1. Date and time of the pursuit.
2. Initial reason and circumstances surrounding the pursuit.
3. Length of pursuit in distance and time, including the starting and termination points.
4. Involved vehicles and officers.
5. Alleged offenses.
6. Whether a suspect was apprehended, as well as the means and methods used.
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(a) Any use of force shall be reported and documented in compliance with the Use of Force Policy.

7. Arrestee information, if applicable.

8. Any injuries and/or medical treatment.

9. Any property or equipment damage.

10. Name of supervisor at the scene or who handled the incident.

(e) Annually, the Chief of Police should direct a documented review and analysis of department vehicle pursuits to minimally include reporting procedures, policy suitability, policy compliance and training needs.

307.13 REGULAR AND PERIODIC PURSUIT TRAINING

All officers shall receive documented initial training and supplemental training on vehicle pursuits. All officers will participate, no less than annually, in regular and periodic training addressing this policy and the importance of vehicle safety and protecting the public. Training will include recognition of the need to balance the known offense and the need for immediate capture against the risks to officers and others.
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Warrant Service

607.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This policy establishes guidelines for the planning and serving of arrest and search warrants by members of this department. It is understood that this policy cannot address every variable or circumstance that can arise in the service of a search or arrest warrant, as these tasks can involve rapidly evolving and unique circumstances.

This policy is intended to be used in conjunction with the Operations Planning and Deconfliction Policy, which has additional guidance on planning and serving high-risk warrants.

This policy is not intended to address the service of search warrants on locations or property already secured or routine field warrant arrests by patrol officers.

607.2 POLICY

It is the policy of the Syracuse Police Department to balance the safety needs of the public, the safety of department members, privacy interests and other relevant factors when making decisions related to the service of search and arrest warrants. All warrants shall be executed pursuant to the requirements of CPL 690.

607.3 SWAT TEAM COMMANDER

The SWAT Team Commander or authorized designee (see the Operations Planning and Deconfliction Policy) shall review all risk assessment forms with the involved supervisor to determine the risk level of the warrant service.

The SWAT Team Commander or authorized designee will also have the responsibility to coordinate service of those warrants that are categorized as high risk. Deconfliction, risk assessment, operational planning, briefing and debriefing should follow guidelines in the Operations Planning and Deconfliction Policy.

607.4 SEARCH WARRANTS

Officers should receive authorization from a supervisor before preparing a search warrant application. Once authorization is received, the officer will prepare the affidavit and search warrant, consulting with the applicable prosecuting attorney as needed. The officer will also complete the risk assessment form and submit it, along with the warrant affidavit, to the appropriate supervisor. Based on the score from the risk assessment form, the supervisor may consult with the SWAT Team Commander for review and classification of risk (see the Operations Planning and Deconfliction Policy).
607.5 ARREST WARRANTS

If an officer reasonably believes that serving an arrest warrant may pose a higher risk than commonly faced on a daily basis, the officer should complete the risk assessment form and submit it to the appropriate supervisor and the SWAT Team Commander for review and classification of risk (see the Operations Planning and Deconfliction Policy).

If the warrant is classified as high risk, service will be coordinated by the SWAT Team Commander. If the warrant is not classified as high risk, the supervisor should weigh the risk of entry into a residence to make an arrest against other alternatives, such as arresting the person outside the residence where circumstances may pose a lower risk.

607.5.1 FUGITIVES FROM JUSTICE

For the guidelines and procedures for the arrest and processing of fugitives from justice who are apprehended by the Syracuse Police Department see below.

See procedure for FUGITIVES FROM JUSTICE

607.6 WARRANT PREPARATION

An officer who prepares a warrant should ensure the documentation in support of the warrant contains as applicable:

(a) Probable cause to support the search or arrest, including relevant dates and times to demonstrate timeliness and facts to support any request for nighttime, no-knock or all persons present warrant execution (CPL § 690.35).

(b) A clear explanation of the affiant’s training, experience and relevant education.

(c) Adequately supported opinions, when relevant, that are not left to unsubstantiated conclusions.

(d) A nexus between the place to be searched and the persons or items central to the investigation. The facts supporting this nexus should be clear and current. For example, the affidavit shall explain why there is probable cause to believe that a particular person is currently residing at a particular location or that the items sought are present at a particular location.

(e) Full disclosure of known or suspected residents at the involved location and any indication of separate living spaces at the involved location. For example, it should be disclosed that several people may be renting bedrooms at a single location, even if the exact location of the rooms is not known.

(f) A specific description of the location to be searched, including photographs of the location, if reasonably available.

(g) A sufficient description of the items to be seized.
**Warrant Service**

(h) Full disclosure of any known exculpatory information relevant to the warrant application (refer to the Brady Information Policy).

(i) If an “all persons present” endorsement is requested, the affidavit shall describe the type of premises (e.g., private or public access), the anticipated number and behavior of the persons expected at the time of warrant execution and whether persons with no connection to the suspected activity may be present (CPL § 690.15).

607.6.1 NO-KNOCK WARRANT APPLICATIONS

Agency Content

Under a limited set of circumstances a member may make an application for a search warrant and request that a search warrant authorize the executing police officer(s) to enter a premises to be searched without giving notice of their authority and purpose (CPL § 690.35(4b)).

Any search warrant application requesting a No-Knock provision, must be reviewed and approved by a command officer (i.e. lieutenant or above) prior to being submitted to the Court.

**Authorization must be granted by the Chief of Police or a Deputy Chief prior to the execution of any No-Knock search warrant.**

Any member making such application to a court shall articulate that there is reasonable cause to believe that:

(a) The property sought may be easily and quickly disposed of, or;

(b) The giving of such notice may endanger the life or safety of the executing officer or another person, or;

(c) In the case of an application for a search warrant as defined in paragraph (b) of subdivision two of section 690.05 for the purpose of searching for and arresting a person who is the subject of a warrant for a felony, the person sought is likely to commit another felony, or may endanger the life or safety of the executing officer or another person.

607.7 HIGH-RISK WARRANT SERVICE

Best Practice MODIFIED

The case supervisor or the authorized designee shall coordinate the service of warrants that are categorized as high risk with the SWAT Team Commander or their authorized designee. The SWAT Team Commander or their authorized designee shall have sole authority in determining the manner in which the warrant will be served, including the number of officers deployed. The SWAT Team Commander shall prepare an operational order prior to each high-risk search warrant that must be approved by the ERT Commander prior to execution.

The member responsible for directing the service should ensure the following as applicable:

(a) When practicable and when doing so does not cause unreasonable risk, video or photographic documentation is made of the condition of the location prior to execution of a search warrant. The images should include the surrounding area and persons present.
**Warrant Service**

(b) The warrant service is audio- and video-recorded when practicable and reasonable to do so.

c) Evidence is handled and collected only by those members who are designated to do so. All other members involved in the service of the warrant should alert one of the designated members to the presence of potential evidence and not touch or disturb the items.

d) Persons who are detained as part of the warrant service are handled appropriately under the circumstances.

e) Reasonable care provisions are made for children and dependent adults (see the Child and Dependent Adult Safety Policy).

(f) A property receipt listing all items seized is prepared and a copy provided to the person in charge of the premises if present. Alternatively, the property receipt shall otherwise be left in a conspicuous place.

g) A copy of the search warrant is left at the location.

(h) The condition of the property is documented with video recording or photographs after the search.

607.8 EXPLOSIVE BREACHING

**Agency Content**

**Explosive Breach:** The use of an explosive breaching charge configured using explosive and non-explosive materials to create an opening through a door, window, wall, or other barriers, to allow access for personnel or resources.

Under a limited set of circumstances, Explosive Breaching may be authorized where there is a need to gain access to a structure or vehicle, and where, after a careful analysis, it is determined to be the safest and most efficient method of entry. In those cases, a specially trained Explosive Breacher will be responsible for the construction, placement, and detonation of all explosive breaching charges.

Examples of cases where explosive breaching may be considered include, but are not limited to entering a structure or vehicle to affect the rescue of hostages, entering a structure to safely execute a high-risk search warrant, or entering a vehicle or structure to rescue trapped officers or citizens.

Absent exigent circumstances that require an immediate response (e.g. - active shooters or hostage rescue), explosive breaching must be authorized by the Chief or Deputy Chief of Police.

