



City of Boston, Massachusetts
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency
Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARD (CRB) - COMPLAINT #398

Date of Incident: September 18, 2024
Time of Incident: 4:15 AM
Location of Incident: 18 Newport Ave
Date of Filing: September 19, 2024
Investigator: Tastery Reed, Jr.
Date of CRB Decision: May 15, 2025

INVOLVED BOSTON POLICE EMPLOYEE:

Dispatcher's Name	District	Badge/ Employee #	Sex	Race/ Ethnicity
Keva Phillips	C11	ID #119454	F	Black

CASE PROCEDURAL HISTORY:

This is the first time this case has been brought before the CRB.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS:

On September 18, 2024, Complainant filed a complaint with the Office of Police Accountability and Transparency (OPAT) regarding a 9-1-1 dispatcher, identified as Keva Phillips (ID# 119454). Complainant alleged that on September 18, 2024, at approximately 4:15 AM, he placed a 9-1-1 call to report a suspicious individual attempting to open the doors of parked vehicles on his street. The call began in a routine manner, with the dispatcher identifying herself, informing the caller that the call was being recorded, and asking for the nature of the emergency. Complainant stated that he provided a description of the individual and gave the location of the incident. Following this, the dispatcher allegedly fell silent for an extended period of time, and the only sound audible to Complainant was the dispatcher's breathing. Concerned about the dispatcher's well-being, Complainant asked if she was alright. The dispatcher reportedly responded, "I'm good," and then inquired how she could assist.



City of Boston, Massachusetts
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency
Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

Complainant reiterated the incident details, including the location and a description of the individual, three times during the course of the call, which lasted approximately six minutes. Complainant expressed concern regarding the dispatcher's response and questioned the potential outcome had the situation been more critical.

APPLICABLE RULES & LAWS:

- **BPD Rule 102§3 (Conduct):** “Employees shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the Department. Conduct unbecoming an employee shall include that which tends to indicate that the employee is unable, or unfit to continue as a member of the Department, or tends to impair the operation of the Department or its employees.”
 - a. Allegations of Misconduct: Failure to dispatch officers in a timely manner, ignoring or failing to respond appropriately to an emergency call, not verifying crucial details (e.g., location, nature of emergency, suspect description), abandoning or disconnecting call without cause, and failing to notify appropriate units.
- **BPD Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty):** “This includes any conduct, or omission which is not in accordance with established and ordinary duties or procedures as to such employees or which constitutes use of unreasonable judgment in the exercising of any discretion granted to an employee.”
 - a. Allegations of Misconduct: Failure to dispatch officers in a timely manner, ignoring or failing to respond appropriately to an emergency call, not verifying crucial details (e.g., location, nature of emergency, suspect description), abandoning or disconnecting calls without cause, and failing to notify appropriate units.
- **BPD Rule 102§12 (Sleeping on Duty):** “Employees shall remain awake and alert while on duty.”
 - a. Allegations of Misconduct: The dispatcher allegedly fell silent for extended periods of time, and the only sound audible to Complainant was the dispatcher's breathing. Concerned about the dispatcher's well-being, Complainant asked if she was alright. The dispatcher reportedly responded, “I'm good,” and then inquired how she could assist. Complainant reiterated the incident details, including the location and a description of the individual, three times during the course of the call, which lasted approximately six minutes.



City of Boston, Massachusetts
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency
Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

1. On December 6, 2024, Investigator Reed conducted a telephone interview with Complainant, who reiterated the information provided on the intake form. Complainant further added that he heard heavy breathing on the phone and even asked if she was okay, to which the operator responded, "I'm good," and then asked Complainant how she could help.
2. On January 16, 2025, BPD stated that there was no CAD sheet available.
3. On January 9, 2025, Investigator Reed sent an interview request to 9-1-1 Operator Philips as part of an ongoing investigation. However, Operator Philips declined the interview. She stated that her supervisor informed her that "OPAT does not have jurisdiction over their department."
4. On January 6, 2025, Investigator Reed conducted a review of a 911 call placed by Complainant to report an incident. The following timeline summarizes the key moments of the call:
 - a. 4:15:40 AM: The 911 Operator answered the call.
 - b. 4:16:02 AM: After a brief pause, Complainant said, "Hello?" The Operator responded with, "What is the problem?" Complainant began describing the incident.
 - c. 4:17:41 AM: Following another pause, Complainant again said, "Hello?" The Operator replied, "Can I help you?"
 - d. 4:17:47 AM: Complainant asked, "Did you hear me?" There was no clear response, and the Operator appeared to stumble in communication.
 - e. 4:17:52 AM: Complainant was heard restating details of the incident.
 - f. 4:18:06 AM: The Operator asked, "Okay, where is he?" A prolonged pause followed until 4:20:48 AM, when Complainant said twice, "Ma'am, are you okay?"
 - g. 4:21:00 AM: The Operator responded, "Uh, yes." Complainant then remarked, "It seems you're breathing awfully heavy." The Operator replied, "I am fine. How can I help you? Do you have a description?"



