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Background
Directing the City Coordinator’s Office to convene a workgroup comprised of internal City staff as well as community members to analyze dispatch call categories and determine whether there are opportunities to expand the City’s ability to respond to those calls beyond the Minneapolis Police Department. This review shall include, without limitation:

- Whether there are financial, time, and/or personnel efficiencies to be gained in responding to those calls by individuals other than Minneapolis police officers.
- What types of de-escalation training mechanisms are in place or could be in place in responding to calls for emergency assistance, and whether responding to certain calls by non-police personnel will decrease likelihood of escalation.
- What the stakeholder and resident experience is for those on the receiving end of emergency call interventions, whether by police officers or non-police personnel.
- Whether certain calls must, by state law or other legal requirements, be responded to by POST Board-certified law enforcement officers.
- Whether a new alternative emergency number for more specialized triage related but not limited to mental health crises, domestic violence, and substance abuse could improve outcomes.
- What resources, if any, would be required if any portion of the calls currently dispatched to the Police Department were diverted elsewhere, including the cost of hardware and software required to integrate dispatch functionality into other departments.

The work group should be comprised of a representative from the Minneapolis Police Department, 911, Minneapolis Fire Department, Office of Violence Prevention, and the City Attorney’s Office. The workgroup shall be supported by other departments as needed. Additionally, the workgroup shall include six (6) community members to be appointed half by the City Council and half by the Mayor through the open appointment process. Staff is directed to report back to the PSEM Committee with recommendations, including training needs and opportunities, timelines for piloting or prototyping alternative dispatch responses, and financial and personnel costs associated with any forthcoming recommendations by no later than May 9th, 2019.
Reviewing data, there are a large number of actions that could be taken.

**Data review**
- Review of all 911 call and MPD response data over a two-year time period

**Idea generation**
- Over 50 ideas were generated which posed potential for alternative response other than police
- Ranked Ideas based on criteria: 1) extent to which idea answers the study question 2) Magnitude of impact on the study question

**Idea vetting**
- Number of ideas vetted dependent on staff capacity
- Three buckets of ideas moved forward to vetting: data and analytics, reporting and mental health
- Ideas were vetted for financial, capacity and state statute considerations.

**Recommendations**
- Six ideas are recommended to move forward
Recommendations format

Each recommendation will include the following information

• **Description**: A description of the recommendation
• **Rationale**: The reason why the recommendation is being made
• **Minnesota Statutes**: statutes that apply to the recommendation, if any
• **Financial impact**: The estimated financial impact of implementing the idea full scale
• **Test/research information** (for some): The estimated cost and timing for testing the idea before implementation
• **Considerations and risks**: various factors to be aware of if the recommendation were to be implemented
• **Alternatives**: variations to the recommendations that were noted but not vetted
• **Minority report**: a reflection of varying or alternative perspectives to the recommendations which should be considered when weighing which recommendations to move forward.
Findings
Overall findings

**Financial:**
- Most ideas would require up front costs to support overhead for additional staff (fleet, office space, supervisory staff etc)
- The call capacity needs to be met, regardless of responder, so ideas tend to be either cost neutral or could save some personnel costs, though savings would be moderate

**Time/personnel capacity:**
- Most ideas would require someone else to staff up (other departments, agencies etc)
- Don’t really anticipate this resulting in immediate capacity savings for MPD.
- Rather, many ideas are about allocating the right resources to the right calls for improved outcomes.

**Risk assessment:**
- A small number of statutes govern when there must be police response.
- Ideas should be considered on a spectrum, from lower risk to higher risk. Acceptance will depend on cost of risk mitigating factors and City risk tolerance.
Recommendations are either implementation ready or dependent on other work.

**Initial ideas**
- Mental health calls
- Reporting calls
- Improved data/tracking
- Improved police community relations
- Community education
- Improved staff training
- Various forms of alternative response
- Domestic abuse response

**Define low risk first**
- Re-assess priority system
- Improved data tracking
- Use predictive analytics for advanced response

**Mental health response**
- Embed mental health professionals in the Fire Department
- Embed mental health professionals in 911

**Reporting response**
- Direct parking-related calls to Traffic Control
- CSO response to low-risk traffic and reporting calls

**Implement**
- Expand co-responders
- Provide a non-emergency mental health line

**Reporting response**
- Exclusively direct theft report-only calls to 311 or online
Community Members’ Response to 911/MPD Workgroup Recommendations

Some community members on the 911/MPD Workgroup believe the recommendations from City Staff could go farther to address the original Staff Direction provided by the Minneapolis City Council. The Staff direction was to “determine whether there are opportunities to expand the City’s ability to respond to those [911] calls beyond the Minneapolis Police Department.”