607.9 DETENTIONS DURING WARRANT SERVICE

**Best Practice**

Officers must be sensitive to the safety risks of all persons involved with the service of a warrant. Depending on circumstances and facts present, it may be appropriate to control movements of any or all persons present at a warrant service, including those who may not be the subject of a warrant or suspected in the case. However, officers must be mindful that only reasonable force
Warrant Service

may be used and weapons should be displayed no longer than the officer reasonably believes is necessary (see the Use of Force Policy).

As soon as it can be determined that an individual is not subject to the scope of a warrant and that no further reasonable suspicion or safety concerns exist to justify further detention, the person should be promptly released.

Officers should, when and to the extent reasonable, accommodate the privacy and personal needs of people who have been detained.

607.10 ACTIONS AFTER WARRANT SERVICE

Best Practice

The supervisor shall ensure that all affidavits, warrants, receipts and returns, regardless of any associated cases, are filed with the issuing judge or magistrate as soon as reasonably possible, but in any event no later than any date specified on the warrant.

607.11 OUTSIDE AGENCIES AND CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL Warrants

Best Practice MODIFIED

The Deputy Chief of the Investigations Bureau or authorized designee will ensure that cooperative efforts with other agencies in the service of warrants conform to existing mutual aid agreements or other memorandums of understanding and will work cooperatively to mitigate risks including, but not limited to, the following:

- Identity of team members
- Roles and responsibilities
- Familiarity with equipment
- Rules of engagement
- Asset forfeiture procedures

Any outside agency requesting assistance in the service of a warrant within this jurisdiction should be referred to the Deputy Chief of the Investigations Bureau or authorized designee. The Deputy Chief of the Investigations Bureau or authorized designee should review and confirm the warrant, including the warrant location, and should discuss the service with the appropriate supervisor from the other agency. The Deputy Chief of the Investigations Bureau or authorized designee should ensure that members of the Syracuse Police Department are utilized appropriately. Any concerns regarding the requested use of Syracuse Police Department members should be brought to the attention of the Chief of Police or the authorized designee. The actual service of the warrant will remain the responsibility of the agency requesting assistance.

If officers intend to serve a warrant outside Syracuse Police Department jurisdiction, the Deputy Chief of the Investigations Bureau or authorized designee should provide reasonable advance notice to the applicable agency, request assistance as needed and work cooperatively on operational planning and the mitigation of risks detailed in this policy.
Warrant Service

Officers will remain subject to the policies of the Syracuse Police Department when assisting outside agencies or serving a warrant outside Syracuse Police Department jurisdiction.

607.12 MEDIA ACCESS

Best Practice
No advance information regarding warrant service operations shall be released without the approval of the Chief of Police. Any media inquiries or press release after the fact shall be handled in accordance with the Media Relations Policy.

607.13 TRAINING

Best Practice
The Commanding Officer of the Training Division should ensure officers receive periodic training on this policy and associated topics, such as legal issues, warrant preparation, warrant service and reporting requirements.
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Unmanned Aerial System

606.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines for the use of an unmanned aerial system (UAS) and for the storage, retrieval and dissemination of images and data captured by the UAS.

606.1.1 DEFINITIONS

Definitions related to this policy include:

Unmanned aerial system (UAS) - An unmanned aircraft of any type that is capable of sustaining directed flight, whether preprogrammed or remotely controlled (commonly referred to as an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV)), and all of the supporting or attached systems designed for gathering information through imaging, recording or any other means.

Certificate of Waiver or Authorization (COA) - An authorization issued by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to a public operator for a specific UAS. After a complete application is submitted, the FAA conducts a comprehensive operational and technical review. If necessary, provisions or limitations may be imposed as part of the approval to ensure the UAS can operate safely with other airspace users.

FAA Part 107 - Defines operational limits and establishes certification requirements for UAS operators and requires pilots to pass an aeronautical knowledge test at a FAA approved knowledge test center.

606.2 POLICY

A UAS may be utilized to enhance the department’s mission of protecting lives and property when other means and resources are not available or are less effective. Any use of a UAS will be in strict accordance with constitutional and privacy rights and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations.

606.3 PRIVACY

The use of the UAS potentially involves privacy considerations. Absent a warrant or exigent circumstances, operators and observers shall adhere to FAA altitude regulations and shall not intentionally record or transmit images of any location where a person would have a reasonable expectation of privacy (e.g., residence, yard, enclosure). Operators and observers shall take reasonable precautions to avoid inadvertently recording or transmitting images of areas where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy. Reasonable precautions can include, for example, deactivating or turning imaging devices away from such areas or persons during UAS operations.
606.4 PROGRAM COORDINATOR

The Chief of Police will appoint a program coordinator who will be responsible for the management of the UAS program. The program coordinator will ensure that policies and procedures conform to current laws, regulations and best practices and will have the following additional responsibilities:

- Coordinating the FAA Certificate of Waiver or Authorization (COA) application process and ensuring that the COA is current.

- Ensuring that all authorized operators and required observers have completed all required FAA and department-approved training in the operation, applicable laws, policies and procedures regarding use of the UAS.

- Developing uniform protocol for submission and evaluation of requests to deploy a UAS, including urgent requests made during ongoing or emerging incidents. All department UAS – except training missions – should be authorized by a Command Officer and conform to a Certificate of Authorization (COA) and/or Part 107 mission. The Command Officer must confer with a Part 107 Remote Pilot holding a Small Unmanned Aircraft System rating. Except when impractical, a Remote Pilot holding a Small Unmanned Aircraft System rating should be on scene during the missions.

- Developing protocol for conducting criminal investigations involving a UAS, including documentation of time spent monitoring a subject.

- Implementing a system for public notification of UAS deployment.

- Developing an operational protocol governing the deployment and operation of a UAS including, but not limited to, safety oversight, use of visual observers, establishment of lost link procedures and secure communication with air traffic control facilities.

- Developing a protocol for fully documenting all missions.

- Developing a UAS inspection, maintenance and record-keeping protocol to ensure continuing airworthiness of a UAS, up to and including its overhaul or life limits.

- Developing protocols to ensure that all data intended to be used as evidence are accessed, maintained, stored and retrieved in a manner that ensures its integrity as evidence, including strict adherence to chain of custody requirements. Electronic trails, including encryption, authenticity certificates and date and time stamping, shall be used as appropriate to preserve individual rights and to ensure the authenticity and maintenance of a secure evidentiary chain of custody.

- Developing protocols that ensure retention and purge periods are maintained in accordance with established records retention schedules.

- Facilitating law enforcement access to images and data captured by the UAS.

- Recommending program enhancements, particularly regarding safety and information security.

- Ensuring that established protocols are followed by monitoring and providing periodic reports on the program to the Chief of Police.
606.5 USE OF UAS

Only authorized operators who have completed the required training shall be permitted to operate the UAS.

Use of vision enhancement technology (e.g., thermal and other imaging equipment not generally available to the public) is permissible in viewing areas only where there is no protectable privacy interest or when in compliance with a search warrant or court order. In all other instances, legal counsel should be consulted.

UAS operations should be flown in accordance with an approved FAA Facility Map.

PROCEDURES FOR USE OF AN UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM

606.6 PROHIBITED USE

The UAS video surveillance equipment shall not be used:

- To conduct random surveillance activities.
- To target a person based solely on actual or perceived characteristics such as race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, economic status, age, cultural group, or disability.
- To harass, intimidate, or discriminate against any individual or group.
- To conduct personal business of any type.

The UAS shall not be weaponized.

606.7 AUTHORIZED USE

UAS’s may be used for, but are not limited to, the following purposes:

(a) Situational Awareness - To assist decision makers in understanding the nature, scale or scope of an incident and for planning/coordinating an effective response.

(b) Search and Rescue - To assist missing person investigations, AMBER Alerts, Missing Child Alerts, Missing College Student Alerts and Vulnerable Adult Alerts and other search and rescue missions.

(c) Tactical Deployment - To support the tactical deployment of officers and equipment in emergency situations.

(d) Visual Perspective - To provide an aerial perspective to assist officers with directing crowd control, traffic, special circumstances and temporary perimeter security.

(e) Scene Documentation - To document a crime scene, accident scene or other major incident scene.
(f) Agency Assistance - To assist another agency which does not possess a UAS with situational awareness, search and rescue, tactical deployment, visual perspective or scene documentation.

(g) As directed by the Chief of Police or his designee.

606.8 TRAINING OF AUTHORIZED AGENCY PERSONNEL

Authorized agency personnel assigned to operate UAS must complete an agency-approved training program and meet all conditions of the COA and/or part 107 issued by the FAA. Authorized agency personnel assigned to operate UAS should also receive additional training at regular intervals to ensure continued effective use, operation, calibration and performance of UAS and to incorporate changes, updates, revisions and advances in policies and procedures in the deployment and use of UAS.

