

**Maryland Office of the Public Defender
Baltimore City District Office
Comments on Draft Policies Pertaining to Youth
November 2019**

Draft Policy 1207 - Youth Interrogations

The dangers of coercive interrogation techniques leading to inaccurate results are well-documented, with adolescents particularly vulnerable to false confession. As was recently recounted in the Netflix series *When They See Us*, in 1989 members of the New York Police Department used common interrogation techniques to force five teenagers to enter false confessions to the brutal rape of a jogger in Central Park. Five innocent children were wrongfully imprisoned and brutalized for over a decade based on these false confessions. While this high profile case may seem exceptional, data makes clear it is not: according to the National Registry of Exonerations, 36% of crimes allegedly committed by youth involved false confessions, triple the estimated rate of false confessions overall.¹

Even before the *Miranda* rights were formally established, the U.S. Supreme Court made clear that, in the context of police interrogation, events that “would leave a man cold and unimpressed can overawe and overwhelm a lad ...”² The Supreme Court has since stressed what “any parent knows”—indeed, what any person knows—that “children characteristically lack the capacity to exercise mature judgment and possess only an incomplete ability to understand the world around them.”³ Adolescents lack the experience, perspective, developmental maturity, and judgment to recognize and avoid choices that could be detrimental to them.⁴ Young people are extremely vulnerable to complying with authority figures and “yea –saying” or acquiescing to police officers, making them uniquely vulnerable during the pressure-cooker environment of police interrogation.

The distinctions of youth implicate every aspect of an interrogation – including the tone and language used, the likelihood an interaction will be considered custodial, the need for access to an attorney and parent/legal guardian, and the impact of deceptive interrogation techniques. Training will be especially important to ensure that BPD members understand the developmental limitations of all youth and appropriately account for age in their interactions.

¹ National Registry of Exonerations, Table: Age and Mental Status of Exonerated Defendants Who Falsely Confess – 26 February 2019.

² *Haley v. Ohio*, 332 U. S. 596, 599 (1948) (plurality opinion); see also *Gallegos v. Colorado*, 370 U. S. 49, 54 (1962) (“[N]o matter how sophisticated,” a juvenile subject of police interrogation “cannot be compared” to an adult subject).

³ *Roper v. Simmons*, 543 U. S. 551, 569 (2005).

⁴ Brief for American Psychological Assoc. (APA) as Amicus Curiae, p. 4, *Roper v. Simmons*, 543 U.S. 551 (2005). See also, *Miller v. Alabama*, 567 U.S. 460 (2012).

Recommendation 1: Prohibit custodial interrogation of children until the child has consulted with an attorney.

The draft policy conflates access to an attorney with access to a parent/legal guardian, and provides different access to children aged 15 and under from children aged 16 and older. To ensure compliance with constitutional mandates, and limit the likelihood of a false confession, the policy should explicitly require that all children consult with an attorney before any interrogation takes place.

The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP) has declared “that juveniles should have an attorney present during questioning by police or other law enforcement agencies.”⁵ While noting that youth should also be able to consult with a parent, the AACAP recognized that “parental presence alone may not be sufficient to protect juvenile suspects.” Parents generally lack the competency about police interrogation techniques and the risks of providing a statement to advise their child and ensure that any statement is knowing, intelligent and voluntary.

The American Bar Association (ABA) likewise resolved more than 17 years ago that “youth should not be permitted to waive the right to counsel without consultation with a lawyer and without a full inquiry into the youth’s comprehension of the right and their capacity to make the choice intelligently, voluntarily and understandingly.”⁶ Underlying the ABA’s decision are studies which show that, of the Miranda policies in 122 police departments across the country, “[e]ven under the best of circumstances, preteen suspects are likely to find Miranda vocabulary and reading levels are far beyond their understanding.”⁷

BPD’s draft policy distinguishes between 15 year olds and 16 year olds, requiring younger children to have a consultation with an attorney but not affording this needed protection to older children. This distinction between children 15 years of age and younger from children 16 years of age and older is not supported by best practices, the law, developmental science or even leading law enforcement entities. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) has recognized that “juveniles are more vulnerable than adults during interrogation – a vulnerability that is categorically shared by every juvenile, no matter how intelligent or mature.”⁸ These concerns are particularly heightened for older youth with learning disabilities, which is

⁵ American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP) Policy Statement: Interviewing and Interrogating Juvenile Suspects (2013). https://www.aacap.org/AACAP/Policy_Statements/2013/Interviewing_and_Interrogating_Juvenile_Suspects.aspx

⁶ American Bar Association, Resolution on Youth in the Criminal Justice System 101D(3).

