

**Statement on behalf of the  
American Civil Liberties Union of the District of Columbia  
before the D.C. Council Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety  
Hearing on Bill 25-0555 – “Addressing Crime Trends (ACT) Now  
Amendment Act of 2023”**

**by  
Melissa Wasser, Policy Counsel  
November 29, 2023**

Good morning Chairperson Pinto and members of the Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety. I am Melissa Wasser, Policy Counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union of the District of Columbia (ACLU-D.C.). On behalf of our over 14,000 members in all 8 wards, ACLU-D.C. submits the following testimony opposing Bill 25-0555, the Addressing Crime Trends (ACT) Now Amendment Act of 2023.

ACLU-D.C. strongly opposes this legislation and urges the Committee not to move it forward. Allowing officers to choke people, to escape accountability, and to arrest people without probable cause will not make the District any safer. Improving public safety in the District involves restricting harmful police practices, creating more transparency around police misconduct, and holding police accountable for their misconduct. This bill fails on all of these measures.

Reinstating unconstitutional drug free zones does nothing to improve public safety in the District. The definitional changes to neck restraints and asphyxiating restraints are dangerous, potentially fatal, and unnecessary. These changes also stand in direct opposition to the Council’s own rationale for these initial changes in the summer of 2020.

Transparency is a core aspect of policing in a democratic society. The legislation's proposed changes to the body-worn camera (BWC) program, the Office of Police Complaints’ access to files, and the officer disciplinary database fly in the face of transparency and accountability, which are both essential to MPD building trust and legitimacy in the eyes of District residents and the public.

Rather than removing vehicular pursuit tactics from the definition of serious use of force, the Council should be taking steps to limit vehicular pursuits and follow the Police Reform Commission’s recommendations. Lowering the felony theft threshold will not deter people from stealing and layering piecemeal criminal code changes on

top of an already-flawed criminal code will not make the District any safer. Reviving the overly broad anti-mask law would lead to subjective policing and would disproportionately impact the District's Black residents.

For these reasons, we urge the Committee to not move forward on this legislation, as it does not represent the approach that is needed to keep people safe in the District.

**I. Reinstating drug free zones will lead to unconstitutional conduct and does nothing to improve public safety in the District.**

Reinstating drug free zones that were unanimously repealed in 2014, with then-Councilmember Bowser's support,<sup>1</sup> is not the way to achieve public safety. The legislation would revive the Anti-Loitering/Drug Free Zone Act of 1996 and authorize the chief of MPD to "declare any public area a drug free zone for a period not to exceed 120 consecutive hours."<sup>2</sup> Once a drug free zone is designated, MPD must post a statement that it is "unlawful for a person to congregate in a group of 2 or more persons for the purpose of committing an offense... within the boundaries of a drug free zone," and to "fail to disperse after being instructed by a uniformed officer of the Police Department who *reasonably believes* (emphasis added) the person is congregating for the purpose of committing an offense."<sup>3</sup>

Loitering is constitutionally protected and the District can't make it a crime for a person to loiter – or to fail to disperse when ordered to disperse by an officer, which is the same thing.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, loitering for the purpose of committing a crime is not protected. This means a jurisdiction can outlaw loitering if it is being done with the intent to commit an illegal act, such as the sale of regulated drugs or sex. But an officer would have to have *probable cause* to believe that the suspect was committing or intending to commit a crime, because probable cause is the constitutional minimum for an arrest.

Even with the addition of the phrase, "for the purpose of committing an offense," this section is still unconstitutional. This bill gives officers authority to order people to disperse if the officer had a *reasonable belief* that the person was loitering for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Bill 20-0760, Repeal of Prostitution Free Zones Amendment Act of 2014, <https://lims.dccouncil.gov/Legislation/B20-0760>.

<sup>2</sup> Bill 25-0555, Addressing Crime Trends (ACT) Now Amendment Act of 2023, <https://lims.dccouncil.gov/Legislation/B25-0555>.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Papachristou v. City of Jacksonville*, 405 U.S. 156 (1972).

purpose of drug dealing, and then to arrest them if they failed to disperse. The officer will have probable cause to believe that the person he arrests has failed to disperse. However, the dispersal order itself is not valid unless it is based on probable cause to believe that the person who is ordered to disperse has committed a crime. Ordering a person who has committed no crime to disperse and then arresting him if he does not makes mere loitering a crime, which is unconstitutional. As such, we urge the Council to reject this unconstitutional section outright.