A minimum of four hours of training a month should be allotted to ensure maintenance and basic flight skills are performed.

All Remote Pilots in Command (RPIC) are encouraged to study for & complete the Part 107 aeronautical knowledge test, and renew the certification every 24 months.
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Hate Crimes

319.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this policy is to provide members of this department with guidelines for identifying and investigating incidents and crimes that may be motivated by hatred or other bias.

319.1.1 DEFINITIONS

Definitions related to this policy include (Penal Law § 485.05):

Hate crime - A crime motivated by prejudice based on actual or perceived race, color, religion, religious practice, age, national origin, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, ancestry, or disability of the victim.

319.2 POLICY

The Syracuse Police Department recognizes and places a high priority on the rights of all individuals guaranteed under the state and federal constitution and incorporated in state and federal law.

319.3 PREVENTION AND PREPARATION

While it is recognized that not all crime can be prevented, this department is committed to taking a proactive approach to preventing and preparing for likely hate crimes by:

(a) Making an affirmative effort to establish contact with persons and groups within the community who are likely targets of hate crimes, and forming networks that address prevention and response.

(b) Providing victim assistance and community follow-up or identifying available resources to do so.

(c) Educating community and civic groups about hate crime laws.

319.4 INVESTIGATIONS

Whenever any member of this department receives a report of a suspected hate crime or other activity that reasonably appears to involve a potential hate crime, the following should occur:

(a) Assigned officers should promptly contact the victim, witness or reporting party to investigate the matter further, as circumstances may dictate.

(b) A supervisor should be notified of the circumstances as soon as practicable.
Hate Crimes

(c) Once the in-progress aspect of any such situation has been stabilized (e.g., treatment of victims or arrest of suspects at the scene), the assigned officers should take reasonable steps to preserve evidence that establishes a possible hate crime.

(d) Based upon available information, officers should take appropriate action to mitigate further injury or damage to potential victims or the community.

(e) Depending on the situation, the assigned officers or supervisor may request assistance from investigators or other resources.

(f) The assigned officers should interview available witnesses, victims and others to determine what circumstances, if any, indicate that the situation may involve a hate crime.

(g) The assigned officers should make reasonable efforts to assist the victim by providing available information on local assistance programs and organizations as required by the Victim and Witness Assistance Policy.

(h) The assigned officers should include all available evidence indicating the likelihood of a hate crime in the relevant reports. All related reports should be clearly marked “Hate Crime.”

(i) The assigned officers and supervisor should take reasonable steps to ensure that any such situation does not escalate further and should provide information to the victim regarding legal aid.

(j) All investigations reasonably believed to be a hate crime, regardless of offense classification, shall be reported to the Criminal Investigations Division and placed on the felony notification sheet.

319.4.1 INVESTIGATION BUREAU RESPONSIBILITIES

If a hate crime case is assigned to the Investigation Bureau, the assigned investigator will be responsible for:

(a) Coordinating further investigation with the District Attorney’s Office and other appropriate law enforcement agencies.

(b) Maintaining contact with the victim and other involved individuals, as needed.

(c) Maintaining statistical data and tracking of suspected hate crimes, as indicated or required by state law (Executive Law § 837).

319.4.2 SPECIFIC NOTATIONS

When a person is convicted of a hate crime and the specified offense is a misdemeanor or class C, D or E felony, the hate crime will be deemed to be one category higher than the offense actually committed (Penal Law § 485.10). Notice that the crime charged is a hate crime must be indicated on the accusatory instrument. The factual part of the instrument should contain facts supporting the determination the crime is a hate crime. The accusatory part of the instrument should give
notice to the court by using an “H” designation at the end of the statute citation. For example, an accusatory instrument for criminal mischief in the fourth degree determined to be a hate crime would appear as Penal Law § 145.00(1 H) and cited as “Criminal mischief in the fourth degree as a Hate Crime.”

Similar notations are required on arrest reports and the offense page of the incident report. For example, criminal mischief as a hate crime would appear as Penal Law § 145.00(1 H) and cited as “Criminal mischief in the fourth degree as a Hate Crime” on the arrest report and incident report.

319.5 TRAINING

All members of this department should receive training on hate crime recognition and investigation. Training should include:

(a) Guidance for the investigation of hate crimes available through the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services.

(b) The components of Penal Law § 485.05 and Penal Law § 485.10 and related case law, including:

1. Notice that the race, color, national origin, ancestry, gender, gender identity or expression, religion, religious practice, age, disability, or sexual orientation of the suspect, the victim, or both the suspect and the victim does not, by itself, constitute legally sufficient evidence of a hate crime.

2. Notice that the mere mention of a bias remark does not make an incident bias-motivated, just as the absence of a remark does not make an incident without bias.

3. An explanation of how enhanced sentences relate to the specified offenses on which they are based.

4. Related definitions, including age, disability, and gender identity or expression.

(c) Supervisor notification.

(d) Processing an arrest for a hate crime.
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23.00 **POLICY:**

The purpose of this policy is to advise all members of the Syracuse Police Department (SPD; Department) of their sworn duty and responsibility to follow the established Department guidelines for the appropriate treatment of transgender*, intersex, non-binary and gender non-conforming individuals (transgender*) who come into contact with members of the Syracuse Police Department. The Department is committed to the respectful and professional treatment of transgender* persons and is cognizant of the fact that transgender* persons are disproportionately the victims of hate based, violent crimes. Transgender* persons are more likely to the victims of crime rather than the perpetrators.

The Syracuse Police Department is committed to working with all diverse communities in which it serves with fairness and dignity. Members of the Syracuse Police Department shall interact with all citizens in a manner that is professional, respectful, and courteous. Personnel will not exhibit any bias, nor will they pre-judge, or discriminate against an individual or group based on their actual or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

Personnel will address members of the public using pronouns, titles of respect, and name as expressed by the individual, regardless of what is listed on their government issued identification. If members are uncertain about which pronouns are appropriate, then the employee should respectfully ask the individual. Personnel will not use language that is demeaning or degrading in content or tone, understanding that it is equally unacceptable to use non-derogatory language in a derogatory manner or tone.

The SPD’s *Interactions with Transgender* Individual’s policy* shall be readily accessible to the public at no cost via the Department’s website and external search engines.

23.10 **DEFINITIONS:**

A. **Adopted Name** - Preferred non-birth name that a transgender* individual uses in self-reference (this may or may not be the individual’s legal name) person being stopped.

B. **Transgender* -** An umbrella term for a person whose gender identity or expression differs from the sex they were assigned at birth. For example, if a person is born and then assigned female, but ultimately identifies as a male, that person would be described as a transgender* male.

C. **Gender Expression** - How a person expresses their gender. This can include clothing, hairstyles, makeup, mannerisms, behavior, speech patterns, and more. An individual’s
D. characteristics and behaviors (such as one’s name, pronoun, appearance, dress, mannerisms, speech patterns, and body characteristics) that may express one’s Gender Identity.

E. Gender Identity - An individual’s deeply held internal knowledge or sense of being male, female, personal gender, or no gender which may or may not correspond to the individual’s physical characteristics or Sex Assigned at Birth. Gender Identity may or may not be visible to others or expressed outwardly through a person’s chosen pronouns, haircut, dress, behavior, or voice.

23.11 PROCEDURE:
A. Personnel will adhere to the following procedures during departmental contacts with and the arrests of transgender* individuals.
   1. Members shall not request identification or otherwise initiate contact solely based on actual or perceived gender identity, gender expression or sexual orientation.
   2. Members shall not inquire about intimate details of an individual’s sexual practices, genitals, anatomy or medical history, or conduct a search to determine a person’s anatomy or determine gender.
   3. Members shall not use language that is demeaning or derogatory to another person, in particular, language aimed at a person’s actual or perceived gender identity, gender expression, or sexual orientation. Members shall not use language that is demeaning or degrading in content or tone, or use non-derogatory language in a derogatory manner or tone.
   4. Members shall not engage in any sexual harassment of members of the public while on duty, as defined by the department’s policy on sexual misconduct, including mis-identifying gender.
   5. Members shall not consider an individual’s gender identity, gender expression, or actual or perceived sexual orientation as a reason to stop, question, search or arrest that individual, a basis for reasonable suspicion, or as prima facie evidence that the individual is, has or is about to engage in a crime of any kind.
   6. Members shall not fail to respond to a call or act upon a scene based on gender identity or gender expression.

