Purpose of the Directive
The purpose of this Directive is to establish guidelines for members of the Johns Hopkins Police Department (JHPD) regarding responding to calls for service and the use of authorized emergency equipment, lights and sirens, during such activities.

Summary of Directive Requirements
This Directive provides guidance to JHPD members regarding when to respond to calls for service in emergency response mode, which is when they have their emergency lights and siren activated. Importantly, the Directive also provides guidance regarding proper driving behavior when operating in emergency mode including only going 15 mph over the speed limit, stopping at all red lights and stop signs and slowing at intersections.

This Directive establishes that all calls for service received by the JHPD will be classified into one of three response categories. Code 1 is the normal operation of a vehicle, adhering to all traffic regulations, without use of emergency mode, in response to calls for service where expeditious response by police is not required. Code 2 is limited use of emergency response mode while adhering to traffic regulations, including posted speed limits to ease travel through intersections, to pass slow moving vehicles and to negotiate other traffic impediments, in response to calls for service in which rapid police response is advantageous but not imperative. Code 3 is emergency response mode in response to life threatening emergencies. These are calls where the immediate presence of a JHPD member may prevent death or injury or alleviate the threat of death or injury. These are life threatening emergencies.

To determine the appropriate coding of calls for service the Directive requires communications personnel to gather as much information regarding the call as possible from the caller or Baltimore City 911, and properly classify and prioritize calls as Code 1-3, relaying this information and the code of the call to the responding member. The responding member may notify communications of any situations that would warrant a higher or lower code response and is responsible for determining the appropriate response. In addition, the Directive addresses the use of emergency equipment during routine operations and for emergency escorts, and addresses supervisory responsibility related to emergency driving.

Blueprint for the Policy Development Process
The draft JHPD policies (hereinafter referred to as “directives”) shared for community feedback are based on examples of 21st century best practices in public safety policy, identified through extensive benchmarking of university and municipal law enforcement agencies across the nation. Taken together, they represent a comprehensively progressive approach to policing that prioritizes equity, transparency, accountability, and community-based public safety strategies.
The JHPD’s draft directives embody approaches that community advocates and leading experts have championed locally and in law enforcement reform efforts across the nation. The draft directives have also been developed based on input received through robust community engagement in prior phases of JHPD development, including suggestions received in the legislative process as well as last fall’s Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) public comment period and feedback opportunities.

In addition, the directives were drafted to exceed the minimum requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States and the State of Maryland, to align with the Community Safety and Strengthening Act (CSSA) and to fulfill the requirements of the MOU between the Johns Hopkins University and the Baltimore Police Department. The Hopkins community and our neighbors throughout Baltimore can help improve and strengthen these directives further through their feedback and input.

Material that was considered in the drafting of the Directive and Procedure Manual, include:

a. **Publicly available policies from municipal police departments that have undergone substantial reform efforts**, including: the New Orleans Police Department; Seattle Police Department; Portland Police Department; Detroit Police Department; Ferguson Police Department; and Baltimore Police Department;

b. **National guidance on best practices and model policies from criminal justice reform efforts, social science research centers, and civil rights organizations**, including: the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), including the ACLU of Massachusetts’s “Racially Just Policing: Model Policies for Colleges and Universities”; the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP); the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF); U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office); The Justice Collaboratory (The JC) at Yale University Law School; and The Center for Innovation in Community Safety (CICS) at Georgetown Law School.

c. **National and local higher education institutions that are based in comparable environments and make policies publicly available**, including: Carnegie Mellon University; Morgan State University; Towson University; University of Chicago; University of Cincinnati; University of Maryland, Baltimore County; University of Pennsylvania; and Yale University.

To ensure that the proposed directives captured national best practices in community-focused public safety services, the development team collaborated with independent experts from two organizations: National Policing Institute (the Institute), a non-profit dedicated to advancing excellence in policing through research and innovation, and 21CP Solutions, an expert consulting team of former law enforcement personnel, academics, civil rights lawyers, and community leaders dedicated to advancing safe, fair, equitable, and inclusive public safety solutions. Each directive was reviewed by experts selected by both organizations, who provided feedback, suggestions, and edits that were fully incorporated into the current draft.

