

ACC Community Police Advisory Board Development Task Force

Wednesday, February 10, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. via WebEx

Task Force Members Present:

Mokah-Jasmine Johnson, Co-Chair
Shane Sims, Co-Chair
Stephanie Flores
T.K. Monford
Joan Prittie
Dr. Sarah Shannon
Phillip Smith

Task Force Members Absent:

Mykeisha Ross
Nikema Stovall

Visitor:

Liana Perez, NACOLE
Camme McElhinney, NACOLE

Staff:

Chief Cleveland Spruill, Police Department
Sherrie Hines, Attorney's Office
Sarah George, Manager's Office- Recorder

The meeting began at 3:00 p.m.

A. **Approval of the January 27, 2021 Minutes**

Phillip Smith made a motion to approve the January 27, 2021 minutes. Dr. Sarah Shannon seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Sarah George explained that the Committee needs to vote to authorize Shane Sims and Mokah-Jasmine Johnson to approve today's (February 10, 2021) meeting minutes prior to presentation to the Mayor & Commission because the Task Force is an *ad hoc* committee in which there is an end date to the work that the committee does. Typically, the meeting minutes would be approved at the next regular meeting of the committee itself, but, because this may be the last meeting of the Task Force, Sherrie Hines advised that one way to address the meeting minutes from this last meeting would be to authorize the two co-chairs to approve the last minutes.

Phillip Smith made a motion to authorize the Task Force's co-chairs to approve the February 10, 2021 minutes separate from the vote of the committee. T.K. Monford seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Phillip Smith made a motion to approve the February 10, 2021 agenda. T.K. Monford seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

B. **Review Presentation to Government Operations Committee**

Mokah-Jasmine Johnson opened discussion on this agenda point and noted the Task Force had a couple of weeks to review the presentation to the Government Operations Committee. The presentation represents a summary of the final recommendations, and she explained the full recommendations would be attached to the last slide. Johnson asked the Task Force if they had any questions or changes they would recommend for the presentation, and she recalled that Stephanie Flores had made a comment in the presentation that the Task Force had not yet determined the time the auditor would serve. In reviewing the recommendation document, Johnson

noted the term of employment previously being listed as either three or four years, and she asked the Task Force for their thoughts on the term length or if they preferred to leave that decision point for the Mayor & Commission to determine.

Stephanie Flores inquired about how this is established in Tucson and if there was a maximum amount of years that they could recommend rather than setting a minimum number of years. She suggested perhaps setting it to 10 years. She also inquired if they could list another possible reason that the auditor might be let go from the position to address necessity or inefficiency in performing the job well.

Liana Perez explained that, because the position in Tucson has been in existence for so long, there was not an actual timeline with respects to a 3 or 4 year contract. The auditor is basically an employee and is considered an appointed position, so they can be let go at any time. Perez noted that more effective practices of other auditing structures that have come on board across the country in the last 10 years have had a minimum of at least a 3-year appointment with the understanding that it is an appointment in which something could happen between day one and the end of those three years that could allow them to be removed.

Shane Sims explained his view is that, since they could be terminated at any time if necessary, allowing them to serve for as long as they are useful in the position would be wiser than setting a maximum term range. This would allow the person to become familiar with the process, the people, and the communication. It also may help build trust and allow the person to establish relationships with the community as well as the Police Department. Sims advised it may be counterproductive to the trust that they are trying to establish with the board to have the position reset after five years with a new person. T.K. Monford agreed with Sims and noted that if someone is willing, and they are still contributing to the process, he does not think they should remove them from the position because of a term limit. He further noted that he does not believe a term limit is necessary.

Philip Smith concurred with T.K. Monford and Shane Sims. He explained there is a time when term limits are needed, but, in this case, they already have a form of term limits that can be exercised if needed without having to put an automatic switch on there. He further noted that he believes one of the keys to the success of this work is whoever is appointed in these positions. Smith explained that if the person appointed is performing well, he would hate to get rid of them just because of some rule that was instituted a decade prior.