We respect the intention behind the inclusion of community members in this workgroup, and it also must be noted that a more diverse mix of individuals would have created a more representative group. While our facilitator did as much as possible with the time allotted to our in-person meetings, system-level solutions are not brainstormed, vetted, and implemented within a 10-hour period. We believe a workgroup with true and equal - or majority – community representation could help to steer real systems change.

As community members of this workgroup, we recommend and prioritize the following efforts:

• **Study and pilot a program similar to CAHOOTS.** CAHOOTS, or Crisis Assistance Helping Out On The Street, is a program launched in Eugene, Oregon that sends a Mental Health Crisis worker and EMT to mental health calls. Crisis specialists work effectively with those experiencing mental health emergencies, homelessness, and conflict. Currently being considered and/or piloted in Portland, Denver, Oakland, New York, Indianapolis, and other cities, this program has been able to divert 17% of the 911 calls in Eugene to a non-police response.

• **Implement sending EMT to overdose victims.** Recode this call type to EMT only and send MPD only if EMT requests it. Chief Arradondo has discussed that MPD uses the equivalent of 34 days responding to the opioid crisis. This would equate to 1/12 of all police resources.

• **Test improving data on low-risk calls**
Why mental health and reporting?

- Both ranked highest for impact and ability to address staff direction, that is likelihood that an alternative non-MPD response would be appropriate
- Mental health reporting
  - This is the third highest priority 1 call volume and tenth highest problem nature code for all calls.
  - EDP calls are about 3% of call volume and 5-10% of officer time spent on calls.
  - Relative to other categories with similar call volumes, these calls are less likely to result in a police report. A police report was issued for 9% of EDP calls.
  - Ensuring we are sending the right resources to the right calls to improve outcomes

- Report-only calls:
  - Priority 3 calls account for 12% of volume
  - The top four report and parking problem nature codes account for 6% of all MPD call volume and represent 10-15% of officer time spent on calls.
  - While this is a relatively low call volume, time on calls for these tends to be longer.
Why data and analytics

• Many workgroup ideas depended on our ability to send alternative responders to “low-risk calls”, even for those coded as priority one today

• To better address risk, the priority system should be re-evaluated:
  • Re-rank priorities: The priority system is a proxy for risk. This system hasn’t been assessed in over ten years.
  • Disaggregate large categories: Suggestions were made to address this with use of key words and notes in CAD to better capture opioid use, overdose etc. Notes are harder to search and less reliable. Building this in to the priority coding system would both better capture data and operationalize our ability to send alternative response.
Recommendations for ideas that were not vetted

• The workgroup should continue this work
  • We will convene as a group after the Committee presentation to discuss our thoughts on next steps
  • This could range from a second short-term duration workgroup (less than one year) to longer-term durations (greater than one year) and could take a variety of formats, from formalizing the workgroup to creating smaller Agile groups.

• To continue, we should have clear objectives
  • Should we be working toward systems change vs systems rearrangements? How do we build time for genuine solutions?
  • Should we have an ambitious goal to work toward (e.g. divert x% of 911 calls to a non-MPD response?  

• We should have a way to engage the broader community, intentionally
  • Do we hold quarterly community meetings? Do we include a broader spectrum of community members in the workgroup?

• We should consider staff/volunteer support to move this work forward
  • How do we allocate resources to support the amount of time and capacity spent on this work?
  • Estimates of this range from $30-$50K in the form of project management support.
Expand co-responders unit
Expand co-responders unit

Description

- Expand the co-responder unit with afternoon shift (start time: between 3:00pm-7:00pm) 4 days per week with 5 additional teams.

- The current program consists of 5 teams, one for each police precinct. Each team has 1 sworn staff and 1 COPE staff who work 8 hour shifts Monday – Friday from 10:00am to 6:00pm.