City of Boston, Massachusetts
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

Throughout the call, several extended pauses were noted, during which heavy breathing could be heard, but no conversation occurred. Investigator Reed documented these observations for further review.

5. On January 21, 2025, Neal O'Brien, an employee of SEIU Local 888, which serves as the exclusive bargaining agent for the Boston Police Department's civilian bargaining unit, stated via letter that "unit members will not attend OPAT meetings."
6. On February 10, 2025, the Boston Police Department confirmed that no police report had been filed.

EVIDENCE REQUESTED/REVIEWED:

Evidence	Description	Availability Status	File Name
OPAT Complainant Form/Intake Forms	Complainant's statements on OPAT Intake form	Available	N/A
Complainant's interview	Phone call on December 6, 2024	Available	N/A
911 Call	Oral statements from the Operator to Complainant.	Available	N/A
CAD Sheet	Summary of 911 call and dispatchers' conversations	Not available	N/A
Turret Tape	The officer's radio communication to the dispatcher	Not available	N/A
Interview Letters to Operator Keva Phillips	On January 9, 2025, the Operator declined the interview request.	Not available	N/A



City of Boston, Massachusetts
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency
Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

Cover Letter SEIU Local 888	Letter from SEIU Local 888 from Neal O'Brien	Available	N/A
-----------------------------	--	-----------	-----

CRB DECISION:

CRB reached a **unanimous decision (6-0)**, regarding allegations against Dispatcher Keva Phillips' violation of **Rule 102§3 (Conduct)**, **Sustained**.

CRB reached a **unanimous decision (6-0)**, regarding allegations against Dispatcher Keva Phillips' violation of **Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty)**, **Sustained**.

CRB reached a **unanimous decision (6-0)**, regarding allegations against Dispatcher Keva Phillips' violation of **Rule 102§12 (Sleeping on Duty)**, **Sustained**.

Dispatcher's Name	Allegation Rule	CRB Recommended Finding
Keva Phillips	Rule 102§3 (Conduct)	Sustained
Keva Phillips	BPD Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty)	Sustained
Keva Phillips	Rule 102§12 (Sleeping on Duty)	Sustained

CRB reviewed the evidence and examined the circumstances surrounding Complainant's allegations, finding that the evidence supported those allegations. During the call, Complainant is heard explaining the situation to the dispatcher multiple times. There were multiple prolonged pauses in the conversation, during which heavy breathing—audibly coming from the call taker, Operator Keva Philips is heard.

This behavior raised concerns regarding the call taker's attentiveness and professionalism. Operator Philips failed to follow the Boston Police Department's Proper Call Handling Protocols, as outlined in departmental guidelines. The lack of urgency and repeated need



City of Boston, Massachusetts
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

for clarification from Complainant indicated a breakdown in effective communication and response.

Dispatcher Keva Phillips was given the opportunity to participate in an interview, but declined.

CRB RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE:

According to the Discipline Matrix established by the Boston Police Department, CRB has recommended the following:

1. Dispatcher Keva Phillips receive a **5-day suspension for violation of Rule 102§3 (Conduct).**
2. Dispatcher Keva Phillips receive a **5-day suspension for violation of Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty), concurrent with a 5-day suspension for violation of Rule 102§3 (Conduct).**
3. Dispatcher Keva Phillips and her supervisor receive **training and further investigation for violation of Rule 102§12 (Sleeping on Duty).**

CRB has concerns regarding the role and actions of the Duty Supervisor on shift at the time. Supervisors are responsible for ensuring that all calls are handled in accordance with department policy and must intervene when deviations from protocol occur. It is unclear whether the Duty Supervisor was aware of the issues during this call or took any steps to address the dispatcher's conduct. CRB recommends that the Boston Police Department conduct a formal investigation to determine whether the Duty Supervisor fulfilled his/her responsibilities during this incident.

To prevent similar issues in the future, CRB further recommends training on current monitoring practices and that both call takers and supervisors receive updated training on maintaining professional conduct, situational awareness, and appropriate escalation procedures.