

**Cleveland Community Police Commission (CPC)
Full Commission Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 28, 2016**

In attendance: Anthony Body, Mario Clopton, V. Y. Conner, Lee Fisher, Deirdre Jones, Rhonda Y. Williams

Absent: Kathy Clegg, Amanda King, Lynn Hampton, Dylan Sellers, Steve Loomis

Call Meeting to Order/Review Agenda

5:45 p.m., co-chair Mario Clopton called the meeting to order.

Co-Chairs Report

Mr. Clopton provided updates on behalf of Co-Chairs.

- Executive Director Review Committee will meet tomorrow to deliberate
- Sent a letter to the Monitor asking for some clarification and input regarding concerns regarding communication with the Parties
- Announced that the Co-Chairs will also send a letter to Judge Solomon Oliver and request a meeting regarding these matters
- Announced Cleveland Pride canceled for this year

Community Outreach & Engagement Committee

Rev. Conner, Co-Chair of CO&E, provided updates.

- Provided some preliminary, personal remarks including that she participated in a ride-along for 8 hours in District 4. She learned a lot and thanked Sgt. Chism for her help in getting her ride-along set up. She also applauded the CDP for its “excellent” job at the way policing was handled during the RNC.
- Provided an update on the July 13th CO&E Committee meeting. Three (3) Commissioners and eight (8) members from the community, including Tom O’Brien of Neighborhood Connections, attended to hear what we are trying to do, particularly with the community engagement assessment tool. There was discussion about how to design a tool with the existing relationships individual Commissioners already have, and developed next steps.
- Turned to Commissioner Anthony Body to also provide input and discuss next steps more specifically.
- Mr. Body explained that every first Thursday of the month, Neighborhood Connections holds a Neighbor Up meeting, and the Commission will be able to present there on August 4th. Tom O’Brien also has agreed to host another event two or three weeks out. A few other groups and persons, including Mark McClain, agreed to go out into the community in order to reach people where they are. There are still tons of folks not familiar with the process or us (the Commission) and haven’t had their voices heard, and we want to make sure their voices are in the room.

- Rev. Conner shared the August 4th meeting will be in University Circle at 8 p.m. The follow up to the August 4th meeting will be August 18th, and will include a Teach-in.
- (The July 13th CO&E Meeting Minutes prepared by Rev. Conner are entered into the record in italics below.)

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & OUTREACH

McDonald's – 9101 Kinsman Avenue

Wednesday July 13, 6 – 8 PM

Attendees

Commissioners: M. Clopton, Y. Conner, A. Body

Community members: Pete Whitt and (Neighborhood Connections) Ronald James, Katherine Lott, Dawn Arrington, Mark McClain, Gwen Garth, Tom O'Brien.

<i>Opening Introductions and Meeting Purpose</i>		
<i>Meeting highlights & next steps</i>		
<i>Retreat Agenda Update - Peter Whitt shared a draft agenda, received input about the flow of the day (display mission statement, consider quarterly retreat type Commissioner check-ins) and he encouraged those in attendance to make follow-up calls with ideas.</i>		
<i>Community Assessment Tool - Mario Clopton used an informational handout with points from Seattle to frame a top level overview of the CPC Consent Decree and the needed outcome for the tool he is creating. Community members emphasized that CPC should remember that there are various definitions of community policing depending on the neighborhood. It does not always mean decentralizing authority. One way to reach other people is to canvas police reports and contact those individuals for their stories; CPC needs to re-educate the community about what the Consent Decree is: What will a finished product look like, etc. M. McClain suggested that CPC should use an existing survey tool developed by NLI.</i>		
<i>Overview & purpose for the grid – The grid is made available to CPC members as a way to log and track the different entities that we commit to contact. Anthony highlighted the outreach grid entries and added Porch Talks as another possible category.</i>		
	<i>NEXT STEPS</i>	<i>Responsible Team Member</i>

- *The Google grid will be shared with other commissioners for their input.*
- *Community resources: (a) M. McClain will provide a copy of the NLI tool at the July 28th meeting. (b) Neighborhood Connections agreed to make the Community Outreach Engagement Tool project part of its August 4th session scheduled at University Circle UM Church at 7 pm. M. Clopton & other CPC members will attend and participate. M. Clopton will provide a draft survey at the session for feedback on potential questions. He will also provide a flyer for a “Teach In” on August 18 to continue the conversation with people gathered on August 4 and any friends that they are willing to bring. T. O’Brien will secure space for the August 18 session.*
- *August 4th is the first step in launching a networking strategy to develop a community assessment tool.*
- *Other – CDP officers will be included in the networking strategy.*

Anthony Body committed to provide a report out about this meeting at the July 28th Full Commission Meeting.