Mokah-Jasmine Johnson explained she would add in the final presentation a minimum of a 3-year limit but will not add a term limit or a maximum. After the three year contract is complete, it can be revisited or renewed. Stephanie Flores agreed with not having term limits. She noted she recalled the presentation did not address explicitly that they are prioritizing or seeking members of this board who have experienced police violence or over-policing on slides 11 and 12, where it speaks to the member qualification and the composition. She inquired if that could be added and explained she believes it is really important to stress that priority.

Mokah-Jasmine Johnson agreed and noted she would make sure that language from the original recommendation would be added there. She also explained that she thought even in that portion the Task Force had highlighted working with organizations/ contacting organizations to recommend people for this board, so she would add that language as well.

Stephanie Flores agreed and added that she thought more recent examples could be more meaningful when speaking to history to show the necessity behind this. She shared that one example that she thought could be added was the June 6th protest, because she believes there are a lot of people in the community who feel like that was not adequately addressed or who feel

wronged by the clash of the escalation that occurred and that reparation has not really been made for that. She further explained that this is a situation that is centered and could be addressed by an accountability review board. Flores also noted that she also believes it would help members of our community who were affected that day feel more represented. Mokah-Jasmine Johnson agreed and noted that some people in the community have been asking the question about why this is needed. She added that they may not know the whole history behind this committee, some of the negative things that have happened in the community and where the community might not have received a thorough explanation for it; therefore, she does not have an objection about adding that into the history portion.

Dr. Sarah Shannon explained that she does not have a problem with it, but it would just be a matter of how much time you have for the presentation and how many examples it makes the most sense to share in a short amount of time. Dr. Shannon added that she was aware that those are prominent examples that people bring up in the community, so it would be a good idea to have those ready to talk about.

Chief Cleveland Spruill expressed concern about pointing to those specific examples and recommended to the Task Force to stay with the original charge designated by Mayor to make a recommendation to the Mayor and Commission about how the board should be established and move forward. He also noted that there was not an incident on June 6. If the reference is to the May 31st incident, he explained a thorough investigation was done, a total report was released on that incident, and the solicitor-general has also released their report documenting his findings in that case.

Mokah-Jasmine Johnson explained that describing the history behind it is needed, because when the Task Force has spoken in the past and in some surveys, people within the community have asked why this is needed. She further noted that if they are trying to improve relations between the community and police department then they would include that in the summary, even down to the final findings, as there are still people in this community that have questions about what happened and were dissatisfied with the findings and that sent a ripple throughout ACC. She explained that this would have been a great opportunity for this board, had it already existed, for the police officers and members of the community could really work through some of this stuff and find out what happened and why and try to come some kind of deeper understanding.

Shane Sims further added that this board may have also served a great purpose for the police department, because it could have represented a voice that the community could trust. He further explained that, very often, the findings of these board across the country comes up to be similar if not the exact same as the police department; however, it lends credibility to those findings, because they are a board of community members that came to this same determination.

Mokah-Jasmine Johnson asked the Task Force if anyone had any further objections to adding that.

Mokah-Jasmine Johnson summarized and explained that the Task Force had an opportunity for two weeks to review the presentation and to add their comments. She noted they would revise the materials based on the comments and suggestions made at this meeting. She explained that she and Shane Sims wanted to go ahead and make a vote to accept the presentation with the amendments that have been made based on the surveys, feedback, and months of hard work, so they can go ahead and present this to the Mayor and Commission in a couple of weeks.

Philip Smith made a motion to approve the recommendation as it stands with the amendments discussed today. TK Monford seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Shane Sims explained that all that is left is for us to make our recommendation, and he expressed a job well done to the Task Force.

Mokah-Jasmine Johnson thanked the committee and promised to keep everyone posted as to the exact date and time of the presentation as well as any changes that occur or if anyone

C. **Schedule/Agenda Changes**

Dr. Sarah Shannon made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Philip Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting concluded at 3:25 p.m.

The recording of this meeting can be accessed on YouTube at the following link:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8zn0FsxcXhc>