Rationale

- There is additional need during current hours
  - Approximately half of co-responder calls are responding to EDP problem nature codes, half are a variety of other calls connected to follow up calls from the prior day or over night

- Many calls that would benefit from co-responder response happen during afternoon hours

- EDP calls outside of Co-Responder hours are handled by 911 responders

Minnesota Statutes

As an expansion of an existing program, this is not impacted by state statute.
# Financial Impact

## Expanded Co-Responder Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MPD Officer</th>
<th>Mental Health Co-Responder (from COPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Fringe</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Purchase – one time</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Increases</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ongoing costs/one-time costs</td>
<td>$126,000/ $32,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$258,000
Year 1 cost per additional co-responder unit

$1,290,000
Year 1 cost for 5 additional co-responder units

Note:
1) Sworn Staff were redeployed to current Co-Responder program from 911 responders
2) Under current program, 3.5 COPE staff are paid through City of Minneapolis budgeted funding. Remaining COPE staff costs are offset by County received Federal grant and other County funding of approximately $140,000
3) Costs above do not include office space, computers, other
Expand co-responders unit

Considerations and risks

• Hard to find: There is a dearth of mental health professions; COPE and MPD would take some time to staff up in order to build up the 5 teams
• MPD would still need to backfill calls if co-responders were tied up
• Hard to keep: Second shifts may be hard to fill or can experience higher turnover. Consideration should be given as to how this impacts outcomes.
• Part of the co-responders program is funded by SAMSHA. The grant is through 9/2023 and covers 1 COPE mental health worker.
• Partnering with COPE is an asset because they have established relationships in the community and are accustomed to responding in the field.

Minority report

• This does not align with the original Staff direction as it does not shift a 911 response “beyond the Minneapolis Police Department.” De-escalation and mental health issues are best addressed outside the police department.
• While the workgroup believes in and supports the co-responders program, this does not expand resources beyond MPD. In fact, this would be a further investment in added police officers. There are workgroup concerns this does not actually address the staff direction.
• Allocate budget for COPE reimbursement of mental health providers on the co-responder team to a different department in order to ensure external oversight of this spending
Data and Analytics
Data and analytics

Description

• The workgroup has recommended a number of alternative response ideas for low-risk calls. At this point, there is not a definition for low-risk. The purpose of data and analytics would be to further vet and define low-risk calls that could be appropriate for alternative responses. In priority order
  • Re-configure the priority system and the response plan to create efficiencies. This system hasn’t been reviewed since at least 2007. Are the problem nature code categories still appropriate? Should they be combined, disaggregated, or changed?
  • Improved tracking for what happens at mental health related calls (drug type, action etc) in order to help us better prioritize. This is being tracked today, but the need for this would be dependent on how low risk is defined and if further data is needed.
  • Explore using predictive analytics to predict which calls are least likely to change and are most likely to be “low-risk” mental health calls in order to best assess opportunities for alternative response.

Rationale

• Most ideas from the workgroup were around responding differently to low risk. Low risk has not been defined
Data and analytics

Minnesota Statutes

- There are no current statutes at issue here – that could change based on how the types of calls get classified once the analysis is done; we could also look at any data privacy issues once it is determined how the data will be extracted and used and how the results will be shared.

Considerations and risks

- High volume, complex problem nature codes should be disaggregated into smaller categories which can be re-prioritized (e.g. EDP, Unknown Trouble, Welfare Checks). This could improve tracking, but also help us refine potential for alternative response.

Alternatives

- When officers close out of a call they click a flag that says its "low" so we can start to identify when a call is low risk.

Minority report

- The overall goal of this recommendation is important. However, it needs to be expanded beyond only focusing on improving the data and to include actionable solutions to reduce the number of calls requiring an MPD response.

- There are dangers with predictive analytics, such as unconscious bias in predictive models, or using incomplete data to reflect future state. We might just want to code calls based on the description of the situation given to the dispatcher - i.e. "is there a weapon present? has the person threatened anyone with harm?" so that we have a clear distinction based on the situation and not on analytics.
### Financial Impact

#### Data and analytics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reconfigure priority system</th>
<th>Improved data tracking</th>
<th>Use of predictive analytics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/contracting costs</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$250,000/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated time of project</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The predictive analytics and improved data tracking costs/timelines are high level estimates; working to confirm.
Embed mental health workers with MFD
Embed mental health workers with MFD

Description
Include mental health workers in Fire department response in order to respond to low-risk EDP calls.
• This would create a co-responder type program for the Fire Department.

Rationale
• This is the closest the City could come to the CAHOOTS program out of Eugene Oregon, but with EMT’s/firefighters instead of EMS.
• Today MFD is responding to very few EDP calls.