CPRB Ordinance Update

“Dr. Rhonda” Y. Williams provided the update on the Civilian Police Review Board Ordinance. She read from the provided handout assessing the status and analyzing the divergences and convergences between the Commission’s recommendations and the drafted emergency ordinance prepared by the City Council on the CPRB charter amendment. (See document prepared by Dr. Rhonda Y. Williams entered into the record in italics below.)

Tuesday, July 26, 2016

Cleveland Community Police Commission

Civilian Police Review Board Update: Assessment of Drafted Emergency Ordinance

Prepared by Dr. Rhonda Y. Williams, Chair of PRB Work Group, Cleveland Community Police Commission, for Commissioners’ Review and Discussion, and to be entered into the CCPC Minutes for the Full Commission Meeting on 7/28/2016 for the record.

- *The City and City Councilperson Matthew Zone have drafted and proposed Emergency Ordinance No. 826-16.*
- *While the CCPC proposed a comprehensive approach to revising the charter as regards the city’s Office of Professional Standards and the Police Review Board,*

this City and City Council has decided not to follow that recommendation.

- *The CCPC recommended comprehensive revisions after significant research, numerous drafting sessions and meetings with stakeholders, and substantive community input.*
- *The City and City Council decided to focus solely on Section 115-2. The Commission's recommendations were considered and many accepted in this section only.*
- *An assessment of the convergences and divergences with the CCPC's recommendations for Section 115-2, as presented in the CCPC chart and draft language submitted in May 2016, is outlined below.*

Section 115-2: ORDINANCE CHANGES IN AGREEMENT w/ CCPC RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. *Agree on 9 members;*
2. *Agree on 5 by Mayor, 4 by Council;*
3. *Agree on representation from police districts;*
4. *Agree on a representative who is 18-30 years of age;*
5. *Agree with no member being on the PRB who is currently serving as a law enforcement officer or a current or former member of the CDP;*
6. *Agree on 30 days vacancy statement, request for applicants, and members selected from among those applicants;*
7. *Agree that terms of appointment should be for four years each;*
8. *Agree on chair and vice-chair being elected by the Board, and the term limits as stated;*
9. *Agree with provision added regarding initial and annual training on topics relevant to the duties of the Board.*

The CCPC's language was much more explicit and still represents what we would have liked as a baseline inclusion: "CPRB members shall receive initial and, at minimum,

annual training that is adequate in quantity, quality and scope by persons inside and outside the CDP that addresses, at minimum, constitutional and other relevant law on police-citizen encounters, including law on the use of force and stops, searches and seizures, and arrests; the particular challenges of investigations of police conduct; bias-free policing; policing individuals in crisis; CDP policies, rules, and procedures; and community outreach."

PROVISIONS MISSING, BUT REQUESTED by CCPC:

1. The draft ordinance does NOT include the CCPC's desire to explicitly have "representation from the African American community and other communities of color, the LGBT Community, persons with experience with mental health, disabilities, homelessness, women's rights."

2. The draft ordinance does NOT include an explicit mention of no police union, or union-affiliated persons.

3. The draft ordinance does NOT include an explicit role for the CCPC in developing assessment criteria for selecting applicants, nor does it include an explicit role for the CCPC in reviewing, ranking, or recommending applicants. This is what the CCPC proposed. (In writing this assessment, we are aware that both the City and the Department of Justice stated that because the CCPC is not a charter entity it should not be referred to or included specifically in the charter.)

*It remains a **must** for the City and City Council to establish a **public, independent, and transparent process** -- again with publicly posted and transparent rules, guidelines, established criteria, an application, and explanation of how and who will be making the decisions on who the Board members will be. The CCPC hopes that such a process is created forthwith and becomes a mandatory requirement in the selection of CPRB members.*

4. The CCPC questioned whether the executive head of the police force should have removal power. This remains a question and a concern that needs to be addressed. As stated in the CCPC's recommendations, "NACOLE and CCPC questions whether this should be another official/entity. The concern is whether giving such authority to the executive head of the police force threatens independence and sets up potential for retaliation."