23.12 DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ALL MEMBERS:
A. It shall be the duty and responsibility of all members of the Department to:
   1. Address the public using names, pronouns and titles of respect appropriate to the individual’s gender identity or gender expression as expressed by the individual (e.g. “she, her” for an individual who uses she/her pronouns; “he, his” for an individual who uses he/his pronouns; “they, them” for an individual who uses they/them pronouns.). The goal is to be the most inclusive and respectful to all individuals.
   2. Treat transgender* and gender-nonconforming individuals in a manner respectful of the individual’s gender identity or gender expression, aware that this may be different from their sex assigned at birth or what is listed on their official government-issued identification.
3. Be aware that individuals’ names may change over time, whether due to marriage, changes in gender identity, or other factors, and should always use the name currently used by individuals.

4. Provide appropriate medical attention:
   a. In the event a transgender* individual requests medical attention the officer shall promptly request medical assistance. Officers shall render emergency first aid within the limits of their individual skills, training and available equipment until professional medical assistance arrives.

23.13 GENDER CLASSIFICATION WHEN A TRANSGENDER* PERSON IS A VICTIM OR WITNESS:
   A. When necessary for documenting an incident, a transgender* person’s gender will be classified as it appears on the individual’s government-issued identification card.
      1. Officers should be aware that identification may be accompanied by a physician’s letter explaining gender identity, sometimes called a “carry letter”, which would further document an individual’s gender identity or gender expression.
      2. If the person identifies with a gender different than what is listed on their government identification, the officer should make a note of the gender identity or gender expression under the “Narrative” section of the necessary report. This would include the pronouns the person uses.
      3. If an individual explicitly informs personnel that they are transgender*, and an officer finds a record for an individual (NCIC or any other law enforcement record) that lists a different gender from what the individual is currently presenting, the officer will document the information in the “Narrative” section of the New York State Arrest Report.

23.14 ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR GENDER CLASSIFICATION WHILE PROCESSING A TRANSGENDER* PERSON FOR ARREST:
   A. An arrestee’s gender will be classified as it appears on the individual’s government-issued identification card. This does not negate what pronouns the person uses to identify themselves.
   B. For the purposes of listing gender on citations, arrest reports, and other official documentation, members shall use the designation listed in the most recent records in official government databases, starting with the CNYLEADS.
   C. NOTE: While the SPD recognizes the potential negative connotation associated with the term “alias,” the use of such term is institutional of the criminal justice system and is no way intended to be disrespectful to, or dismissive of, transgender* individuals.
   D. In the event that a government-issued identification card is unavailable, the arrestee will be classified according to their self-identification.
   E. In the event that there is uncertainty regarding the appropriate classification of an arrestee's gender, a supervisor will be consulted for guidance on the appropriate
classification (e.g., In situations in which the arrestee does not have identification, and will not speak to police, supervisors can attempt to establish communication necessary to make a determination of the arrestee’s gender or use the arrestee’s gender expression for classification).

23.15 TRANSPORTATION AND SEARCHES:

A. Unless there are exigent circumstances, a transgender* prisoner shall be transported alone.

B. An officer of the individual’s gender identity, when practical, will be present during the transport.

C. Transporting officers shall notify police radio with their beginning and ending mileage and record such information on their patrol log.

D. Transgender* juvenile arrestees shall be processed in accordance with SPD juvenile transportation policies.

E. In situations involving the transfer of transgender* prisoners to county prisons or other police agencies, the officer will ensure that the paperwork accompanying the prisoner adequately describes gender identity information, in a manner consistent with the policy.

F. SEARCHES:

1. Transgender* persons shall not be subject to more invasive search or frisk procedures than non-transgender persons.

2. Members shall continue to use standard practices and procedures when conducting field interviews, pat frisks for weapons, or investigative contacts in a manner that does not unreasonably endanger themselves or another person.

3. Members shall not stop, detain, frisk, or search any person in whole or in part for the purpose of determining that person’s gender or in order to call attention to the person’s gender expression. This limitation does not prevent an officer from following established Department procedures relative to ensuring the proper processing of suspects.

4. Where feasible, all searches of the transgender* individual shall be conducted in the presence of at least one other officer. If available, the officer conducting the search should be of the preferred gender of the individual being searched. If the suspect does not specify a preference, then the search shall be conducted by a female officer.

23.16 RESPONSIBILITIES OF SUPERVISORY / COMMAND OFFICERS:

A. It shall be the duty and responsibility of all supervisory and Commanding Officers to:

1. Continually examine all areas of police action and operations under their control to discover procedural defects and violations of policies, rules and procedures.
2. **Receive**, record, and investigate complaints, regardless of their source (e.g. internal, external, or precautionary), pertaining to gender profiling.

3. **Review** and approve applicable Departmental reports.

4. **Process** discriminatory and victimization of transgender* persons or gender profiling complaints pursuant to the Department's policy governing Office of Professional Standards' investigations.

5. **Take** appropriate disciplinary action to address sustained complaints of any and all discriminatory profiling.

### 23.17 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS:

A. The Office of Professional Standards is responsible for the Department's internal investigation function and shall investigate gender-profiling complaints.

B. All members of the Department shall adhere to the Department’s policy governing the Office of Professional Standards' investigations and utilize appropriate complaint procedures to investigate and document allegations of gender bias, including but not limited to:

1. **Complaints** received from transgender* persons.

2. **Complaints** directed to the Office of Professional Standards.

3. **Complaints** directed to the office Chief of Police.

4. **Complaints** directed to the Citizen’s Review Board.

5. **Complaints** initially received by other law enforcement organizations, or other public entity.

### POLICY REVISION HISTORY
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Policy is applicable to the following New York State Accreditation Standard(s):
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Contacts with Syracuse Police:
Citizens’ Assessments

Robert E. Worden

July, 2020

Report to the Syracuse Police Department
The John F. Finn Institute for Public Safety, Inc., is an independent, not-for-profit and non-partisan corporation, whose work is dedicated to the development of criminal justice strategies, programs, and practices that are effective, lawful, and procedurally fair, through the application of social science findings and methods. The Institute conducts social research on matters of public safety and security – crime, public disorder, and the management of criminal justice agencies and partnerships – in collaboration with municipal, county, state, and federal criminal justice agencies, and for their direct benefit. The findings of the Institute’s research are also disseminated through other media to criminal justice professionals, academicians, elected public officials, and other interested parties, so that those findings may contribute to a broader body of knowledge about criminal justice and to the practical application of those findings in other settings.

The Finn Institute was established in 2007, building on a set of collaborative projects and relationships with criminal justice agencies dating to 1998. The first of those projects, for which we partnered with the Albany Police Department (APD), was initiated by John Finn, who was at that time the sergeant who commanded the APD’s Juvenile Unit. Later promoted to lieutenant and assigned to the department’s Administrative Services Bureau, he spearheaded efforts to implement problem-oriented policing, and to develop an institutional capability for analysis that would support problem-solving. The APD’s capacity for applying social science methods and results thereupon expanded exponentially, based on Lt. Finn’s appreciation for the value of research, his keen aptitude for analysis, and his vision of policing, which entailed the formulation of proactive, data-driven, and – as needed – unconventional strategies to address problems of public safety. Lt. Finn was fatally shot in the line of duty in 2003. The Institute that bears his name honors his life and career by fostering the more effective use of research and analysis within criminal justice agencies, just as Lt. Finn did in the APD.

© 2020, The John F. Finn Institute for Public Safety, Inc.
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Introduction

Citizens’ satisfaction with police services forms one of the “bottom lines” for any American police agency. Citizens are, in a sense, customers of the police, and the social value of police services turns to some degree on citizens’ assessments of service quality. Because police services are not delivered through market mechanisms, however, citizens’ valuations are not measured by what they willingly pay as the service is rendered.\(^1\) Instead, police executives and city officials must rely on other information about whether and to what degree the services that are provided by police are meeting citizens’ expectations. One well-established method of obtaining such information is to survey citizens about their experiences with the police.\(^2\)

In 2019, the Finn Institute contracted with the City of Syracuse to conduct a survey of people who had recent contacts with Syracuse police. A “contact survey” of this kind often provides for structured inquiries of people who had voluntary contacts with police – e.g., people who reported crimes to police, or who called police for assistance of some type. That is what we proposed to the Syracuse Police Department: a survey of 800 people sampled from among those who had called police to request assistance. A sample of this size is sufficient to generate reasonably accurate estimates of citizens’ assessments of the quality of service they experienced in their individual contacts. We conducted the survey by phone, a modality that allows for more extensive queries than web-based surveys, and which tends to yield more representative samples than mail surveys. Additional details about survey methodology are described below.