⁷ The Comprehensibility and Content of Juvenile Miranda Warnings. <https://njdc.info/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/The-Comprehensibility-and-Content-of-Juvenile-Miranda-Warnings.pdf>

⁸ International Association of Chiefs of Police, Reducing Risks: An Executive’s Guide to Effective Juvenile Interview and Interrogation 3 (2012), <https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/all/p-r/ReducingRisksAnExecutiveGuidetoEffectiveJuvenileInterviewandInterrogation.pdf>.

disproportionately common among justice-involved youth.⁹The Supreme Court has further held that all children under the age of 18, as a class, are subject to additional protections.¹⁰ Research demonstrates that all children, even 16 and 17 year olds, are highly susceptible to pressure, have poor impulse control, incomplete brain development, and limited understanding of long-term consequences.¹¹

BPD's current draft policy language is both confusing and vague. The exact procedures for children to access counsel must be stated in clear, unmitigated terms. Specifically, the policy should explicitly require that all youth consult with an attorney prior to any interrogation, and that this consultation be confidential, outside the presence or hearing of a member, and in-person, by telephone or video conference. OPD stands ready to provide representation for this consultation and avers that access to an attorney will not be a barrier to policy implementation.

Suggested Action: Create a distinct section on Consultation with an Attorney. Suggested language, which conforms to research and recommendations discussed above, is provided at page 4 of the redlined version of Draft Policy 1207 attached.

Recommendation 2: Prohibit the use of any deceptive interrogation techniques and require breaks in lengthy interrogations.

The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized that police interrogation tactics “can induce a frighteningly high percentage” of false confessions,¹² and that this risk is multiplied when a child is the subject of an interrogation.¹³ Children are two to three times more likely to falsely confess

⁹ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention, *Youths with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities in the Juvenile Justice System* (2017). <https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Intellectual-Developmental-Disabilities.pdf>

¹⁰ APA Amicus Brief, *supra* note 3 at 4.

¹¹ *See, e.g.*, Naomi E. S. Goldstein, Emily Haney-Caron, Marsha Levick & Danielle Whiteman, *Waving Good-Bye To Waiver: A Developmental Argument Against Youths' Waiver Of Miranda Rights*, 21 N.Y. J. LEGIS. & PUB. POL'Y 2 (2018) <https://www.nyujlpp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Legis-21-1-Article-Goldstein-WavingGoodbyetoWaiver.pdf>; Hayley M. D. Cleary & Todd C. Warner, *Parents' Knowledge And Attitudes About Youths' Interrogation Rights*, 23 PSYCHOL., CRIME & L. 777-793(2017); Thomas Grisso, *Juveniles' Capacities to Waive Miranda Rights - An Empirical Analysis*, 68 Cal. L. Rev.6 (1980); Richard Rogers, et al., *The Comprehensibility and Content of Juvenile Miranda Warnings*, 14 PSYCHOL., PUB. POL'Y & L. 1 (2008), Thomas Grisso, *The Competence of Adolescents as Trial Defendants*, 3 PSYCHOL., PUB. POL'Y & L. 1, 1997; Viljoen, J.L., Zapf, P.A. & R. Roesch, *Adjudicative Competence and Comprehension of Miranda Rights in Adolescent Defendants: A Comparison of Legal Standards*, 25 BEHAV. SCI. L.W 1-19; American Bar Association Criminal Justice Section, Report 102B, Feb. 2010. ¹¹ Megan Crane, Laura Nirider, & Steven A. Drizin, *The Truth About Juvenile False Confessions*, 16 INSIGHTS ON L. & SOC'Y 10, 13 (2016).

¹² *Corley v. United States*, 556 U.S. 303, 320-21 (2009).