Thoughts on New Language in the Ordinance not previously considered or discussed yet by CCPC:

1. 2 additional members cast by City Council and term beginning February 2017 -- **Seems reasonable** given the Mayor has appointed all the sitting CPRB members thus far. Any additional thoughts?

2. Next 2 vacancies, whether for a new or unexpired filled by City Council -- **Seems reasonable** given the Mayor has appointed all the sitting CPRB members thus far and this would then give the City Council its four (4) total appointments, including #1 additional members provision above. Any additional thoughts?

3. **Need more time to consider the language regarding** serving more than one term, because this is NEW LANGUAGE not discussed during deliberations with the City, DOJ, or City Council. According to the Proposed Charter Amendment City of Cleveland summary statement in the Emergency Ordinance, however, this language **differs** from the CCPC recommendation, because it allows for Board Members to potentially serve more than a maximum of 8 total years in a 12-year period.

These conclude the updates, assessments, and thoughts as of this writing. ###

- As part of the report, Mr. Clopton stated that per Councilperson Zone, emergency ordinance covering Section 115-2 won't be the first and last look at changes and issues regarding the CPRB.
- Rev. Conner expressed her agreement with the assessment in the document, and asked if we would be able to get clarity on the issue regarding setting up a public and transparent process **for the selection and vetting process for Board members**. She stated that she agreed with the items on page 2 and page 3, and asked if what Dr. Rhonda was asking was for us to take a look at the language **mentioned** in the last item **(#3)** under the last section **titled "Thoughts on New Language"** of the document. This was affirmed. **Rev. Conner also asked whether or not the CPC would have representation at the upcoming Council meetings scheduled to clarify and ratify the document in preparation for the November ballot.**

Community Engagement Assessment

Mr. Clopton gave a presentation on the draft Community Engagement Assessment Plan.

The presentation via Prezi can be found at: <http://tinyurl.com/jk8p3ma>

Proposed Community Engagement Assessment Plan

updated July 28, 2016

Drafted by: Mario M. Clopton, Co-chair- Cleveland CPC

**THIS PROPOSAL HAS NOT YET BEEN MOVED FOR AFFIRMATIONAL VOTE. PROPOSED
VOTE: AUGUST 10,2016**

Rationale:

Cleveland **community** must have a strong relationship that is built on mutual trust and respect. The Constitution requires the City to prevent excessive force, to ensure that searches and seizures are reasonable, and to ensure that police services are delivered free from bias. These precepts also are fundamental to a strong **community-police** relationship. ¶1

Constitutional policing and effective policing are interdependent, and rely on a strong partnership between the police department and the **communities** that it serves. ¶6

The consent decree recognizes the importance of **community** input into the way police services are delivered. Ongoing **community** input into the development of reforms will strengthen CDP and the **police-community** relationship that is necessary to promote public safety. ¶14

Consent Decree Mandates for Community and Problem-Oriented Policing:

The Commission will on an ongoing basis:

- assess CDP's community activities ¶17
- recommend strategies for the CDP to increase community engagement with and community confidence in CDP. ¶17
- to work with the many communities of Cleveland to develop recommendations for police practices that reflect an understanding of the values and priorities of Cleveland residents; ¶17
- will consult the CDP regarding draft community and problem-oriented policing models ¶27
- will be provided community policing reports from the CDP ¶34

CDP will:

- *develop and implement a comprehensive and integrated community and problem-oriented policing model. ensure that its mission statement reflects its commitment to community oriented policing ¶28*
- *ensure that officers are familiar with the geographic areas they serve, ¶29*
- *provide initial and annual in-service community and problem-oriented policing training that is adequate in quality, quantity, type, and scope, ¶30*
- *maintain collaborative partnerships with a broad spectrum of community groups. ¶31*
- *develop and implement systems to monitor officer outreach to the community. ¶33*
- *annually present the results of this analysis, broken out by District, in a publicly-available community policing report detailing its community policing efforts in each District.*

The CDP will carry out the above consent decree mandates through a **Community and Problem-Oriented Policing Model**.