Minnesota Statutes
• There does not seem to be new legal ground here. If the city was creating new contracts, the City Attorney’s Office civil division will be involved in that process.
# Test #3 - Embed mental health workers with MFD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Low Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>High Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost ($)</td>
<td>$5,000-$25,000</td>
<td>$30,000-$50,000</td>
<td>~$500,000/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>6 months - 1 year</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties Involved</td>
<td>911/MPD workgroup, 911, MFD/EMS, Actors</td>
<td>Workgroup, Mental Health Professional, MFD/EMS, 911</td>
<td>Mental Health Professional, MFD/EMS, 911, City Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Meeting Room/Open Space</td>
<td>Real-life setting i.e MFD/EMS responding to EDP calls over a short period of time.</td>
<td>Real-life setting i.e MFD/EMS responding to EDP calls over an extended period of time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Impact: 
Embed mental health workers with MFD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MFD Firefighter (3)</th>
<th>Mental Health Co-Responder (from COPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Fringe</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Purchase – one time (2)</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ongoing costs/one-time costs</td>
<td>$118,000/$32,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$250,000
Year 1 cost per co-responder unit

(1) Example of cost for embedding COPE personnel in MFD. Cost and capacity unknown for embedding into EMS.
(2) Assumes standard vehicle, not fire rig
(3) Currently, firefighters respond with a 3 person minimum team.
Note: All 911 EDP calls require a two-person squad arrive to assess safety before a co-responder team arrives. The information above does not include the cost of the patrol squad personnel/equipment.
Embed mental health workers with MFD

Considerations and risks

- This would change the scope of work for MFD and volume of calls handled. The exact amount by which the volume would change is dependent on the data and analytics recommendation.

- Response would include an EMT and mental health professional. Because of this, transport by this team alone could not be provided.

- Cost implications do not include training costs which would be necessary to respond to mental health calls.

Alternatives

- Work with EMS to discuss potential for CAHOOTS program. The City does not have the authority to create an exact replica of this program as we don’t oversee EMS.

Minority report

- It is unclear if this would fully remove MPD from responding to mental health calls, which we believe should be a goal of the city. Additionally, it appears to be more costly given the inclusion of MFD resources, whereas a model with a single responder, or one utilizing a Mental Health Crisis worker and EMT could be more cost-effective.

- Consider just mental health provider response to low-risk EDP calls, without a co-responder (MPD, Firefighter/EMT or EMS). COPE does this today, so we should look to support and expand.
Re-assign reporting calls to alternative responders
Re-assign reporting calls to alternative responders

Description

- **Report only**: For report only calls (theft, damage, non-evidence related receive information calls), exclusively direct calls to the web or 311 to enter reports online without the option for officer response.

- **Parking calls**: Direct non-emergency parking calls to traffic control (e.g. someone blocking a fire lane, blocking driveways, fire hydrants etc). These are high-priority and need to be addressed quickly.
  - This includes the potential for traffic control to cover the first night of snow emergencies (ticket and tow to clear snow emergency routes).

- **Low-risk report**: Community service officer (CSO) respond to calls to take a report, including theft and traffic incidents.

Rationale

- These calls represent the highest priority 3 call volume and, relative to percent of total call volume, a higher call time.

- Because these are priority 3 calls, they are lower risk and represent fewer hurdles to alternative response.