**II. Changing the definitions of “neck restraints” and “asphyxiating restraints” is dangerous, unnecessary, and in direct opposition of the Council’s own rationale on initial policing reforms in the summer of 2020.**

The bill would amend the definitions of asphyxiating restraint and neck restraint and apply them retroactively. The bill removes the word “effect” from the definition of asphyxiating restraint so the definition now reads “with the purpose or intent of severely restricting the person’s breathing.”<sup>5</sup> The bill also removes the word “movement” from the definition of neck restraint so the definition now reads “with the purpose, intent, or effect of controlling or restricting the person’s blood flow or breathing.”<sup>6</sup>

These changes are dangerous, potentially fatal, and unnecessary.<sup>7</sup> Like many other major city police departments, MPD has prohibited the use of neck restraints for some time in its use of force policy.<sup>8</sup> In the wake of the killing of George Floyd, prohibitions like MPD’s have become law in numerous states and cities across the country.<sup>9</sup> If passed, the updated definition would allow a chokehold to restrict an

---

<sup>5</sup> Bill 25-0555, Addressing Crime Trends (ACT) Now Amendment Act of 2023, <https://lims.dccouncil.gov/Legislation/B25-0555>.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

<sup>7</sup> Bozeman et al., “Safety of Vascular Neck Restraint applied by law enforcement officers,” *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 92, 102446 (Nov. 2022), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2022.102446>.

<sup>8</sup> “It shall be unlawful for members to apply a neck restraint.” MPD Use of Force Overview (2023), 3, <https://mpdc.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/mpdc/publication/attachments/5.1%20Use%20of%20Force%20Overview%20FINAL.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> Harmeet Kaur and Janine Mack, “The cities, states and countries finally putting an end to police neck restraints,” CNN (June 16, 2020), <https://www.cnn.com/2020/06/10/world/police-policies-neck-restraints-trnd/index.html>.

individual's movement even if that restraint has the unintended effect of restricting that person's breathing.

These changes also stand in direct opposition to the Council's own rationale for banning these restraints. In response to the killings of Breonna Taylor and George Floyd by police in the summer of 2020, the Council initially passed policing and criminal justice reforms in the District, including a ban on the use of neck restraints. The Council reasoned that banning the use of neck restraints was "the provision most responsive to the circumstances of George Floyd's death."<sup>10</sup> In following the recommendations of the D.C. Police Reform Commission, the Council created a broader prohibition against any restraint that creates the risk of asphyxiation and expanded the prohibition to "prohibited techniques," which included both neck restraints and asphyxiating restraints.<sup>11</sup>

Furthermore, the initial underlying rationale of the ban – to prevent the asphyxiation of individuals taken into custody – extended to restraints beyond those that target an individual's neck. Prior to George Floyd's murder, special police officers in the District knelt on Alonzo Smith's back in 2015 and held his head down. Smith later died and an autopsy revealed blunt force injuries on his head, neck, and torso; his death was ruled a homicide. We cannot go back to being a city that allows the use of these restraints.

Amending the definitions of "neck restraints" and "asphyxiating restraints" goes directly against what the Council was trying to achieve with policing and criminal justice reforms in the summer of 2020. Although the Mayor and MPD claim these changes clarify the distinction between a serious use of force and incidental contact with the neck,<sup>12</sup> asphyxiating restraints would be defined solely on the purpose or intention of the law enforcement officer to severely restrict the person's breathing. This means that this legislative change is much larger than trying to just stop

---

<sup>10</sup> D.C. Council Committee on the Judiciary & Public Safety Committee Report on Bill 24-0320, the "Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022," 16, [https://lms.dccouncil.gov/downloads/LIMS/47448/Committee\\_Report/B24-0320-Committee\\_Report1.pdf?Id=151042](https://lms.dccouncil.gov/downloads/LIMS/47448/Committee_Report/B24-0320-Committee_Report1.pdf?Id=151042).