The Commission will carry out the above consent decree mandates through a **Community Engagement Assessment**.

Community Engagement Assessment Monitoring Plan tasks:

- *CPC will submit to CPD, the Parties, and the Monitor a draft Community Engagement Assessment Plan that outlines the process to conduct an assessment on an ongoing basis of CPD's community engagement and the community's confidence in CPD.*
- *CPD, the Parties, and the Monitor will provide written and/or in-person feedback on the Community Engagement Assessment Plan.*
- *CPC will revise the Community Engagement Assessment Plan to reflect the CPD, the Parties, and the Monitors feedback, where appropriate, and submit a Final Community Engagement Assessment Plan to the public, Parties, and Monitor.*
- *CPC will issue its Annual Report summarizing the results of its Community Engagement Assessments to date.*

Components of Cleveland Plan:

- I. Recommended Feedback

- II. Stakeholders Feedback
- III. Community Feedback
- IV. Data Analysis
- V. Drafting of Assessment
- VI. Implementation

The two columns below represent two different plans as offered with the Seattle CPC. The Cleveland plan is inspired by the Seattle model but is altered to fit Cleveland's consent decree and needs.

Seattle Plan	Cleveland Plan
<p><i>Step 1: Gather input from a variety of communities, including SPD, on the current state of police-community interactions and engagement.</i></p> <p><i>Stage 1: The first stage was a review of information collected from the Seattle community in 2012 and 2013 on ways in which SPD engages with the communities it serves. The CPC's Community Outreach Report and SPD's Safe Communities Report are the most extensive compilations of such feedback. Please see Exhibit A for a short explanation of each report and a summary of the key themes extracted from the feedback.</i></p> <p><i>Stage 2: Hold meetings with communities where outreach was not previously conducted. This provided perspectives that were not reflected in the CPC's Community Outreach Report or SPD's Safe Communities Report. Please see Exhibit B for a list of these meetings, the questions asked, and a summary of the information collected.</i></p> <p><i>Stage 3: Meet with SPD precinct leaders and attend a number of police-community outreach and engagement functions to learn about and observe the interactions that regularly occur between SPD and Seattle communities. Please see Exhibit C for a list of the meetings/functions that CPC staff attended in this stage.</i></p>	<p><i>I. Recommended feedback</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Collect and compile feedback and input from all previously approved CPC recommendations, meeting minutes, public comments and feedback.</i> ● <i>Collect feedback from articles, community outreach reports currently in print (Cleveland focused)</i> <p><i>II. Stakeholders Feedback</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Meet with the various stakeholders engaged in community-police relationships including but not limited to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Community Relations Board, Director</i> ○ <i>Community Relations Committee Representatives (Districts 1,2,3,4 and 5)</i> ○ <i>Director of Public Safety, Chief of Police</i> ○ <i>Division of Police District Commanders</i> ○ <i>Bureau of Community Policing, Commander</i> ○ <i>Cleveland City Council</i> ● <i>Meet with various activist and community policing organizations and networks to give their input on community policing and problem-oriented policing</i>
<p><i>Patrol Officer Forum</i></p>	<p><i>III. Community Feedback</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>CPC conducted a four-hour patrol officer forum. The 18 police officer attendees represented all five precincts and each of the three watches. Attendees were assigned to one of three groups to allow for a robust discussion. CPC staff identified the following observations and concerns from the information provided by forum participants:</i> <p><i>Demographic Advisory Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>SPD formed Demographic Advisory Councils (DACs) over a decade ago as a way to build trust between racial/ethnic communities and the police department, discuss law enforcement in the community, and increase understanding about both cultural norms and the role of police. We attended six DAC meetings in April and May 2015 (see Figure 10) to inform our evaluation of SPD’s community engagement practices. The primary goal of attending these meetings was to further our understanding of SPD’s relationship with racial, ethnic, immigrant, and refugee communities.</i> <p><i>Step 3: Develop a list of themes from the information gathered during community outreach; prioritize the themes to determine the focus of the upcoming gap analysis.</i></p> <p><i>Step 4: Oversee a gap analysis of the chosen areas of focus to determine the differences between the current and the ideal states of the themes as identified in the shared vision and guiding principles.</i></p>	<p><i>Stage 1: Survey Development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Develop a survey that will be used in public meetings to collect feedback, input and experiences from the community</i> <p><i>Stage 2: Town Hall Meetings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Develop a series of town hall meeting focused solely on police-community relations, both educating the public on community and problem-oriented policing as well as receiving community input</i> <p><i>Stage 3: Listening Sessions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>So as to expand the footprint of the CPC develop a series of sessions called “Listening Sessions” through non-profit organizations to collect feedback on behalf of the CPC.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The CPC would solicit applications/ reach out to non-profit organizations to take part in listening sessions where each organization would be required to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Train for, plan, execute and plan for a facilitator of a listening session meeting</i> ■ <i>have x amount of attendees or responses at their listening session</i> ■ <i>Assure survey information is collected and data/responses are returned to the CPC</i> <p><i>Stage 4: Invite activist or advocacy organizations to provide input into the community-police relations policy making</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>A one-day event where activists take part in discussing, debate and crafting policies on parts community, problem-oriented policing practices.</i>
<p><i>Step 5: Return to the community to share the gap analysis report and develop strategies for change. This step involves convening</i></p>	<p><i>IV. Data Analysis</i></p> <p><i>Develop a list of themes from the information gathered during community outreach;</i></p>