Finally, individuals and organizations representing the diversity of the Johns Hopkins University community provided feedback to ensure the policies and procedures reflect and respond to the values of our institution and to our community’s public safety service needs.

Now they are available for your review. Johns Hopkins is committed to adopting, incorporating, or otherwise reflecting recommended changes and feedback in the final version of policies so long as
feedback is aligned with our values and commitments, permissible within legal parameters, and supported by national best practices for community policing and public safety.
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Policy Statement

When responding to calls for service, members of the Johns Hopkins Police Department (JHPD) will operate Police Department motor vehicles in a manner consistent with safety and in accordance with the provisions of law. (CALEA 41.2.1)

Who is Governed by this Policy

All sworn police officers, as defined by MD Code, Public Safety, § 3-201 in service with the Johns Hopkins Police Department are governed by this Directive.

Purpose

The purpose of this Directive is to establish procedures for responding to emergency and routine calls for service and guidelines for the use of authorized emergency equipment during such activities. All officers will operate departmental vehicles with due regard for the safety of the public when traveling during the performance of their duties. activities.
**Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency Response Mode:</th>
<th>Driving with emergency lights and siren activated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member:</strong></td>
<td>All members of the JHPD, including employees, officers, and volunteers, unless the term is otherwise qualified (e.g., member of the public, member of the Baltimore Police Department, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer:</strong></td>
<td>All sworn police officers, at any rank, as defined by MD Code, Public Safety, § 3-201, in service with the JHPD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy**

Officers shall operate all vehicles with the utmost care and caution and will comply with all traffic regulations. While operating in Emergency Response Mode, officers shall comply with Maryland State Law governing emergency vehicle operations. Officers shall weigh the risks of driving in Emergency Response Mode against the nature of the emergency.

**Procedures**

I. **General-Emergency Response Mode** (CALEA 41.2.1.)

A. Officers are only permitted to drive in Emergency Response Mode in authorized law enforcement vehicles equipped with and using emergency lights and sirens.

B. Officers shall not drive in Emergency Response Mode when transporting civilians or prisoners.

C. Before operating a law enforcement vehicle in an Emergency Response Mode, officers shall consider the following:
   - The nature or seriousness of the offense or the call for service
   - Current road or environmental conditions
   - Familiarity with the route and destination
   - Pedestrian and vehicular density

D. When responding to an emergency call for service, Code 3, below, such as an in-progress incident with the potential for injury, or armed person calls, officers are authorized but not required to respond in an Emergency Response Mode.

E. When operating in an Emergency Response Mode, in keeping with MD Code, Transportation, § 21-106, officers may:
   - Exceed the speed limit, by no more than 15 miles per hour (mph), so long as members do not endanger life or property.
• Proceed through a red light or stop signal, a stop sign, or a yield sign, but only after a full stop at all traffic control devices. For non-controlled intersections, officers must slow down, and clear each intersection for safety before proceeding.

• Disregard regulations governing turning or movement in a specified direction but must do so in a manner that does not otherwise endanger the safety of the member, other vehicles, and pedestrians.

F. At all times, in accordance with MD Code, Transportation, § 21-106 officers shall drive with due regard for the safety of all persons.

II. Call Response Categories (CALEA 41.2.1.b,c)

All calls for service received by the department will be classified into one of three response categories. These categories are guidelines. All personnel must be aware that factors such as new information and command discretion may dictate a change in response. The categories for responding to calls for service are:

A. Code Three (3) Response

Continuous emergency response mode - in response to life-threatening emergencies. These are calls where the immediate presence of police may prevent death or injury or alleviate the threat of death or injury. These are life-threatening emergencies. Calls in this category include, for example:

• Violent felonies or active threat in progress or that have just occurred.

• Other situations, such as medical emergencies, in which the immediate arrival of police could possibly eliminate the threat of or prevent death or injury to persons.

• Fire Alarms: Many times, fire alarms on campus are the result of criminal damage to fire detection equipment. Only the lead unit will respond Code-3 to fire alarms; secondary units will respond Code 1. If there are additional conditions from the location (multiple devices activating, callers reporting smoke or fire, etc.), then secondary units may respond Code 2 or Code 3.