¹³ *J.D.B. v. North Carolina*, 564 U.S. 261, 269 (2011).

than are adults.¹⁴ In fact, children account for approximately one-third of all false confessions.¹⁵ In a study that analyzed 340 exonerations, forty-two percent of children were found to have given false confessions, in comparison to thirteen percent of adults.¹⁶

In recognition of the research establishing the heightened risks of youth interrogations, in 2006, the IACP in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) developed a training curriculum for law enforcement and a set of model policies for juvenile interrogation. In their extensive report *Reducing Risks: The Executives Guide to Effective Juvenile Interview and Interrogation*,¹⁷ the IACP acknowledged that standard law enforcement interrogation techniques are unreliable when used with children. The IACP explained “the presentation of false evidence may cause a young person to think that the interrogator is so firmly convinced of his guilt that he will never be able to persuade him otherwise.” As such, IACP’s model policy instructs officers to do four things:

1. Limit interrogations of children to no more than four hours;
2. Give children a “substantial break” at least once an hour.
3. Avoid deception.
4. Avoid Promises of Leniency and Threats of Harm

It is important to note, the IACP model policy is for all children, not just those under the age of 16. As discussed above (Recommendation 1, *supra* 2-3), the IACP recognized that “juveniles are more vulnerable than adults during interrogation – a vulnerability that is categorically shared by every juvenile, no matter how intelligent or mature.” The current proposed policy only prohibits deception for children under the age of 16. It also allows for interrogations of all children to continue for an unspecified length and to include promises of leniency and threats of harm.

¹⁴ Megan Crane, Laura Nirider, & Steven A. Drizin, *The Truth About Juvenile False Confessions*, 16 INSIGHTS ON L. & SOC’Y 10, 12 (2016) (finding that a “majority of youthful participants complied with a request to sign a false confession without uttering a single word of protest.”). Another study found that individuals ages twelve and thirteen, as well as those ages fifteen and sixteen, were “more likely to confess” than were “young adults,” ages eighteen to twenty-six. *See, e.g.*, Saul M. Kassin et al., *Police-Induced Confessions: Risk Factors and Recommendations*, 34 L. & HUM. BEHAV. 3, 6 (2010) (“[T]he single-minded purpose of interrogation is to elicit incriminating statements, admissions, and perhaps a full confession in an effort to secure the conviction of offenders.”); Buffie Brooke Merryman, *Arguments Against Use of the Reid Technique for Juvenile Interrogations*, 10 COMM. L. REV. 16, 20 (2010) (“The priority in every criminal investigation is to acquire a confession because of the evidentiary power inherent in a voluntary, self-incriminating statement.”).

¹⁵ Steven A. Drizin & Richard A. Leo, *The Problem of False Confessions in the PostDNA World*, 82 N.C. L. REV. 891, 944–45, 963 (2004). Sixty-three percent of these 125 false confessions came from those under age twenty-five, and thirty-two percent from those under age eighteen. *See* Crane et al., *supra* note 9, at 12.

¹⁶ *See* Crane et al., *supra* note 11, at 12.

¹⁷ International Assoc. of Chiefs of Police, *Reducing Risks: An Executive Guide to Effective Juvenile Interviewing and Interrogation* (2012). www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/all/p-r/ReducingRisksAnExecutiveGuidetoEffectiveJuvenileInterviewandInterrogation.pdf

Aspects of interrogation are often manipulative, and the police are permitted to take some manipulative measures in interrogations with adults. However, deception should be completely forbidden with children and the policy should make this distinction clear. In order to ensure that all statements are knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily given, the risk of false confessions by children must be fully mitigated by prohibiting deception, limiting interrogation length, and specifically prohibiting implicit promises of leniency or allowing a child to believe they will be free to go home if they confess.

Suggested Action: comply with the IACP's guidance by prohibiting deception for all Child Interrogations, limiting interrogations to four hours, with hourly breaks, and avoiding promises of leniency and threats of harm. Suggested language is provided in the Conducting the Interrogation section of the redline version of Draft Policy 1207 and Required Actin ¶ 2.

Recommendation 3: Revise Youth Miranda Warning Form 68 to use simplified language and to require the interrogator to check for understanding.