<p><i>community groups previously engaged by the CPC and sharing with them the findings of the gap analysis. It is important for the community to know that feedback they provided in the past is being used to create positive change. It is anticipated that community members will also offer a unique perspective on the gap analysis findings that will help the CPC understand the implications of the results. In addition, the community may have new ideas and strategies for implementing changes in the areas of focus. The CPC will then develop a formal list of strategies, taking into account the community input it receives in this step.</i></p>	<p><i>prioritize the themes to determine the focus of the upcoming gap analysis.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Identifies trends in responses</i> ● <i>Identifies common ideals and common differences</i>
<p><i>Step 6: Develop an implementation plan listing the strategies for change, action steps for how to achieve the desired changes, interim and final deadlines, and a means to continuously assess progress.</i></p>	<p><i>V. Drafting of Assessment VI. Implementing Assessment</i></p>

- Mr. Clopton explained that the first step is to create the plan for how to create and develop the community engagement assessment tool. Then the tool is developed, and the tool is implemented.
- He walked through the slides, the first few of which are captured below:
 - Slide 1: Need for trust and respect and need for a stronger relationship, cooperation, collaboration, and general good will
 - Slide 2: CDP will produce its own work product.
 - Slide 3: CPC will assess CDP's engagement activities, how they can be improved. The CDP will consult with the Commission in drafting their plan, and be provided with update reports.
- After a full presentation, Mr. Clopton commented that this is going to be a big undertaking that will hopefully result in new relationships, connectivity, and levels of outreach that had not existed before. It will provide a great opportunity to hear from people who don't typically get asked what their opinions are, or have time to come to meetings.
- He indicated that, according to the way the Monitor Plan is laid out currently (March edition), the CPC won't be able to do this multi-layered and detailed plan, and stated that his preference was to take the time necessary and have something that stands up, versus rushing just to get something done. We want a quality product that is effective.
- He discussed some challenges that will need to consider and unravel. For instance, as which CBOs (community-based organizations) do we approach to help us with the process? Do we open an application process for organizations? If we are issuing contracts, so that people are paid for their contributions to the Commission's work, how much does each CBO receive for their contract? What are the financial procedural

issues to resolve? How can we partner with a local university to help with crafting? Should we partner with a local university to help with crafting science-based survey questions that take into consideration age and literacy, etc.? Do we want to push forward hiring our community outreach and policy analyst?

- Stated we will need hired staff and support to do this. Raised for consideration, contracting with a marketing and public opinion firm; a local college/university to potentially help with data analysis; the need to train CBO facilitators
- Shared thoughts on Immediate next steps: the CPC needs to approve a working draft of CEAP so it can be shared to get feedback and input; suggested Commission vote at next meeting or an e-vote in between meetings, if necessary.
- Final Comments: Mr. Clopton remarked that given the social context and what is going on in the nation, he felt the Commission and public were “lucky” to have something like this where we can potentially tackle something preemptively.