<sup>11</sup> D.C. Police Reform Commission, "Decentering Police to Improve Public Safety: A Report of the DC Police Reform Commission," 120 (April 1, 2021), <https://dccouncil.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Police-Reform-Commission-Full-Report.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> Executive Office of the Mayor, "Mayor Bowser Announces New Legislation to Support Safe and Effective Policing," October 23, 2023, <https://mayor.dc.gov/release/mayor-bowser-announces-new-legislation-support-safe-and-effective-policing>.

incidental contact and would further the use of chokeholds by MPD. Decriminalizing these chokeholds will not make us safer in the District.

Instead of amending these definitions, the Council should reject these changes and follow the Police Reform Commission’s recommendation and further expand the prohibited uses of force beyond “neck restraints” to include other means of asphyxiation, such as applications of force causing positional asphyxia (including a prone restraint with a knee in the back of a person being arrested).<sup>13</sup>

**III. Changes to the body-worn camera program, the Office of Police Complaints’ access to files, and the officer disciplinary database violate public trust and fail to hold police accountable when they abuse their power.**

Similarly, the Mayor also seeks to roll back changes to the body-worn camera (BWC) program. The legislation would allow officers to view BWC footage prior to writing initial reports except in certain circumstances and to allow for the redaction of likenesses of District and federal government employees in BWC footage release. This means that in cases that do not involve police use of force or involve use of force that is below the force identified in the amended law, police can view their BWC before writing initial reports.

When the Council passed the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act, the Council embraced accountability and transparency for a city with a troubled history of police abuses and chronic failures to hold officers responsible for their misconduct, particularly when that misconduct affects communities of color. BWC provisions help promote police accountability, deter officer misconduct, and provide objective evidence to help resolve complaints against police. The D.C. Police Reform Commission even recommended that prohibiting officers from reviewing their BWC recordings before writing initial reports should be a permanent change.<sup>14</sup>

While studies suggest that pre-report reviews of BWC footage can produce a small increase in the accuracy of police reports, there is a tradeoff: research shows that video recordings “do not necessarily reflect what the [officer] saw, heard or

---

<sup>13</sup> D.C. Police Reform Commission, “Decentering Police to Improve Public Safety: A Report of the DC Police Reform Commission,” 120 (April 1, 2021), <https://dccouncil.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Police-Reform-Commission-Full-Report.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 169.

perceived, particularly when recorded from a different vantage point”<sup>15</sup> and can bias the officer’s memory, suppress what the officer originally recalled, and cause overreliance on video footage for recollection.<sup>16</sup> Initial police reports should be based on the officer’s unbiased recollection of events, and officers should not be permitted to view BWC footage prior to preparing initial reports.

The legislation would also remove the requirement that the officer disciplinary records database include the name, badge number and current duty status of MPD officers against whom an allegation of misconduct has been sustained. This change violates public trust by shielding police misconduct from the public view.

The establishment of this database was a massive win for transparency. This database marked the first time the public would be able to track officer misconduct and how the MPD handles sustained allegations. Unlike most other professions that we have access to misconduct and certification records (e.g., law, medicine), law enforcement personnel have a right to kill and harm (often without consequences). The database will help keep MPD accountable to the public it serves and build further trust that the police are removing “bad apples” from their ranks.

Removing the requirement that the database include names, badge numbers, and current duty status of MPD officers with sustained allegations of misconduct would render the database useless. These records should be public because it would help improve police accountability and build greater trust within the community. Making these disciplinary records public also prevents greater waste, fraud, and abuse from re-hiring officers who have committed misconduct.<sup>17</sup> From 2010 – 2020, there have been \$91 million in payments involving allegations of police misconduct

---

<sup>15</sup> Donald Dawes, et al, “Body Worn Cameras Improve Law Enforcement Officer Report Writing Accuracy,” *Journal of Law Enforcement*, Issue 2161-0231 (2015), 10-11, <https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/improvelawenforcement.pdf>.

