

Testimony For SB0190, with Amendments

Please vote for SB0190, with amendments.

At first glance, everything in the bill makes sense except the time period for police to respond to a qualified wellness check.

Using the vague and undefined term “immediately”, may make it difficult for the law enforcement agency to defend itself should a citizen believe that prompt action was not taken. (Page 2, line 4)

Given the shortage of police staff, how would a police dispatcher decide what is more important, a crime in progress, an accident, or a wellness check.

Based on the wording in this bill, one may determine that the wellness check would take precedence, since action must be “immediate”.

Also, there is the issue of availability. If all the police are on a call, how can one take immediate action?

Perhaps the bill could be amended to state, “. . . , the law enforcement agency shall [IMMEDIATELY CONDUCT] ASSIGN a wellness check of the individual TO THE FIRST AVAILABLE OFFICER THAT IS NOT NEEDED TO BE ASSIGNED TO A MORE IMPORTANT TASK, SUCH AS RESPOND TO A CRIME IN PROGRESS, OR RESPOND TO AN ACCIDENT/FIRE SITUATION (a more detailed list of higher priority situations could be added or cite a reference to a list of higher priority situations, if one exists).

Alan Lang
242 Armstrong Lane
Pasadena, MD 21122
410-336-9745
Alanlang1@verizon.net