The standard Miranda warning requires a tenth grade level of reading comprehension.¹⁸ Adolescents are more likely than their adult peers to assert they understand material, to avoid embarrassment and to appear intelligent. So when a law enforcement officer simply asks “do you understand” many children will respond in the affirmative even if they are completely in the dark. To ensure that a waiver is knowing, intelligent, and voluntary, Miranda warnings for children must be pitched at a third-grade reading level, police officers must read each warning slowly, and the interrogator must stop after each one to ask the child to explain the warning back in his or her own words.¹⁹

Suggested action: Revise language as provided in the attached amended version of Form 68. The recommended language provided is derived from the simplified Miranda warnings for youth that were adopted by the Kings County (Washington State) Sheriff's Department.

¹⁸ Richard Rogers, et al., *The Language of Miranda Warnings in American Jurisdictions: A Replication and Vocabulary Analysis*, 32 L. & HUM. BEH. 124 (2008).

¹⁹ See, e.g., Juv. Delinquency Act, 18 U.S.C. § 5033 (requiring Miranda warnings for youth to be delivered in “language comprehensive to a juvenile.”); Richard Rogers, et al., *Juvenile Miranda Warnings: Perfunctory Rituals or Procedural Safeguards?*, 39 CRIM. JUST. & BEHAV. 229 (2012), online at <http://cjb.sagepub.com/content/39/3/229>. The King County, Washington, Sheriff's department adopted specialized youth warnings that are particularly well-reasoned and were developed with community input. See King County Sheriff's Office, Press Release, Sept. 27, 2017, online at: <https://www.kingcounty.gov/~media/depts/executive/performance-strategy-budget/documents/pdf/RLSJC/2018/July26/Miranda-Warning-for-Youth.ashx?la=en>.

Recommendation 4: Make the youth-specific provisions mandatory not permissive.

Strengthen language to make clear the Department is committed to providing the appropriate protections for youth being interrogated.

Suggested action: Revise core principle 2 as detailed in redline edits and change “should” to “shall” throughout the document.

Recommendation 5: Make the reasonable child standard explicit and provide examples that are relevant to children.

In *JDB v. North Carolina*, the U.S. Supreme Court recognized that a young person may feel bound to submit to questioning when an adult would not and held that officers must consider a child’s age when determining whether he or she is in custody and, in turn, whether Miranda rights must be read.

Suggested action: Revise the custody definition as detailed in the redline edits.

Recommendation 6: Make clear that a child cannot be interrogated prior to notification to their parent/legal guardian and allow for an alternative adult for when the parent/legal guardian is excluded.

While the draft policy intends to provide greater protections to youth below the age of 16, as written the provision for notifying a parent/legal guardian for youth 15 and younger is merely a condensed version of the provisions for youth 16 and older, suggesting that they actually have fewer protections. The policy should be explicit for all youth that no interrogation may occur prior to notifying a parent/legal guardian.²⁰ Moreover, even if a parent/legal guardian meets one of the exceptions to being notified of or included in the interrogation, the youth should still have access to a trusted adult.

Suggested action: Create one Parental Notification and Access section that applies to all children, relying on the protections included in the current provision for parental notification for youth age 15 years and younger with the revisions detailed in the redline edits. In the exception

²⁰ To the extent that the BPD continues to provide separate requirements for children aged 15 and younger from children aged 16 and older, the draft provisions for children 16 and older should require: (1) detail on what constitutes reasonable efforts to contact a parent/legal guardian; (2) a statement requiring the BPD member to honor a parent/legal guardian’s request to be present or have an attorney present with their child, and to not commence any interrogation until the parent/legal guardian or attorney is present; and (3) clarification on why the member would confer with the parent/legal guardian before/during/after the interrogation and what this discussion may/may not include.

for when a parent/guardian may not be appropriate to participate, include a provision for the Child to identify a Supportive Adult in lieu of their parent/guardian.

Recommendation 7: Make clear that a parent has no legal right to waive a youth's rights.

The involvement of a parent/legal guardian is intended to help protect their child – and cannot be a means to secure the waiver of any right that a Child invokes. A parental waiver cannot establish that any statement later made by the child is knowing, intelligent and voluntary -- as required for it to pass constitutional muster. In fact, a parent's unilateral waiver may suggest that the child felt coerced into providing a confession – to appease both the police and the parent. Thus, while a parent can invoke additional protections for their child, the policy should make clear that only the person being interrogated can waive their rights.