---

\(^1\) The analogy between police agencies and private sector firms has important limitations. Writing about the application of “total quality management” (or TQM) to policing, Larry Hoover observes that “the issue of definition of customer satisfaction for police agencies is far from a simple one”; see Larry T. Hoover, “Translating Total Quality Management From the Private Sector to Policing,” in Larry T. Hoover (ed.), Quantifying Quality in Policing (Washington: Police Executive Research Forum, 1996). The analogy has another limitation also: citizens are not only consumers of police services but also “co-producers” of public safety, in that they contribute to public safety both independently (e.g., by taking steps to reduce their risk of victimization, and by intervening directly to curb disorderly or even illegal behavior) and in conjunction with the police (e.g., by providing information, or through collective crime prevention efforts). See, e.g., Gordon P. Whitaker, “Coproduction: Citizen Participation in Service Delivery,” Public Administration Review 40 (1980): 240-246.

Contact surveys sometimes include other types of police contacts in addition to those that we sampled for this survey. In fact, we previously conducted a contact survey in Syracuse as part of a larger project, which was funded by the National Institute of Justice; the survey encompassed samples of people who had (1) called for assistance, (2) been stopped by police, or (3) been arrested by police. The previous survey, administered in 36 semi-monthly waves between mid-2011 and early-2013, included similar content, such that we are able to draw comparisons between the current survey and the earlier survey.

In this first of two reports, we summarize survey findings concerning citizens’ assessments of police services generally and of their contacts with police. We also summarize the extent to which citizens’ assessments are associated with (or patterned by) their characteristics. The second report will summarize the findings of analyses of somewhat greater depth.

Public Attitudes and Subjective Experience

Public satisfaction with police services is of intrinsic significance in a democracy, as police are accountable to the public. Public attitudes may also be of instrumental importance, as trust and confidence in the police is associated with a sense of obligation to comply and cooperate with law enforcement. The Syracuse contact survey provided for measures of public attitudes toward Syracuse police in general, particularly judgments about what is widely characterized as police legitimacy, and measures of citizens’ assessments of individual contacts with police – i.e., their subjective experiences, especially elements of procedural justice. The two substantive sections of the report, which follow a brief description of survey methodology, attend to each domain: police legitimacy and citizens’ subjective experiences.

Public satisfaction can be construed as a measure of police performance, and as an outcome for which police executives are responsible. Analyses of data on citizens’ assessments of police service can pinpoint dimensions of service with which the public is particularly pleased or displeased, directing attention to sources of dissatisfaction that might be addressed. Caution should be exercised in treating measures of citizens’

---

3 Survey findings for Syracuse are reported in Robert E. Worden and Sarah J. McLean, *Mirage of Police Reform: Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2017), chaps. 3-4. We did not include stops and arrests as sampling strata in the present survey in consideration of feasibility and costs. Stops by Syracuse police are documented on a specific reporting form, which omits the individual’s phone number; the omission adds costly steps to the process of administering a phone survey. The completion rate among people who are arrested is lower than that among people who call for assistance, increasing the cost of survey administration.


subjective experience as performance indicators, however. Citizens’ evaluations of their contacts with the police are not simple and direct indicators of what police do and how well they do it, as they are shaped by citizens’ more general assessments of and attitudes toward the police, and indirectly by other factors as well.6

Survey Methodology

We surveyed people who called the Syracuse police for assistance of various kinds, who thus had voluntary contacts with the police and are in a meaningful sense police customers.7 (People who are stopped by police have involuntary contacts with police, as do some others involved in incidents to which other involved parties summoned police.) We surveyed a random sample of people who called either 911 or a non-emergency number between March 1 and October 31, 2019, and to whose calls a police unit was dispatched. Details about survey sampling and administration are provided in the appendix. Here we note two features of survey methodology.

First, because the sample was drawn randomly, it is a form of probability sample, meaning that inferences can be drawn to the larger population of voluntary contacts with an estimable degree of sampling error. This is a distinct advantage over non-probability (or “convenience”) samples, such as the sample drawn when questionnaires are distributed in grocery stores, pharmacies, or other types of establishments. Non-probability samples are also subject to not only sampling error but also non-sampling error that stems from systemic factors and can be much larger. Be that as it may, readers should bear in mind that every estimate reported here is subject to a degree of sampling fluctuation. In general, the 95 percent confidence intervals around point estimates is no greater than 3.5 percent.

Second, the survey was administered on a rolling basis, with samples drawn and interviews conducted monthly. Consequently, respondents were asked about incidents that transpired two to nine weeks prior to their interviews. Errors of recall are thereby minimized.

6 For example, using panel survey data collected in several Detroit neighborhoods in 1990-1991, Brandl, et al. estimated the effects of prior overall satisfaction on citizens’ evaluations of their (later) contacts with the police. They found that “global” attitudes toward the police have a powerful influence on citizens’ assessments of their contacts. By comparison, assessments of contacts have a modest effect on more general attitudes. See Steven G. Brandl, James Frank, Robert E. Worden, and Timothy S. Bynum, “Global and Specific Attitudes toward the Police: Disentangling the Relationship,” Justice Quarterly 11 (1994): 119-134. Furthermore, when citizens’ assessments of their contacts with police are analyzed in terms of independent measures of police behavior, the influence of the latter on the former is weak; see Worden and McLean, Mirage of Police Reform.

7 This is not to imply that the police customer is always “right”: some customer expectations for police service may be unlawful, for example.
Police Legitimacy

The legitimacy of the police is a topic of long-standing interest and significance, though the term became widely recognized in police circles in the 2000s and particularly salient in the past five years. In the U.S., officer-involved shootings and in-custody deaths of African-Americans propelled police use of force and public distrust of police into the headlines repeatedly in 2014-2015. In late-2014, the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing was charged with formulating recommendations for (re)building public trust in policing. The urgency of its work was reflected in the short 90-day turnaround on its report, which was issued in 2015. The Task Force report declared that “Building trust and nurturing legitimacy on both sides of the police-citizen divide is not only the first pillar of this ... report but also the foundational principle underlying this inquiry into the nature of relations between law enforcement and the communities they serve.”

We incorporated into this survey a number of items that were developed and validated in previous research as measures of police legitimacy. Many of the survey items are statements with which respondents were asked to agree or disagree, with different levels of intensity (i.e., very or somewhat). Three of the items are sometimes characterized as reflections of people’s trust and confidence in the police:

- I have confidence that the Syracuse Police Department can do its job well.
- I trust the leaders of the Syracuse Police to make decisions that are good for everyone in the city.
- The police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for the people in my neighborhood.

The distributions of responses to these questions is shown in Figure 1. (The bars in this and other charts omit respondents who told interviewers that they did not know, who constitute the difference between the sum of the percentages and 100 percent.)

Responses to these items tend to correlate strongly, such that respondents who respond favorably to one also respond favorably to the others, and vice-versa. Such a pattern holds in Syracuse, producing similar distributions of opinion across these three items. Each statement elicited strong agreement from 40 to 50 percent of the respondents, with approximately 30 percent agreeing less intensely. Each statement elicited disagreement from 20 to 25 percent of respondents.

---

Two other items reflect “identification” with police:

- I am proud of the work of the Syracuse Police.
- If you talked to most of the police officers who work in my neighborhood, you would find they have similar views to my own on many issues.

Figure 2 displays the responses to these items.

The first of the identification items, concerning pride in the work of Syracuse police, exhibits a distribution of responses that is quite comparable to those of the trust and confidence items. The second item departs from the pattern mainly in the proportion of respondents who did not express an opinion (the ‘don’t know’ responses).

Previous survey research, including our own in Syracuse and elsewhere, has shown that the five trust and confidence and identification items tend to correlate with one another and to form a single, reliable index of police legitimacy when they are combined.\(^\text{10}\) We formed a simple additive index to summarize the legitimacy of Syracuse police in the eyes of people who called for assistance. See Figure 3. The index scores range potentially from 0 to 20. For the purposes of summarizing the responses in bar charts, we divided the scale of the index into four equal segments: very high (16 to 20); moderately high (10 to 15); moderately low (5 to 9); and very low (0 to 4).