C. Code Two (2) Response

Limited use of emergency response mode while adhering to traffic regulations, including posted speed limits to ease travel through intersections, to pass slow moving vehicles and to negotiate other traffic impediments, in response to calls for service in which rapid police response is advantageous but not imperative. Calls in this category include, for example:

• Property crimes in progress may be halted, or persons apprehended with rapid response.
• Traffic accidents where the situation warrants a police officer on scene immediately to prevent further accidents or injuries.

D. Code One (1) Response (CALEA 41.2.1.a)
Normal operation of vehicle, adhering to all traffic regulations, without use of emergency mode, in response to call for service where expeditious response by police is not required. Calls in this category include, for example:

• Crimes that have already occurred.
• Traffic accidents with property damage only and no hazardous situations.
• Non-emergency assistance to citizens, including affiliates.
• Non-urgent medical calls.
• Alarm activations (intrusion, panic, fire alarm trouble). It should be noted that response to alarm activations may be upgraded based on verification of a crime in progress, a hazardous condition, or the time / frequency of the alarm.

III. Use of Emergency Mode During Routine Operations

A. During the performance of routine activities, officers may use emergency lights and/or sirens, when necessary. Such activities may include, but are not limited to:

• Traffic Stops
• Motorist Assists
• Parking in the Roadway
• Crowd or Traffic Control

B. During these types of activities, officers will use the emergency equipment for the purpose of commanding attention. Use of emergency equipment during these activities will be limited to that equipment necessary for the effective performance of the assigned task. See JHPD Directive #442, Traffic Control & Enforcement.

IV. Emergency Escorts (CALEA 61.3.3)

A. Officers may escort ambulances and other emergency vehicles in an emergency situation, in emergency response mode, when the drivers of these vehicles are unfamiliar with the route to the destination, or when the emergency warning equipment on these vehicles is inoperative.

B. Under no circumstances will officers escort private vehicles whose operator or occupant(s) are in need of emergency medical treatment.

• Officers encountering motorists experiencing a medical emergency will immediately request emergency medical services (EMS) through the Communications Center, or
• Release the vehicle if in close proximity to the medical facility when it appears the operator may safely control the vehicle.

V. Responsibilities

A. Communications Officers (COs) shall:
   • Gather as much information regarding the call as possible from caller or Baltimore City 911, and properly classify and prioritize calls as Code 1-3
   • Relay all pertinent information to patrol units as this will affect the justification of the method of response or the need to change category.
   • Notify responding officers/supervisors immediately when the communications officer reasonably believes the priority level of the call has changed.
   • Provide control of radio communications during the response.
   • In addition to the JHPD response, notify Baltimore City 911 to dispatch, if appropriate. Notify BPD when the call for service is related to Group A offenses under National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) program except: Larceny/Theft Offenses; Burglary/Breaking & Entering, and Motor vehicle theft, for which JHPD will have primary responsibility for investigations and arrests, along with all Group B offenses under the NIBRS program.
   • In addition to the JHPD response, notify Baltimore City 911 to dispatch BPD for all pedestrian and vehicular accident/collision investigations resulting in death or serious bodily harm.

B. Responding Officers shall:
   • Consider conditions listed above while responding.
   • Not exceed speed limits by any more than 15 mph and in a manner that is appropriate under the circumstances.
   • Advise Communications Center (CC) of any situations that would warrant a higher or lower code response.
   • Notify CC upon arrival and provide status report as soon as possible.

C. Supervisors
Supervisors will be held strictly accountable for the emergency response conduct of their officers, and shall;
   • Verify that the proper number and type of units are responding.
   • Monitor and manage responses (as assigned, upgrade, or downgrade) or discontinue any emergency response.
• Ensure that emergency response procedures are adhered to at all times.

• On a monthly basis, complete a driver’s license check to ensure each JHPD Officer’s driver’s license is valid.

Policy Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforcement</th>
<th>Police Department managers and supervisors are responsible for enforcing this Directive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Reporting Violations | Suspected violations of this directive should be reported to the Public Safety Accountability Unit. |

Related Resources

University Policies and Documents

Operational Procedure #442, Traffic Control & Enforcement

External Documentation

Police Department Forms and Systems

https://powerdms.com/ui/login

Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Office Name</th>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
<th>E-mail/Web Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Clarification and Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>