Suggested action: Note in the Parental Notification and Access section that the parent may not waive their child's rights

Recommendation 8: Revise Policy 1105 so that its references to youth conform to this policy.

The adult Custodial Interrogations policy was drafted with the expectation that there would be a companion youth policy, but it still included some of the basic protections for youth in its discussion of special populations. It should conform to this policy to require the same base protections, most notably the use of simplified Miranda warnings, access to an attorney and parent/guardian, and limitations on the use of deception.

Suggested action: In Policy 1105, Conducting the Investigation, Using Deception During the Investigation, add the following provision:

The use of any form of deception is strictly prohibited with youth. See Policy 1207, Conducting the Investigation ¶ 3.

In Policy 1105, Special Circumstances, Interrogations of Youth, revise ¶ 2 as follows:

When advising a youth of their Miranda rights, **the** simplified warnings **provided in Form 68 must** ~~should~~ be used ~~when administering warnings to youth~~. The member must evaluate the youth's age, experience, education, background, and intelligence, to determine whether the youth has the capacity to understand the warnings given to them, the nature of their Fifth Amendment rights, and the consequences of waiving those rights. **In addition, the youth must have a confidential consultation with an attorney and their parent/legal guardian must be notified prior to administering warnings to youth.** For more detailed guidance, see Policy 1207, Youth Interrogations.

Draft Policy 1115: Use of Force, Proposed Youth-Specific Provisions

The youth-specific provisions for Draft Policy 1115 provide little distinction or guidance for interacting with youth than with adult suspects. While the policy overall and the training developed to-date rightly address de-escalation and critical thinking, they do not provide context and examples addressing the unique dynamics of interacting with youth.

The developmental phase of adolescence make police interactions with youth distinct from those with adults. The neurological and psychosocial development of youth make adolescents more prone to risk-taking, dangerousness, peer pressure and poor decision-making. Adolescents are still physiologically and cognitively immature, rendering them less able to anticipate consequences, discern right from wrong, and self-regulate their emotionally charged behaviors in comparison to their adult counterparts.

Police officers must adopt developmentally-informed strategies to account for adolescence. This is particularly important with respect to use of force. For one, the level of force permitted is based on the member's perceived level of danger – which may be heightened by a lack of understanding of developmental responses. Moreover, the likelihood of escalation is particularly dramatic without age-appropriate response strategies. Finally, the long-term consequences of force used is of heightened – in terms of possible physical harm, future justice involvement, and trust in law enforcement.

Recommendation 9: Develop a developmentally-informed policy and approach to use of force and youth.

A use of force policy appropriate for children must include:

- Core values that recognize the developmental distinctions of youth; the relevance of adolescent development considerations in police encounters with youth; and the importance of considering the psychological/emotional limitations of youth regardless of physical size.
- How to factor in age and maturity in assessing a situation with youth
- De-escalation techniques appropriate for youth
- Prohibitions on force instruments likely to result in physical or long-term developmental harm.
- Requirements to contact medical personnel and/or a parent/legal guardian in response to a use of force incident.

Recommendation 10: Develop and deliver a dedicated training on police interactions with youth that includes developmentally-informed use of force modules.

BPD – BSP MOU Assessment

The BPD's assessment of how the Baltimore School Police (BSP) has used the authority bestowed to it in the MOU to exercise law enforcement powers is limited to a records review of BSP reports from February 2016 to February 2019 that specify an incident location off school grounds. With this narrow focus, it gathered data from 290 reports and qualitatively examined only 51 reports from the three year period, despite being provided with reports from more than 1,335 incidents.

By providing such a narrow analysis, the BPD was able to provide some basic statistics but did not delve nearly as deep as needed to truly assess BSP's exercise of law enforcement powers. As a result it is not surprising that, despite concerns with school police raised by the Department of Justice, community members and even among the BPD members reviewing reports for this assessment, the only recommendations provided concern the forwarding of information under existing frameworks.

Recommendation 11: Conduct a complete assessment of BSP's exercise of law enforcement powers.