Minnesota Statutes

- If non-peace officers are taking reports on criminal offenses, the training process will need to be clear and comprehensive as the reports may still lead to criminal prosecution. The City Attorney’s Office should be involved in determining the type of reports that can be taken and to help develop those processes.
## Financial Impact – Report Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community Service Officer</th>
<th>Code Compliance Specialist (Regulatory Services, Traffic)</th>
<th>311 Customer Service Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary &amp; Fringe</strong></td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>$82,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle</strong></td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle maintenance</strong></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ongoing costs / one-time costs</strong></td>
<td>$75,000/$14,000</td>
<td>$85,000/$28,000</td>
<td>$82,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimates of increased cost/volume</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 CSOs responding to theft and property damage reports for 5 hours/week could complete 147 reports/week. In a year, that would total 7,644 reports (Annually, 3,103 calls for theft &amp; damage reports occur between 8am-6pm.)</td>
<td>A bolstered traffic control unit could cover snow emergency routes and ensure parking compliance. The full cost to create a second shift in the Traffic Unit is $2,475,000 (25 FTEs). *Does not include incidentals</td>
<td>311 would require 2 additional FTEs to manage this added volume—a cost of $165,200.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test #4 - Re-assign reporting calls to alternative responders - Report only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Low Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>High Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost ($)</td>
<td>0 – 1,000</td>
<td>1,000 – 5,000</td>
<td>41,000 – 164,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>1 – 2 weeks</td>
<td>4 – 6 weeks</td>
<td>3 – 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties Involved</td>
<td>911, 311, IT, Actors</td>
<td>911, 311, IT, Actors</td>
<td>911, 311, Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Classroom style engagement with simulation of report-only callers being instructed to call 311 or submit online report. Will help gauge potential reactions to a non-police response.</td>
<td>Add controls to online form to catch issues that require a police response (ex. Screening questions to ensure immediate assistance is not needed) and test simulations with actors. Also simulate 311 staff walking a caller through the form.</td>
<td>Implement updated form and begin required 311 referrals and walk throughs for real life calls over a test period of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test #4 - Re-assign reporting calls to alternative responders – Parking calls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Low Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>High Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost ($)</td>
<td>0 – 1,000</td>
<td>10,000 - 25,000</td>
<td>60,000 - 400,000 (1 – 4 traffic agents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>1 - 2 weeks</td>
<td>4 - 6 weeks</td>
<td>3 - 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties Involved</td>
<td>911, 311, Reg Services, Actors</td>
<td>911, 311, Reg Services</td>
<td>911, 311, Reg Services, Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Classroom style engagement with simulation of parking calls being transferred to traffic control.</td>
<td>Random control trial of “qualified” calls via 911 to traffic control for response and action in specific neighborhoods</td>
<td>Implemented program of call transfer between 911 and traffic control for response and action city-wide. Pilot may need to last a full year to study all seasons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Test #4 - Re-assign reporting calls to alternative responders - Low Risk Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Low Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>High Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost ($)</strong></td>
<td>0 – 3,000 (salary)</td>
<td>5,000 – 9,000 (salary)</td>
<td>50,000 – 186,000 (salary &amp; vehicle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 days</td>
<td>2 – 4 weeks</td>
<td>3 – 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parties Involved</strong></td>
<td>911, Police (CSO)</td>
<td>911, Police (CSO), Actors</td>
<td>911, Police (CSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting</strong></td>
<td>Classroom-style exercise using materials and acting to perform the process of receiving a dispatching low risk calls to CSOs v. Peace Officers.</td>
<td>Classroom-style simulation to act out 911 dispatchers receiving calls and dispatching CSOs vs. Peace Officers to respond to low-risk calls with actors</td>
<td>Hire two (2) CSOs to respond to select low-risk calls within a selected Police Precinct within Minneapolis and compare to Peace Officer responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re-assign reporting calls to alternative responders

Considerations and risks

- **Report only:**
  - Would need to ensure capacity to review forms in the event someone enters more serious crimes and needs more immediate services (this has happened before).
  - Would need to ensure we can provide assistance for filling out the forms if we are directing people online. The form of assistance could be via the phone, but this option would mean there would be no in-person support provided. Also, 311 is not open 24/7 so phone support would have limited hours.
  - Political will: are we willing to change our level of service as a City if someone requests a police officer but we direct them online or to 311?

- **Parking calls:**
  - If this work shifted to traffic control and they were tied up, this could delay the response.
  - Having traffic control ticket and tow for night one of snow emergencies would require an additional shift. This seems cost prohibitive, but MPD could use traffic control for other purposes in the late night hours (e.g. bar close, write tags and tow cars parked illegally during bar close to help with traffic flow, semi and commercial truck parking) and traffic control could use the additional staff as they are over capacity now.

- **Low-risk report:**
  - If action is needed on the scene (e.g. warrant on a license), a CSO would need to call for backup.
  - CSO’s would need additional fleet and equipment.
  - Would need to adapt protocol for CSO’s to ensure any reports could stand up in court.
  - CSO’s do not have an overnight shift so after hours coverage would still need to be handled by peace officers.

Alternatives

Minority report

- We believe that it is important to evaluate how Regulatory Services and 311 can handle “reporting calls” instead of MPD. However, the current recommendation offers a solution where shifting work from MPD to Traffic Control would save MPD $50k (for snow emergency coverage) while increasing Traffic Control’s costs by $2.5m. The costs and benefits in this example do not seem reasonable.
Embed mental health workers in 911 dispatch
Embed mental health workers in 911 dispatch

Description

• Include mental health professionals in 911 dispatch to respond to EDP or mental-health related calls. The concept is that this could help to better dispatch as we look at alternative response, or that some calls could be handled via phone by a mental health worker.

• Because this is currently being piloted in several other jurisdictions, (at least a few known are Ramsey County, Hennepin County) we would first research if this has been an effective intervention before moving forward with pilot or implementation.

Rationale

• This could be used to support dispatchers as we explore alternative responses to mental health related calls.