---

Nearly half of the respondents’ scores on the legitimacy index placed them in the very high range, and about one-quarter fell into the moderately high range. The remainder of the respondents were about evenly split between the moderately and very low ranges of scores.

Figure 2. Identification with Syracuse Police, 2019.
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Figure 3. Police Legitimacy Index.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses.]

Very low 47.7
Moderately low 12.5
Moderately high 26.7
Very high 15.1

Strongly disagree Disagree somewhat Agree somewhat Strongly agree
Scores of the legitimacy index vary somewhat across the parts of the city that comprise the different police districts, as Figure 4 displays. We note that the geographical placement of each respondent and his/her score is based not on the respondent’s residential address but rather the location to which police were dispatched, which are not always the same. Respondents whose calls brought police to the North District had the most favorable views of police legitimacy, while respondents who encountered police in the Southwest District were had the least favorable views.

Scores on the legitimacy index in 2019 were comparable to the scores of those who called for assistance in our earlier survey; see Figure 5. The differences in the two sets of responses are generally within the margin of sampling error. We can also draw a comparison to other agencies, given that the same item was asked of respondents surveyed in 2013-2014 for the National Police Research Platform (NPRP). The NPRP surveyed 16,787 citizens across 58 police agencies of varying size. We caution that the samples are not equivalent: the NPRP sample consisted of people whose police contacts arose from traffic or pedestrian stops, traffic crashes, and complainants’ reports of crime. With that caveat, confidence in the Syracuse police is comparable to that reported for larger departments (with 500 or more sworn officers) in the NPRP survey; see Figure 6.

Figure 4. Police Legitimacy by Police District.

---

Figure 5. Legitimacy Index: 2019 v 2011-2013.

Figure 6. Confidence in Police, Syracuse vs. NPRP.
Correlates of Legitimacy

Police legitimacy is influenced by individuals' backgrounds and by the character of the neighborhoods in which they reside. We analyzed several factors that are commonly associated with legitimacy. One such factor is age, though the pattern in Syracuse does not show a strong bivariate relationship; see Figure 7.

Figure 7. Legitimacy by Respondent Age.

Another factor is race/ethnicity. With few exceptions, previous research and other public opinion polls consistently find disparities in trust among Black, Latino, and White individuals. Part of the disparity is attributable to differences in the quality-of-life conditions of the neighborhoods in which people reside – i.e., the severity or perceived severity of social and physical disorders. Attitudes toward police are more positive where (and by whom) such incivilities – e.g., vandalism, noise, open-air drug markets – are perceived to be less serious problems. Variation in neighborhood disorder accounts for at least some of the racial disparity in attitudes toward the police.\footnote{See, e.g.: Michael D. Reisig and Roger B. Parks, “Experience, Quality of Life, and Neighborhood Context: A Hierarchical Analysis of Satisfaction with Police,” \textit{Justice Quarterly} 17 (2000): 607-630; and Robert J. Sampson and Dawn Jeglum Bartusch, “Legal Cynicism and (Subcultural?) Tolerance of Deviance: The Neighborhood Context of Racial Differences,” \textit{Law and Society Review} 32 (1998): 777-804.} The history of policing also surely plays a role in the Black-White gap. One study, for example, surveyed samples of Blacks and Whites about their beliefs about the fairness of the justice system, and also
elicited respondents' judgments about the propriety of police enforcement actions in each of two scenarios in which the race of the citizen was experimentally manipulated. They found considerable support for their “perceived discrimination hypothesis”:

Given the history of racial bias in the system, African Americans should be more vigilant to signs of discrimination in encounters between police and black civilians. Brutality and profiling are so familiar to many African Americans that they constitute chronically accessible “scripts” that are frequently primed and likely to guide interpretations of ambiguous events. ... Thus, blacks as a group are likely to view confrontations between police and black civilians as yet another instance of police discrimination (2005:767).13

The disparities in Syracuse are quite comparable to those found elsewhere. See Figure 8.

Figure 8. Legitimacy by Respondent Race/Ethnicity.

Household income also bears a relationship to legitimacy, but the simple bivariate association is not a strong, consistent one; see Figure 9. In general, legitimacy rises with income, but the relationship is not linear. Legitimacy rises modestly with increasing income up to $40,000, with differences of greater magnitude as income rises above that

---

level. People with incomes greater than $60,000 hold substantially more favorable views of police legitimacy than those with incomes under $60,000.

Figure 9. Legitimacy by Respondent Income.

Citizens’ Subjective Experiences

Citizens who interact with police assess their experiences by several criteria, including the outcomes of the interaction and how police authority is exercised. We reiterate that citizens’ assessments of their police contacts are subjective, and they do not necessarily represent what police officers do in those incidents. Citizens interpret their experiences through the filters of their prior attitudes toward and expectations of the police. Citizens who hold favorable attitudes toward the police tend to interpret their experiences with police in positive terms, while citizens who hold unfavorable attitudes toward the police tend to interpret their experiences with police in negative terms, other things being equal. Even so, citizens’ subjective experiences are important to consider and understand.

The survey tapped citizens’ satisfaction with the contact, in terms of both how they were treated by police and how the problems for which they sought police assistance were handled by police. The survey also queried citizens about elements of the procedural justice that they experienced, and their assessments of the fairness and effectiveness of the outcomes of their contact. We first address findings concerning the
two forms of satisfaction, followed by those regarding procedural justice and subjective outcomes. We then consider several correlates of procedural justice.

**Satisfaction**

We asked respondents about how satisfied they were with how police treated them and with how police handled their problem:
- Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police on the scene handled the problem?
- Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police on the scene treated you?

Three-quarters or more indicated that they were very or somewhat satisfied – more (over 80 percent) with their treatment by police; see Figure 10. Most of those who were satisfied were very satisfied. Most of those who were dissatisfied were very dissatisfied.

![Figure 10. Citizen Satisfaction in Police Contact.](image)

**Procedural Justice**

Citizens’ subjective judgments about procedural justice encompass four aspects of their interactions with authorities:
- “**Voice**”: People are more satisfied when they have an opportunity to “tell their side of the story” – to explain their situation or behavior to authorities.
• **Neutrality**: People are more satisfied when they believe that authorities’ decisions are based on facts.
• **Quality of treatment**: People are more satisfied when they feel that they have been treated with dignity and respect.
• **Trustworthy motives**: People are more satisfied when they trust authorities’ motives, which is more likely when authorities explain their actions in terms that demonstrate that they have taken account of citizens’ concerns and needs.

While it is surely helpful for heuristic purposes to describe these aspects of procedural justice as distinct constructs, they are conceptually and empirically intertwined with one another. Empirically, survey-based indicators of these features of police-citizen encounters tend to be strongly or at least moderately correlated, reflecting only a single underlying construct of procedural justice. Such a pattern of association is open to (at least) two interpretations: it might be that authorities’ behaviors are correlated (e.g., officers who are polite also tend to listen to citizens and explain themselves), that citizens’ perceptions are correlated (citizens who judge officers’ actions as respectful also tend to perceive them as attentive), or some combination of both sets of forces.

**Voice**

We asked respondents:

- When you talked to the police, did they pay careful attention to what you had to say?
- The police considered my views (agree/disagree).

About three-quarters of the respondents indicated that police paid attention to what they had to say, and a similar proportion agreed (strongly or somewhat) that police considered their views; see Figure 11.

**Quality of Treatment**

We asked respondents:

- Did you find the police … <1> Very polite <2> Somewhat polite <3> Somewhat impolite, or <4> Very impolite?
- The police treated me with dignity and respect (agree/disagree).

Approximately 85 percent of the respondents indicated that police were very or somewhat polite, and a comparable fraction agreed (strongly or somewhat) that police treated them with dignity and respect; see Figure 12.

---

Figure 11. Voice.

Figure 12. Quality of Treatment.
Neutrality

We asked respondents to agree to disagree with these statements:
- The police made their decision based on facts.
- The police tried hard to do the right thing.
Each statement elicited agreement from about three-quarters of the respondents; see Figure 13.