Floor open to Commissioners for comments:

- Rev. Conner commended Mr. Clopton for drafting this robust, but she wholeheartedly believes doable, plan, particularly if the Commission gets professionals to help
- Dr. Rhonda also commended Mr. Clopton for his work, and emphasized how important she thought it was that we are thinking seriously about partnering with CBOs, and how this is an opportunity to share the wealth and resources in community since the Commission will be spending these dollars to do this work.
- Mr. Body emphasized that it is important to get, and will aid in getting others involved in a consistent way and doing the work, particularly grassroots level organization.
- (Rev. Conner had to depart at this time.)

Suggested Revisions to the Monitoring Plan

Mr. Clopton guided this discussion about the necessity to provide more time for the Commission to produce its work products. He appreciated the intensity and urgency, but also appreciated and recognized the time needed to do the deeper dive work to provide a foundation for and bolster our recommendations and work. It is important to get the work product done, but the Commission also does not want to leave too much of the community behind. Recognized the CPC and Commissioners are still trying to find our way and place in this process as well.

(Mr. Fisher arrives to the meeting at 6:50 p.m.)

Public Comment Period

Dr. Rhonda goes over again the Ground Rules for the public comment period. (See April 19th meeting minutes.) Co-chair Mario Clopton helps by keeping time.

- A community member expresses his view that the CPC has put forth enormous efforts, but he feels that the CDP and the City are not taking this process seriously. He raised a June 27th article about a baby shower incident at a police union hall, and stated that the Consent Decree calls for transparency, but that to date there has been no response to his public request for information.

- A community member asked whether the Commission was assessing the current strategy of community policing engagement for City? All related training deadlines?
- A member of SURJ remarked that the organization sent letters to the Parties including Judge Oliver regarding the removal process for Commissioners. He stated that Det. Loomis should be removed if he does not resign, stating a conflict of interest. He asked the Commission if we have received a response?
- Answer: No. No we have not.
- A community member shared the history of the CPPA, and read an excerpt of the material on the website about rioting militants killing police officers on the “about us” page. He stated, “I find it reprehensible. I can’t believe it is still allowed to be up there.”
- A community member asked about the City position of the Implementation Coordinator for the Consent Decree coordinator. He stated he did a public records request, and that all he received was one application and no accompanying resume. He found this troubling. He stated that the Commission received 100 applications for its executive director position, and the City received one? He asked that the documents he provided be entered into the record.
- A community member expressed that he felt America was at war with itself, described the \$5 million the Monitor received as “blood money,” and while people like him were being assaulted as a black man. He called Cleveland one of the most racist cities in United States
- Sgt Jones asked if she could provide a clarification. She stated to the speaker, expressing all due respect with him as a grown man and member of the community, that she was troubled by his comments, including his wording on a flier that he handed out. She found his reference to all police officers as Neo-Nazis as offensive and viewed the statement “blood money” as an invective. She remarked that she has called out police officers who have made blanket statements about protestors, and that she found the majority of officers that she works with do not personally or professionally exhibit Neo-Nazi behavior. She described his rhetoric as divisive and expressed that it served no valuable purpose. She also respectfully suggested that he not speak until he had feasible and/or reasonable solutions to offer. The police department will not be dismantled, and there will be no moratorium on hiring white police officers because it is a violation of the Civil Rights Act.
- Dr. Rhonda chimed in after Sgt. Jones, stating that she wanted to recognize that the community member had stopped, at least at this meeting, publicly calling all police officers Neo-Nazis (a small measure of improvement), and that she and the co-chair have talked with him about this and the kind of climate the Commission is trying to establish at the meetings, and also referred back to the Ground Rules. Dr. Rhonda continued that the Commission can not tell community members what their solutions should be. [Note: Sgt. Jones left the meeting somewhere during these remarks.] However, she would appreciate concrete suggestions and solutions to advance the work and to affirm the importance of public comment and engagement. She apologized for taking public comment period time, but just felt the need to speak on this. She stated as a social justice advocate that she did not have a problem with discussing issues of racial inequality, white supremacy, privilege, etc., and that if the community member wanted to

have that discussion and raise these concerns there were more effective ways than saying all CPD officers are Neo-Nazis or even that the CPD is an all-white police force, because those statements can be easily undercut and dismissed. For instance, the speaker could provide stats on the percentage of white officers and talk about how they make up the majority of the force and there needs to be greater diversity, or raise the issue of how racial discrimination in policing also impacts people in the community (e.g., racial profiling, etc.) In summary, she maintained that the CPC is trying to again establish a space to speak truth *and* advance police reform work.