Minnesota Statutes

• No specific statutes on the issue. May be contractual issues that could be addressed, and if the mental health workers were speaking directly to callers, they may become potential witnesses in criminal trials as 911 calls are frequently used as evidence.
## Research #1 - Embed mental health workers in 911 dispatch to better triage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Low Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>High Fidelity Prototype</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost ($)</td>
<td>0 – 5,000</td>
<td>5,000 - 25,000</td>
<td>100,000 - 300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>1 - 2 weeks</td>
<td>4 - 6 weeks</td>
<td>6 - 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties Involved</td>
<td>911, Mental Health Professional, Actors</td>
<td>911, mental health professional, COPE (or other mental health crisis response team)</td>
<td>911, mental health professional, COPE (or other mental health crisis response team), City officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Classroom style engagement with simulation of 911 triage process with mental health professional</td>
<td>Real life setting of 911 call triage process over a short period of time</td>
<td>Real life setting of 911 call triage process over an extended period of time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial impact: Embed mental health workers in 911 dispatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary/fringe</th>
<th>911 Dispatcher</th>
<th>Mental Health Co-Responder (from COPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary/fringe</td>
<td>$91,900</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adding a mental health professional to 911 dispatch would cost $100,000 per FTE
Embed mental health workers in 911 dispatch

Considerations and risks

- Would need to consider having all shifts covered, or at least high-volume times which tend to be mid-shift for EDP calls.
- Preliminary research on the use of phone counseling instead of police response based on a pilot in New York found they were only able to divert 3% of EDP calls using this technique. Success depended on the call being made by the EDP themselves and required that they were in a quiet, private space to have this conversation.

Alternatives

- Divert 911 calls eligible for immediate mental health support to another agency/hotline which already provides this service.

Minority report

- This is worthy of further evaluation. And, we think that where possible, we should prioritize in-person Mental Health Crisis workers to help people through mental health emergencies. Nothing can replace a person to person connection.
Provide a special emergency number for mental health calls
Provide a special emergency number for mental health calls

Idea description

• Provide a specific call line for mental health emergency calls.

Rationale

• The staff direction required that we explore this option.

Minnesota Statutes

• This would still be under the purview of 911 (as it is still an emergency number – unlike 311); N11 codes are nationally assigned under the FCC; there is actually an FCC report on the feasibility of establishing a 3 Digit dialing code for mental health calls.
Provide a special emergency number for mental health calls

Considerations and risks

• Because this is currently being piloted in several other jurisdictions, we would first research if this has been an effective intervention before moving forward with pilot or implementation.
• Many people are already used to calling 911 if it is a crisis.
• COPE already provides a crisis line/phone number

Alternatives

• Leverage existing crisis lines rather than building internal City infrastructure for this purpose.

Minority report

• This seems like an approach that has not produced significant results in other communities and would need significant public awareness dollars to achieve a small amount of benefit. It also doesn’t include recommendations on how to triage and handle the calls.
Appendix

- The design process
- State statutes
- 911/MPD Data
Understanding the design process

The design process is intended to properly test and explore ideas before too many resources get used. Prototyping and piloting highlight what works and shines a light on any flaws which can then be rectified before full-scale implementation.

Prototype
- Prototypes can be quick and rough — useful for early-stage testing and learning
- Low confidence in results
- Lots of assumptions
- Low cost
- 2-6 week timeframe
- Existing resources are leveraged
- Discover efficacy of the idea

Pilot
- Pilots can also be fully formed and detailed — usually for trials near the end of the project
- High confidence in results
- Tested assumptions
- Moderate-high cost
- 4-6 month timeframe
- New or re-allocated resources are assigned to the idea
- Discover scalability of the idea
Licensed Peace Officers & Minnesota State Statutes

Domestic Violence

Minn. Stat. 629.342 – each police department must develop a protocol regarding domestic violence cases.
Minn. Stat. 629.341 – an officer who finds probable cause that a domestic abuse crime has occurred must do a police report.

Other Statutes

Minn. Stat. 626.84
(c) "Peace officer" means:
(1) an employee or an elected or appointed official of a political subdivision or law enforcement agency who is licensed by the board, charged with the prevention and detection of crime and the enforcement of the general criminal laws of the state and who has the full power of arrest; . . . ;
Subd. 2. Scope.
Notwithstanding sections 12.03, subdivision 4, 12.25, or any other law to the contrary, no individual employed or acting as an agent of any political subdivision shall be authorized to carry a firearm when on duty unless the individual has been licensed under sections 626.84 to 626.863.