<sup>16</sup> Brittany Blaskovits and Craig Bennell, “Exploring the Potential Impact of Body Worn Cameras on Memory in Officer-Involved Critical Incidents: a Literature Review,” *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 35(3) (2019), 255-259, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11896-019-09354-1>. See also Vredeveltdt, A., Kesteloo, L., & Hildebrandt, A., “To watch or not to watch: When reviewing body-worn camera footage improves police reports,” *Law and Human Behavior*, 45(5) (2021), 427, <https://psycnet.apa.org/fulltext/2022-09218-004.pdf>; and Pezdek, K., Shapland, T., & Barragan, J., “Memory outcomes of police officers viewing their body-worn camera video,” *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition* (2022), <https://psycnet.apa.org/manuscript/2022-42983-001.pdf>.

<sup>17</sup> Washington Post Editorial Board, “Why D.C. has rehired fired police – and given them back pay,” *Wash Post.* (Oct. 18, 2022), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/10/18/dc-rehire-fired-police-officers-misconduct/>.

at MPD.<sup>18</sup> In the District, 65 officers have been named in repeated claims, accounting for \$7.6 million of the \$91 million paid—the fifth highest overall of the 25 cities surveyed. Having a public database of misconduct records could deter conduct that would end up in yet another settlement payment for the District.

The legislation would also change the Office of Police Complaints’ access to information from “unfettered access to all information” to “timely and complete access to information.”<sup>19</sup> This change will hurt the oversight power of OPC and will fail to hold MPD and D.C. Housing Authority Officers accountable for their behavior. By changing access from “unfettered” to “timely and complete information,” it sends a greater message that law enforcement officers will not be held fully accountable by the Office of Police Complaints for their misconduct. The Council should reject these provisions outright.

#### **IV. Vehicular pursuits are inherently dangerous, and the Council should acknowledge that inherent danger by rejecting this section outright.**

The bill would also amend the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 to clarify the standards by which the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) may engage in a vehicular pursuit and would make permanent amendments to the vehicular pursuit law that were passed on an emergency basis this past summer. These changes include allowing vehicular pursuits that endanger the suspect and passengers in the suspect’s vehicle; removing various police tactics of stopping vehicles from the definition of serious use of force; and removing the section that calls “ramming” a use of deadly force.

As we testified to this committee in 2021, “[a]cross the country and here in the District, laws exist that penalize members of the public for speeding. Because at a fundamental level, our society recognizes the inherent dangers speeding cars pose to anyone in their vicinity. Police chases pose the same threat.”<sup>20</sup> The Police Reform

---

<sup>18</sup> Keith L. Alexander, Steven Rich, and Hannah Thacker, “The hidden billion-dollar cost of repeated police misconduct,” Wash. Post (Mar. 9, 2022), <https://wapo.st/3Gk0Sdn>.

<sup>19</sup> Bill 25-0555, Addressing Crime Trends (ACT) Now Amendment Act of 2023, <https://lims.dccouncil.gov/Legislation/B25-0555>.

<sup>20</sup> ACLU-D.C. Testimony Before the D.C. Council Committee on the Bias in Threat Assessments Evaluation Amendment Act and Law Enforcement Vehicular Pursuit Reform Act (May 20, 2021), <https://www.acludc.org/en/legislation/aclu-dc-testimony-dc-council-committee-bias-threat-assessments-evaluation-amendment-act>.

Commission also recommended that “in the interest of both public safety and harm prevention, the Council should strictly limit vehicle pursuits.”<sup>21</sup>

The legislation removes the following practices or tactics for stopping vehicles from the definition of serious use of force: boxing in, caravanning,<sup>22</sup> deploying a roadblock, deploying a tire deflation device, paralleling,<sup>23</sup> and ramming<sup>24</sup> (previously designated as a use of deadly force). By removing these practices, the Mayor is sending a message that these uses of force are approved when pursuing a suspect and their potential passengers. Vehicle pursuits are inherently dangerous and can be fatal. Because of this inherent danger, police departments across the country, including MPD, strictly limit them to situations involving fleeing suspects who pose an immediate risk of killing or injuring another person.<sup>25</sup> Despite these policies, the District had at least three incidents of police chases that ended up in the deaths of District residents – Terrence Sterling in 2016, Jeffrey Price in 2018, and Karon Hylton-Brown in 2020.