- A community member remarked about the low number of hours per year for training of officers after they get out of the academy.
- Dr. Rhonda asked if she could send what she was reading from.
- A community member expressed that she wished Sgt. Jones was here, because she had recently read an article about police and trainers that she would have liked to ask her about. The community member described the study and then remarked that in addition to bias and posed several questions: Are we strategically looking at strategies to change the culture of the police department? In Dallas, leadership fired 40% of the police department so that they could initiate change...can we in Cleveland find "this 30%" who want culture change?
- A community member applauded the bravery of the speaker whose comments initiated the tense exchange, and stated that he wished there were no police officers on the Commission in order to make room for more community members. He stated that "Loomis has said before that the President has blood on his hands ... and I find that to be much more troubling..." And then he stated by way of reminder that the Mayor did not agree with the findings and Mr. Loomis did not believe reform was necessary.
- Commissioner Fisher added after Dr. Rhonda remarked that the public comment period was really not for Commissioners to speak but to listen because we speak enough during meetings, he felt it appropriate at times for Commissioners to speak. He said that he supported Sgt Jones' comments. He told the community member that he admired that he came to every single meeting, but that he knows he has the ability to convey ideas differently, because when he is not in front of the microphone, he does say what he believes but not the same way.
- The community member asked to respond and then told a story about himself, and raised the question about why when he speaks he is treated differently. "I don't come to sit and be quiet." He stated that he hates to come to the meetings with officers wearing guns," but that is not changed.
- A community member from SURJ stated that some speakers, at times, might want their rhetoric to be inflammatory to shake people up. She also stated that she didn't think we should be telling people what solutions they should or should not have, and that you have to identify racism and violence, white supremacy.
- A community member asked a question about the militarization of police and inquired about the approximately \$20 million of equipment that it was estimated was purchased: "When will there be transparency around that? And how are the RNC purchases made linked to community policing?"

- A community member expressed appreciation for all that the Commissioners are doing on a volunteer basis. That is, engaging us and making sure our voices are heard. She asked to return to the PRB updates, and vocalized 3 broad areas of concern.
 - Concern with the intensity of the deadlines, acknowledging appreciation for the depth of volunteer expertise dedicated to the work and level of engagement with community to ensure their input under very intense deadlines. She also expressed concern for their input and these section potentially getting missed.
 - Expressed concern about 115-1, 3, and 4, being missed particularly because of the level of research, community voice and engagement that went into developing recommendations for those sections of the charter. Asked where might those reside, and be considered in good faith, and implemented so that the concerns, feelings, expressions of community are embodied in those sentiments.
 - Expressed appreciation with the level of negotiation on section 115-2. Pleased to see a number of the recommendations were implemented. Without hearing why those recommendations were accepted, her initial impression was that it will likely make the board run more efficiently, but she still expressed concerned about what has been left on the table from an efficacy perspective. Those recommendations not included seem substantive from what the community has been saying they want the community's police review board to reflect.
 - Expressed some concerns about the broadness of what has been accepted. For example, members should not only be willing to serve, but equipped to serve. The recommendations including those for training are contextual and rooted in why the CCPC was established. She regarded the proposed ordinance language that cites membership is to "include representatives of diverse communities" as not necessarily congruent with what community expressed it wanted. She also referenced the recommendations section that speaks to marginalized and vulnerable communities and that the community spoke to wanting to ensure this level of representation is on the police review board.
 - Stated that she is pro-union, however, she has heard from community that they have deep concerns about this union, particularly because of certain authoritarian elements--Why was the recommendation to not include police unions representation not accepted?
 - The rest of the recommendations are also substantive in a manner that will help build trust, transparency, and accountability.
 - Finally and third, asked for illumination for those in community as to the iterative process--What is the formal forum for their feedback? When is there an opportunity to have further input?

Mario Clopton looked up the City Council correspondence that conveyed the meeting information. Dr. Rhonda announced the Safety Committee meeting was to be held August 9th and noticed that the City Council was then planning to pass it one day later on August 10th. She told those in attendance they should speak to their city councilpersons and attend the meetings if they have concerns they want city officials to hear directly.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.