At a minimum, BPD should have reviewed all of the reports provided, not merely those that it identified as having an incident location off school grounds. While the results section of the report clarifies that off school incidents often result in a report taken on school grounds, it gives no consideration to incidents that may be defined as starting on school grounds, which BSP officers use to exert authority in the community. Without any review of the more-than 1,000 reports that the reviewers designated as having an incident on school grounds, it cannot be assessed (a) how many were misclassified as being located on school grounds; (b) the extent to which incidents beginning at school were inappropriately extended beyond school grounds; and (c) the nature and severity of incidents on school grounds, particularly with respect to school-based incidents resulting in arrest.

Moreover, the deficiencies in current BSP documentation (discussed in Recommendation 2, below) require greater scrutiny than mere data collection from the reports as provided. Notably, the BPD did not review its reports or documentation for incidents that were referred by BSP; nor did it conduct any interviews with BSP leaders, school officials, or other stakeholders; nor did BPD otherwise try to gather information to ensure the sufficiency and reliability of even the very narrow focus of its analysis.

Recommendation 12: Require greater documentation, data collection, and information sharing.

Even within the limited assessment provided here, documentation and recordkeeping was noted: among incidents that BSP is required to forward to BPD, less than 60% included documentation

that they were forwarded in real time and the sworn supervising reviewing these cases critiqued the level of detail. While acknowledging that there currently lacks a sample or level of detail required in the reporting function to BPD in the MOU, the recommendations lack any follow-through on this noted deficiency.

Recommendation 13: Establish oversight and accountability mechanisms to ensure proper coordination of overlapping investigations.

The failure to recommend any reporting requirement, despite this deficiency being explicitly noted a sworn supervisor, coupled with the discussion on the following page seeking to rationalize how the BSP may not have been required to forward reports that the BPD identified as required for forwarding underscores the lack of scrutiny provided in this assessment. Improving youth interactions with law enforcement requires an expectation of responsibility and vigor by all law enforcement officers. Although BPD may have limited authority over SPD, it should encourage greater information sharing, require sufficient documentation in incidents of concurrent jurisdiction, and conduct spot checks to ensure that reports which should be forwarded are.

The MOU does not provide for any ongoing communication mechanism between the BPD and BSP – and, aside from the data on reports forwarded to BPD, communication between agencies is not addressed in the assessment. To ensure proper coordination, the agencies should have mechanisms for greater communication both to improve overlapping law enforcement efforts and for BPD to obtain assurance that the BSP is properly exercising the powers authorized by the MOU.

* * *

Draft Policy 1207 and the proposed additions for Policy 1115 are an important first step for the BPD to acknowledge and address the unique needs of youth. However, they are just a first step. Police interactions with youth encompass far more than these two topics. Moreover, specialized training on adolescent development and developmentally-informed policing, improved practices that are consistent with efforts to reduce the incarceration of youth, and greater oversight and accountability of police interactions with youth all need to be considered.

Recommendation 14: Conduct a comprehensive assessment of efforts to decrease justice involvement of youth.

The consent decree requires that the City:

conduct a comprehensive assessment of the City's efforts to decrease Youth involvement with the juvenile and criminal justice systems and obstacles to doing so, including the

City's diversion programs, *community-based alternatives to incarceration, and treatment options for Youth in need of mental health treatment, drug treatment, or other services.*

Consent Decree ¶ 219. While a diversion assessment was conducted earlier this year, with a report issued by the Center for Children's Law & Policy in April 2019, the mandate of the consent decree is much broader. Specifically, the BPD still needs to assess the community-based alternatives to incarceration and treatment options for youth in need of services.

The City must make a plan for meeting this full mandate, including recommendations for alternatives to incarceration. In doing so, it must further meet the consent decree's requirements of engaging community organizations with particular expertise and/or insight into issues affecting Youth, academics, and Youth advocates, and issue a report publicizing the results of its assessment and making recommendations to improve the City's supports for Youth and its diversion programs.

Recommendation 15: Establish youth policies regarding voluntary interviews, stops, searches, and arrests.

The consent decree further requires the BPD to assess and revise its policies "to ensure that the BPD provides officers with guidance on developmentally appropriate responses to, and interactions with, Youth ... including for appropriate officer conduct during voluntary interactions, stops, searches, arrests, uses of force, and custodial detentions and interrogations." Consent Decree ¶ 220. While addressing use of force and interrogations in this round of policies, the BPD must give attention to, and provide public comment on, similar efforts on the full range of law enforcement activities that involve interaction between BPD members and youth.