Additionally, when more restrictive pursuit policies are adopted, “[t]here is little evidence that more individuals will flee, that crime rates will increase, or that case clearances will decline... Indeed, crime clearances have stayed relatively stable over time despite agencies adopting policies that are more restrictive.”<sup>26</sup> These provisions should be rejected outright. Instead, the Council should follow the Police Reform

---

<sup>21</sup> D.C. Police Reform Commission, “Decentering Police to Improve Public Safety: A Report of the DC Police Reform Commission,” 103 (April 1, 2021), <https://dccouncil.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Police-Reform-Commission-Full-Report.pdf>.

<sup>22</sup> Caravanning is a “[p]ractice or tactic in which a law enforcement officer operates a pursuit vehicle without maintaining a reasonable distance between another pursuit vehicle.” See MPD General Order 301.03 (July 20, 2023), 10, [https://go.mpdconline.com/GO/GO\\_301\\_03.pdf](https://go.mpdconline.com/GO/GO_301_03.pdf).

<sup>23</sup> Paralleling is a “[p]ractice or tactic in which a law enforcement officer operates a pursuit vehicle in the same direction and at approximately the same speed as the suspect motor vehicle using another street or highway parallel to the direction or route of the suspect motor vehicle.” See MPD General Order 301.03 (July 20, 2023), 11, [https://go.mpdconline.com/GO/GO\\_301\\_03.pdf](https://go.mpdconline.com/GO/GO_301_03.pdf).

<sup>24</sup> Ramming is a “[t]actic in which a law enforcement officer intentionally causes a pursuit vehicle to come into physical contact with a suspect motor vehicle with the intent to damage, slow, or stop the suspect motor vehicle, regardless of the speed of the pursuit vehicle.” See MPD General Order 301.03 (July 20, 2023), 11, [https://go.mpdconline.com/GO/GO\\_301\\_03.pdf](https://go.mpdconline.com/GO/GO_301_03.pdf).

<sup>25</sup> MPD General Order 301.03 (July 20, 2023), [https://go.mpdconline.com/GO/GO\\_301\\_03.pdf](https://go.mpdconline.com/GO/GO_301_03.pdf).

<sup>26</sup> Alpert, G. P., & Lum, C. (2014). Police pursuit driving: Policy and research. Springer Science & Business Media, <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=NeS5BAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=Police+pursuit+driving:+Policy+and+research&ots=UBKVpkZxTZ&sig=EPRP5gujJGQjO1gEosMw0fOLYE#v=onepage&q=Police%20pursuit%20driving%3A%20Policy%20and%20research&f=false>.



Commission’s recommendations: reinforce MPD policy by expressly making it unlawful to engage in vehicle pursuits unless certain narrowly defined conditions are met and be clear that officers may not use their vehicles to intentionally contact fleeing vehicles or attempt to force fleeing vehicles into another object or off the road.<sup>27</sup>

**V. Lowering the felony theft threshold will not deter people from stealing and layering piecemeal criminal code changes on top of an already-flawed criminal code will not make the District any safer.**

In addition to the provisions above, the legislation also makes further changes to the criminal code by establishing a new offense of organized retail theft and redefining theft in the first degree as any offense in which “the quantity of property obtained is 10 or more with a value of at least \$250 over a 30-day period.”

This threshold would be a lower value threshold than any other state in the country except New Jersey. There is no research which shows that low felony theft thresholds deter people from stealing. Rather, two studies suggest otherwise. Both studies examine the impact of increasing felony thresholds. If a lower felony theft threshold allegedly deters theft, then increasing it would certainly lead to more stealing.

A study conducted by Pew Charitable Trusts found that “[r]aising the felony theft threshold has no impact on overall property crime or larceny rates” and “[t]he amount of a state’s felony theft threshold... is not correlated with its property crime and larceny rates.”<sup>28</sup> Another study by the New England Public Policy Center examined the impact of felony theft thresholds on crime in New England.<sup>29</sup> Like Pew’s analysis, they find that increasing felony theft thresholds does not increase larceny in the short-run and may actually decrease incidents of larceny in the long-run.