Figure 13. Neutrality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision based on Facts</th>
<th>Tried to do Right Thing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trustworthy Motives

We asked respondents:
- Did the police clearly explain what action they would take?
- The police respected my rights (agree/disagree).
About two-thirds of the respondents indicated that police explained their actions, while about 80 percent said that police respected their rights; see Figure 14.
Procedural Justice Index

As they have in many previous surveys, responses to the items concerning procedural justice are strongly intercorrelated, and together they form a reliable index of procedural justice. We formed a simple additive index to summarize the subjective procedural justice of contacts with Syracuse police, based on the eight items discussed above and three others.15 See Figure 15. The index scores range potentially from 0 to 40. For the purposes of summarizing the responses in simple charts, we divided the scale of the index into four equal segments: very high (31 to 40); moderately high (21 to 30); moderately low (10 to 20); and very low (0 to 9).

Two-thirds of the respondents’ scores on the procedural justice index placed them in the very high range, and about one-sixth fell into the moderately high range. The remainder of the respondents were about evenly split between the moderately and very low ranges of scores.

15 The other survey items were: (1) “How fair were [the police] – were they very/somewhat (un)fair?” (2) “Did you find the police … very/somewhat (un)helpful?” (3) “The police were truthful in their communications with me” (agree/disagree strongly/somewhat).
Theories of legitimacy stress that trust and confidence in police turns more on process – i.e., procedural justice – than on outcomes. Empirical evidence supports this view, but even so, citizens’ experiences are affected by their judgments about the outcomes that they receive. Outcomes include, first, the effectiveness with which police intervene. We asked respondents: Do you feel that the police took care of the problem? Citizens’ experiences are also shaped by distributive justice – whether people believe that the outcome was fair or deserved, whether or not it was in an objective sense favorable to them. We asked respondents to agree or disagree with the statement, “I received the outcome I feel I deserved.”

About 60 percent of the respondents indicated that police took care of their problem, while three-quarters said that they believed that they received the outcome that they deserved. See Figure 16.

Subjective Outcomes
Figure 16. Subjective Outcomes.

- **Got Outcome I Deserved**
  - Strongly agree: 61.2%
  - Agree somewhat: 32.3%
  - Disagree somewhat: 6.6%
  - Disagree strongly: 13.9%

- **Took Care of Problem**
  - Yes: 50.7%
  - No: 19%
  - Don't know: 6.6%

**Comparisons of Subjective Experiences**

We draw three sets of comparisons: (1) findings across police districts; (2) current findings compared to those generated by the 2011-2013 contact survey in Syracuse; and (3) Syracuse findings compared to those based on the NPRP sample.

Scores of the procedural justice index vary little across the parts of the city that comprise the different police districts, as Figure 17 displays. (Again, readers should note that the geographical placement of each respondent and his/her scores is based not on the respondent’s residential address but rather the location to which police were dispatched, which are not always the same.) Procedural justice was nearly uniform across the districts. Differences are well within the margin of sampling error (which is somewhat larger at the district level, inasmuch as the district-based samples are of course smaller).

The procedural justice index scores were quite comparable to those found in our previous survey among people who called for service; see Figure 18. Differences are small and within the margin of sampling error.

Finally, levels of satisfaction with treatment by Syracuse police are higher than those reported for the NPRP sample, and assessments of the extent to which respondents were treated with dignity and respect by Syracuse police are quite comparable to those reported for the NPRP sample; see Figures 19 and 20.
Figure 17. Procedural Justice Index by District.

Figure 18. Procedural Justice Index: 2019 v 2011-2013.
Figure 19. Satisfaction with Treatment, Syracuse v NPRP.

Figure 20. Treated with Dignity and Respect, Syracuse v NPRP.
Correlates of Subjective Experience

Previous research has shown that citizens’ subjective experiences are associated with several factors, a few of which we examine here.

Response Time

We asked respondents whether the police response was faster than they expected, slower than expected, or about the same as expected. This is itself a subjective judgment, of course, which is likely affected by more general attitudes toward the police.\textsuperscript{16} Respondents’ judgments about the celerity with which police responded are associated with their assessments about procedural justice, as it is summarized by the procedural justice index. Respondents who judged response time as faster than expected rated procedural justice more favorably than those who thought police responded as quickly as they expected. Those who thought that police responded more slowly than expected were far less likely to rate procedural justice highly; one-quarter had scores in the moderately to very low ranges. See Figure 21.

Figure 21. Procedural Justice Index by Perceived Response Time.

\textsuperscript{16} These judgments vary somewhat with the nature of the problems about which citizens called, with slower perceived response times to types of incidents that are likely accorded lower response priorities. Further analysis will be conducted to examine the correspondence of perceived response times with CAD-recorded response times, including the components of the latter: dispatch time (the elapsed time from call receipt to dispatch of a police unit) and travel time (the elapsed time from dispatch to arrival at the scene).
Race/Ethnicity

Procedural justice is among the attitudes on which racial/ethnic disparities are commonly found, and Syracuse is no exception to the general rule. The disparities in index scores are not large, however, with the possible exception of respondents who declined to disclose their racial/ethnic identification to interviewers. See Figure 22. Black respondents were the most likely of the racial/ethnic groups to register scores in the very low range. Otherwise, though, index scores exhibit similar distributions across the races/ethnicities.

Figure 22. Procedural Justice Index by Race/Ethnicity

Age

Previous research has generally found that age is directly associated with attitudes toward the police: as age increases, people’s attitudes toward the police become more positive. We find a muted association among the Syracuse respondents, one that appears principally when one considers the oldest age group, over 65 years of age. Differences in index scores across the other age groups are small and within the margin of sampling error. See Figure 23.

Income

Scores on the procedural justice index are relatively high among those in the highest income group, relatively low among those in the lowest income group, and fairly similar among groups in between. See Figure 24.
Figure 23. Procedural Justice Index by Age.

Figure 24. Procedural Justice Index by Income.
Conclusions

We surveyed people who had a recent contact with Syracuse police as a result of a call for police assistance. The sample is in every detectable respect representative of the larger population of such voluntary contacts. From this sample, we infer that substantial proportions – three-quarters or more – of the people who request the assistance of Syracuse police are satisfied with how police treat them and rate the procedural justice of police in their contacts in favorable terms. The remainder are dissatisfied and/or less positive about procedural justice. The patterns that we find in the 2019 survey are comparable to those that we found in Syracuse 6-7 years earlier, and comparable to those reported from a national survey across 58 police agencies. Readers can make their own judgments based on the findings, but against these standards, Syracuse police fare reasonably well.

Citizens’ judgments about procedural justice and their satisfaction with police contacts are shaped by a number of factors outside of police control. Citizens bring to their encounters with police a set of outlooks and expectations that influence their perceptions of the interaction, for better or for worse; subjective experience and police action are not equivalent. Furthermore, the incidents or problems about which citizens seek police assistance may not be susceptible to police-imposed solutions, or the solutions that police can impose may not be sustainable. Expectations for police action may be incompatible with what law requires or permits.

Some factors are within police control. The strongest effects on citizens’ subjective experiences stem from the use of police authority, particularly frisks and searches and the use of physical force. These actions are seldom taken against people whose contacts with police are voluntary, however, and do not account for the variation in subjective experiences reported here.

Response times are to some degree within police control, within the constraints of patrol staffing and subject to dispatch protocols and practices in a communications center. The procedural justice with which police act is largely within police control, and though discourtesy or disrespect is to some unavoidable extent subject to different interpretations, it surely affects citizens’ subjective experiences.\(^{17}\) Dispositions – e.g., completing reports rather than concluding incidents with no formal action – may have a bearing on citizens’ satisfaction. Follow-up with crime victims by investigators also affects citizens’ judgments. On some of these questions we can and will perform additional analysis of the survey data.

\(^{17}\) Though Worden and McLean found weak relationships between citizens’ subjective experiences and an independent measure of the procedural justice of officers’ actions, they found a stronger relationship between citizens’ subjective experiences and a measure of the procedural injustice of officers’ actions. Citizens’ perceptions are demonstrably affected by procedurally unjust actions. See *Mirage of Police Reform*, chap. 7.
Appendix – Sampling and Survey Procedures

The survey sample was drawn from the population of calls for service received and captured in the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system between March 1 and October 31, 2019. Beginning with CAD records extracted by SPD personnel and provided to the Institute, records of officer-initiated incidents were removed, leaving the call-for-service (CFS) population, numbering 77,647 over the eight-month period (see Table A-1). Based on the information on each CAD record about the nature of the incident and the identity of the caller, we identified and excluded selected types of incidents. Alarm calls were excluded based on the premise that no face-to-face contact between police and citizen (other than security personnel) occurred. Incidents for which the CAD record contained no name, and incidents involving citizens for whom neither the CAD system nor the record management system (RMS) contained a phone number, were also excluded. The application of these exclusionary criteria yielded the sampling frame: all of the incidents eligible for sampling. With one exception, the incidents comprising the sampling frame bear a strong resemblance to the CFS population in terms of the nature of the incidents, the police districts to which police were dispatched, and the time of day – i.e., platoon – during which calls were received.\(^\text{18}\) The exception is the proportion of incidents in the suspicious circumstances category, due to the exclusion of alarm calls.