Minn. Stat. 626.862 POWERS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.
Except as specifically provided by statute, only a peace officer and part-time peace officer may:
(1) issue a citation in lieu of arrest or continued detention unless specifically authorized by ordinance;
(2) ask a person receiving a citation to give a written promise to appear in court; or
(3) take a person into custody as permitted by section 629.34.

Minn. Stat. 169.98 POLICE, PATROL, OR SECURITY GUARD VEHICLE.
§ Subd. 1a. Vehicle stop authority.
Only a person who is licensed as a peace officer or part-time peace officer under sections 626.84 to 626.863 may use a motor vehicle governed by subdivision 1 to stop a vehicle as defined in section 169.011, subdivision 92.
Subd. 1b. Operation of marked vehicle.
Except as otherwise permitted under sections 221.221 and 299D.06, a motor vehicle governed by subdivision 1 may only be operated by a person licensed as a peace officer or part-time peace officer under sections 626.84 to 626.863.
911/MPD Data
1 - TYPES OF CALLS FOR SERVICE

The Minneapolis Police Department responds to many types of calls for service. Sometimes the calls for service are self-initiated, such as directed patrol, walk through a building, and traffic law enforcement stops. Other times calls for service for MPD are 911 calls or calls taken by 911 call takers via the non-emergency number. Calls for service can be grouped into two distinct call for service categories: MPD 911 calls and self-initiated. Below is two years of data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPD 911 calls</td>
<td>390,836 (55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-initiated</td>
<td>320,127 (45%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>710,963 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CALLS FOR SERVICE - CALL TYPE

- **MPD 911 calls**
- **self-initiated**
2 - MPD 911 CALL PRIORITIES

Each 911 call is given a priority by the call taker based on the information the caller provides during the call. The priority can change based on additional information learned. A priority 0 is a known crisis exists that threatens the life of an individual. A priority 1 is considered an imminent threat to personal safety. Priority 2 is where no immediate threat of harm exists. Priority 3 is where conditions are stable at the scene of the call. A priority 4 is typically a self-initiated call and is the least urgent. The priority helps indicate the order of the calls to dispatch. Below is two years of call priority data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.
3 - PUBLIC 911 CALL PROBLEM TYPES

Various problem nature codes make up each of the priority levels for MPD 911 calls. Each 911 call is assigned a problem nature code by the call taker based on the information the caller provides during the call. Problem nature codes may change at anytime throughout the incident. These changes can be from additional information provided by the initial caller, a subsequent caller, or based on what responders/officers encounter when arriving on-scene. As part of this data overview, the problem nature code at the time assigned will be reviewed. Below is two years of problem nature codes by priority data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019. Click on the priority to see the problem nature codes which make up the priority.

Choose call type.

MPD 911 calls

Priority 1

Priority 2

Priority 3

Priority 4
4 - PROBLEM CHANGES FROM FIRST ASSIGNED TO FINAL

Problem nature codes may change at anytime throughout the incident. Below is two years of MPD 911 call changes in problem nature codes (problem nature code at time first assigned on the top and the final problem nature code on the bottom) data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.
5 - PUBLIC 911 CALLS QUEUE TO ASSIGNED

The priority level helps to indicate the seriousness of an incident and the procedures for response. Once a call taker gets a call and it is given a priority level, the call is placed into the dispatch queue. Depending on priority and availability, the call will wait in the queue until it can be assigned to a unit. If the call is in queue longer than the threshold the sergeant is notified. Below is two years of MPD 911 call average minutes from queue to assigned data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.

![Graph showing average minutes from queue to assigned over time for different priority levels.](image-url)
6 - PUBLIC 911 CALLS ASSIGNED TO ARRIVED

The priority level helps to indicate the seriousness of an incident and the procedures for response. The priority level determines how units reach the incident (lights, siren, and/or emergency driving). Below is two years of MPD 911 call average minutes from assigned to arrived data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.
The duration in which officers are on the scene of an incident is determined by what is encountered, what needs to happen for the situation to be under control, and deliver requested services to the public. Below is two years of MPD 911 call average minutes from first arrived to closed data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.
8 - PUBLIC 911 CALL TOP PROBLEM TYPES

Of the problem types that make up each of the three priority levels for MPD 911 calls, some happen more frequently than others. The 'few' problem nature codes that occur most frequently make up a larger percent of the total incidents than the 'many' problem nature codes that occur less frequently. This implies that most (~80%) of the incidents come from the 'few' (~20%) problem nature codes. Below is two years of the top 20 MPD 911 call problem nature codes by priority data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.