---

<sup>27</sup> D.C. Police Reform Commission, “Decentering Police to Improve Public Safety: A Report of the DC Police Reform Commission,” 103 (April 1, 2021), <https://dccouncil.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Police-Reform-Commission-Full-Report.pdf>.

<sup>28</sup> Pew Charitable Trusts, The Effects of Changing Felony Theft Thresholds (April 12, 2017), <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2017/04/the-effects-of-changing-felony-theft-thresholds>.

<sup>29</sup> Osborne Jackson and Riley Sullivan, “The Impact of Felony Larceny Thresholds on Crime in New England,” New England Public Policy Center (2020), <https://www.bostonfed.org/publications/new-england-public-policy-center-research-report/2020/the-impact-of-felony-larceny-thresholds-on-crime-in-new-england>.

The proposed creation of the offense of organized retail theft, along with the redefinition of theft in the first degree is illustrative of what is wrong with the broader approach taken by recent criminal justice bills that make changes to offenses and penalties: layering piecemeal criminal code changes on top of an already-flawed criminal code. The District's criminal code already suffers from several problems, including overlapping offenses for the same behaviors and disproportionate penalties, which in turn, can lead to inconsistent results and disproportionate criminal sentences.<sup>30</sup> Because policymakers have only updated our criminal statutes in piecemeal fashion over several decades, the code lacks a basic framework to ensure a coherent, proportionate approach to offenses and penalties.<sup>31</sup> This has made our criminal code difficult to navigate and continually risked public trust in the fairness of our criminal legal system.

Building a scheme of criminal laws that is clear, internally consistent, distinguishes among different types of behaviors that cause different harms, and takes a proportional approach to penalties is crucial to public safety. Doing so makes it more likely that our criminal legal system produces fair and consistent results, and further, builds public trust. Piecemeal criminal code changes risk exacerbating our current system's inequities. The Council should not continue to engage in piecemeal changes, as doing so will move us further away from a criminal legal system that is truly consistent with public safety and security.

**VI. Reviving the overly broad anti-mask law would lead to subjective policing and would disproportionately impact the District's Black residents.**

The bill would also bring back the anti-mask law that the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act repealed. The Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act repealed the prohibition on wearing masks with the intent to commit crimes or violations, or to intimidate or deprive of rights.

At the time of introduction, the law was intended to prevent hate groups like the Ku Klux Klan from intimidating people while wearing hoods and masks. The law was written so broadly and applied subjectively that it has been used to stop, pat down,

---

<sup>30</sup> Councilmember Charles Allen, then-Chairperson of the Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety, Report on B24-0416, the "Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022," 3-7 (October 26, 2022), [https://lms.dccouncil.gov/downloads/LIMS/47954/Committee\\_Report/B24-0416-Committee\\_Report1.pdf?Id=148331](https://lms.dccouncil.gov/downloads/LIMS/47954/Committee_Report/B24-0416-Committee_Report1.pdf?Id=148331).

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*

and even charge District residents for wearing hoodies;<sup>32</sup> this section's inclusion of 16-year-olds means that additional minors could be stopped for similar reasoning. The Police Reform Commission recommended that this repeal should be made permanent and that the "Council was right to repeal the statute."<sup>33</sup> This section should be removed from the bill to stay in line with the Police Reform Commission's recommendation.

## VII. Conclusion

ACLU-D.C. thanks the Committee for the opportunity to testify today. We once again urge the Committee not to move forward with this legislation, as it is not the approach to protecting public safety that District residents need or deserve. We are happy to work with the Committee on a comprehensive, proactive approach to public safety that respects and values the rights of D.C. residents and is focused on prevention, effectiveness, and accountability.

---

<sup>32</sup> D.C. Police Reform Commission, "Decentering Police to Improve Public Safety: A Report of the DC Police Reform Commission," 119 (April 1, 2021), <https://dccouncil.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Police-Reform-Commission-Full-Report.pdf>.

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*