Each month, 1,000 calls were sampled randomly from among the eligible calls, whereupon the names and phone numbers of the citizens, and the dates of their contacts, were provided to a professional survey firm (JB Research, LLC). The monthly target number of completed interviews was 100. The 8,000 sampled calls, and the 801 incidents about which respondents completed interviews, are very similar to the sampling frame (see Table A-1). Any differences between the sample and the sampling frame are matters of random chance. Differences – detectable and undetectable differences – between the respondents and the sample are to some extent random and to some extent a function of participation patterns. The respondents are representative of the larger sampling frame to the extent that we are able to draw comparisons.

We note that, depending on the date of a call for service and the timing of a completed interview, respondents were asked to reference an incident that transpired two to nine weeks prior to the interview. CAD and RMS extracts were drawn shortly after the end of each month, with sampling and the preparation of call lists completed soon thereafter. Interviews based on the month’s sample were completed prior to the following month’s sampling. At the extremes: a citizen who called police for assistance late in the month, and who was contacted for an interview at the beginning of that month’s interview period, was asked to recall an incident that occurred about two weeks earlier; a citizen who called police for assistance early in the month, and who was contacted for an inter-

\(^{18}\) Incident type categories are those formulated by Gordon P. Whitaker; see “What Is Patrol Work?” *Police Studies* 4 (1982): 13-22
Table A-1. Syracuse Police Contact Survey Sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident type*</th>
<th>CFS population</th>
<th>Sampling frame</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>77,647</td>
<td>44,627</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal conflict</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent crime</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious circumstances</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent person</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic problem</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public nuisance</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical problem</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assistance</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other crime</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District**</th>
<th>CFS population</th>
<th>Sampling frame</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platoon 1</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Call for service (CFS) population excludes officer-initiated incidents ("field events")
Sampling frame excludes ineligible incidents: alarm calls; other incidents for which there is (a) no identifiable individual complainant, or (b) no phone number available in CAD/RMS.

* Classification based on CAD field ACTUINCD.  Unspecified = “call” or “misc”
** Percentages omit incidents with no beat information (2% for the population)
view near the end of that month's interview period, was asked to recall an incident that occurred as much as nine weeks earlier.

We also note that some citizens had called for police assistance on multiple occasions. More than one-quarter (222) had called for service at least once in the two months prior to the incident that was sampled; 163 called for service at least once in the two months following the incident that was sampled (including 69 who had called in the previous two months). Though the interviewers advised respondents about the date of the incident about which we inquired, these respondents may have had difficulty in differentiating among the incidents. Such discrepancies affect only analyses that involve data that are derived from police records (including, e.g., police district).

Many citizens involved in sampled calls could not be reached (see Table A-2). In some instances, the number obtained from police records had been disconnected or was reportedly a wrong number. In many instances, the interviewers’ calls were not answered on any of the three occasions on which they attempted to reach the individual. In still other instances, the respondent was not available at any of the times that they were called. Previous experience led us to anticipate these challenges and to sample accordingly in order to achieve a sample of 800 completed interviews for analysis.

Of those who were contacted, nearly two-thirds completed the interview. Some who began the interview did not complete it, for one reason or another. About one-fifth declined to participate in the survey. A small number were screened out (due to their age, as we interviewed only adults), while 45 individuals whom we contacted were unable to participate due to a language barrier (the interviews were conducted only in English).

Table A-2. Survey Calling Dispositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of contacted</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barrier*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screened out</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contacted</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contacted – respondent unavailable</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contacted – no answer, answering machine, other</td>
<td>4,562</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong number/disconnected</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,643</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 16 Spanish language; 29 other language
Respondents’ Characteristics

The survey protocol concluded with a set of questions about the respondents’ background, including the race/ethnicity with which they identify, their age, and their household income. Interviewers also recorded respondents’ sex.

Nearly 60 percent of the respondents were male.

A bit more than half of the respondents identified as White, and one-quarter as Black or African-American. Six percent were Latino, and slightly more than 10 percent identified as another race or ethnicity, including mixed race. Three percent declined to specify their race/ethnicity.
Half of the respondents were 26 to 50 years of age. Slightly more than one-fifth were 51 to 65, and less than one in ten over 65. About one-sixth were 18 to 25.

Nearly one-quarter of the respondents reported a household income under $10,000, and an additional 14.5 percent reported an income of $10,000 to $20,000 – i.e., below the federal poverty level for a family of 3. Nearly one-fifth of the respondents reported household incomes of $20,000 to $30,000. About one-quarter reported higher incomes, though 17.4 percent declined to disclose income information.
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The “Say Their Name“ Police Reform Agenda & Bills

Governor Andrew M. Cuomo announced on June 5, 2020, the “Say Their Name“ reform agenda following the murder of George Floyd and an ongoing pattern of police brutality against minority communities across the nation. The Governor said he will work with the State Legislature to get these policies done next week.

The reform agenda includes:

• Allow for transparency of prior disciplinary records of law enforcement officers by reforming 50-a of the civil rights law;
• Banning chokeholds by law enforcement officers;
• Prohibiting false race-based 911 reports and making them a crime; and
• Designating the Attorney General as an independent prosecutor for matters relating to the deaths of unarmed civilians caused by law enforcement.

“Mr. Floyd’s murder was the breaking point of a long list of deaths that were unnecessary and abusive, and people are saying enough is enough, we must change and we must stop the abuse,” Governor Cuomo said. „Stopping police abuse vindicates the overwhelming majority- 99.9 percent - of police who are there to do the right thing. It restores the confidence, the respect, and the trust that you need to make this relationship work. You have to heal the police-community relationship for the sake of the police and for the sake of the community. As the progressive capital of the nation New York should be at the forefront of this movement, and I want to work with the Legislature to pass these policy priorities next week to reform our systems and put a stop to this abuse once and for all.” -Governor Andrew M. Cuomo, June 5, 2020

**Senate Bill S.8496**: Repeals section 50-a of the Civil Rights Law that provides additional protections to the personnel records of police officers, firefighters, and correction officers.

**Senate Bill S.2574B**: Creates an Office of Special Investigation within the Department of Law, under the Attorney General, which will investigate, and, if warranted, prosecute any incident of a person whose death was caused by a police officer or peace officer.

**Senate Bill S.3253B**: Clarifies that a person not under arrest or in the custody has the right to record police activity and to maintain custody and control of that recording, and of any property or instruments used to record police activities.

**Senate Bill S.6670B**: Named the “Eric Garner Anti-Chokehold Act,” prohibits the use of chokeholds by law enforcement and establishes the crime of aggravated strangulation as a Class-C felony.

**Senate Bill S.3595B**: Establishes the Law Enforcement Misconduct Investigative Office within the Department of Law to review, study, audit and make recommendations regarding operations, policies, programs and practices of local law enforcement agencies. The goal of this legislation is to enhance the effectiveness of law enforcement, increase public safety, protect civil liberties and civil rights, ensure compliance with constitutional protections and local, state and federal laws, and increase the public’s confidence in law enforcement.
Senate Bill S.1830C: Named the Police Statistics and Transparency (STAT) Act, will require courts to compile and publish racial and other demographic data of all low-level offenses, including misdemeanors and violations. The bill also requires police departments to submit annual reports on arrest-related deaths to be submitted to the Department of Criminal Justice Services and to the governor and the Legislature.

Senate Bill S.8492: Establishes a private right of action for a member of a protected class when another person summons a police or peace officer on them without reason to suspect a crime or an imminent threat to person or property existed.

Senate Bill S.6601A: Amends the Civil Rights Law by adding a new section that affirms New Yorkers’ right to medical and mental health attention while in custody.

Senate Bill S.8493: Named the New York State Police Body-Worn Cameras Program, directs the Division of State Police to provide all state police officers with body-worn cameras that are to be used any time an officer conducts a patrol and prescribes mandated situations when the camera is to be turned on and recording.

Senate Bill S.2575B: Requires state and local law enforcement officers, as well as peace officers, to report, within six hours, when they discharge their weapon where a person could have been struck, whether they were on or off duty.