On 12/21/2023, the VT Chief’s were provided a copy of the proposed FIP policy with a request for any feedback that they would like brought to the Council on their behalf.  All feedback received was aggregated so as not to be directly attributed to any specific VACOP member or department.  A summary of the feedback included the following 15 concerns:

1. Concern that the policy was an immigration policy and not a FIP policy.  Leading to a request for all immigration related references to be “stripped” from the document.
2. A question was raised requesting clarity on the juxtaposition of the terms "plurality" and "minority."
3. A stated belief that immigration status was central to application of Rule 3 in that an undocumented person has enhanced risk of flight, and if not risk of flight, then a lowered chance of detection and location if they did flee.
4. A recommendation that Section III be stripped entirely and addressed under the jurisdiction of department policies.
5. A concern that the "comments" sections read more like personal opinion or was feeding into political rhetoric then actionable directives in a policy. The example provided was in reference to: *Comment: The mere presence of ICE or CBP officials on the premises or their vehicles in the [Agency’s] parking lot may create unnecessary confusion and apprehension in the community and undermine the [Agency’s] efforts to build and maintain confidence that the [Agency] is truly committed to serving all community members, and is not involved in civil immigration enforcement.*
6. Concern was expressed with section IV subsection b. reference “shall not require that passengers in motor vehicles provide identification or other documents.” As this may not always be restricted: As it reads, "A passenger not providing identification..." - needs to be more specific - "does not in and of itself create a violation..." etc. i.e. you have to have a reason to compel identification, this was read by some Chief’s as if restricted so that one could never compel a passenger to identify themselves.
7. Border community Chiefs expressed that while they do not want to discourage victims and witnesses from cooperating with police, they disagree with ideological policy that cannot be practically applied regarding criminal activity. They work closely with Border Patrol in that they are the closest backup officers on calls who additionally assist when executing search warrants, etc.
8. Reference page 6 under Section V. This relates to not being able to know if individuals crossing the border outside POEs are seeking asylum. This is still a criminal violation and should not be referenced in policy.
9. Borer Patrol often releases individuals into the northern communities after processing them, without notification to local law enforcement. Open communication with federal partners is essential to prevent adverse enforcement outcomes. Any limitation or perceived limitation of communication in policy will only complicate criminal enforcement issues.
10. The FIP policy “blurs the line between civil and criminal violations.”
11. Section V - Strike the first sentence from the opening paragraph as it was perceived to be unnecessary and argumentative.
12. Sub Section b. - remove the word "imminent". The protection of public safety and order might not rise to the "imminent" time frame.
13. Sub Section c, d and e, were recommended to be stricken in their entirety, with the focus on FIP rather then investigative techniques
14. Reference Section VI – Some expressed a belief that it is their choice as to whom they allow to use their interview rooms and facilities.
15. Section IX – Their was a recommendation to strike in its entirety and include a "Refer to the IA Policy" line.