Top 20 Priority None MPD 911 Calls for Service
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8 - PUBLIC 911 CALL TOP PROBLEM TYPES

Of the problem types that make up each of the three priority levels for MPD 911 calls, some happen more frequently than others. The ‘few’ problem nature codes that occur most frequently make up a larger percent of the total incidents than the ‘many’ problem nature codes that occur less frequently. This implies that most (~80%) of the incidents come from the ‘few’ (~20%) problem nature codes. Below is two years of the top 20 MPD 911 call problem nature codes by priority data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.

Top 20 Priority None MPD 911 Calls for Service
The average minutes from various time parameters can be looked at for the ‘few’ problem nature codes within each priority that represent ‘most’ of the MPD 911 calls for service. The problem nature codes that have a high queue to arrived and a high arrived to closed indicate incidents which take longer to respond to and longer to complete. Below is two years of public 911 call time compare data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.

**Priority 1 Problem Nature Code Time Compare**

**Choose Priority Level:** Priority 1

**Choose X Axis Parameter:** Entered Queue to First Assigned

**Choose Y Axis Parameter:** Phone Pickup to Entered Queue

**Problem Nature Code Volume to Police Report Compare**

**Volume (Incident Count)**

**Police Report count**
The average minutes from various time parameters can be looked at for problem nature codes within each priority that represent self-initiated calls for service. The problem nature codes that have a high arrived to closed indicate incidents which take longer to complete. Below is two years of self-initiated call time compare data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.
This is a combination of public 911 calls for service and self-initiated showing the volume of the problem nature code at first assigned and the corresponding average duration (in minutes) on scene. Click on a bar to the left to highlight the corresponding circle on the right. Below is data for two years of calls for service data from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.

### All Calls for Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directed Patrol (P)</td>
<td>118,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Check (P)</td>
<td>51,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Law Enforcement (P)</td>
<td>46,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Site (P)</td>
<td>26,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious Person (P)</td>
<td>24,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check the Welfare (P)</td>
<td>23,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance (P)</td>
<td>22,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Beat (P)</td>
<td>20,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted Person (P)</td>
<td>18,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious Vehicle (P)</td>
<td>17,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Wireless/Cell Ph.</td>
<td>16,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Acciden.</td>
<td>15,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Trouble (P)</td>
<td>15,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (P)</td>
<td>15,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse-in Progre.</td>
<td>14,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft - Report Only (P)</td>
<td>12,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Problem (P)</td>
<td>11,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Disturb Parso.</td>
<td>11,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic (P)</td>
<td>11,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audible Business Alarm (P)</td>
<td>10,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage/Hit &amp; R..</td>
<td>9,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault in Progress (P)</td>
<td>9,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down Outside-One (P)</td>
<td>8,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist EMS Personnel (P)</td>
<td>8,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight (P)</td>
<td>8,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audible Residential Alarm (P)</td>
<td>8,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Information (P)</td>
<td>8,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Count vs. Duration

- Average Minutes Arrived to Closed
- Count
- Priority Number Color Legend:
  - 4
  - 3
  - 2
  - 1
  - 0
  - Null
10 - VOLUME AND QUEUED TO ASSIGNED BY PROBLEM NATURE CODE

Response Dates between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2019. Division in Precinct 1, Precinct 2, Precinct 3, Precinct 4, Precinct 5. Incidents with no null times for phone pick-up, entered queue, first unit assigned, or first unit arrived.

FILTERS

Choose Precinct:
- All

Choose Problem:
- Assault in Progress (P)
- Assist EMS Personnel (P)
- Audible Business Alarm (P)
- Audible Residential Alarm (P)
- Burglary Dwelling - Report (P)
- Burglary Dwelling In Progress (P)
- Check the Welfare (P)
- Damage Property-In Progress(P)
- Damage Property-Rpt Only (P)
- Disturbance (P)
- Domestic (P)
- Domestic Abuse-In Progress (P)
- Down Outside-One (PE)
- Emotionally Disturb Person (P)
- Fight (P)
- Loud Party (P)
- Music-Loud (P)
- Narcotics (Drug) Activity (P)
- On Site (P)
- Parking Problem (P)
- Person with a Gun (P)
- Person with a Weapon (P)
- Personal Injury Accident (PFE)
- Poss Personal Injury Acc (P)
- Property Damage Accident (P)
- Property Damage/Hit & Run (P)
- Receive Information (P)
- Recover Property (P)
- Retrieve Prop/Dom Situation(P)
- Road Hazard (P)
- Sound of Shots Fired (P)
- Suspicious Person (P)
- Suspicious Vehicle (P)
- Theft - Report Only (P)