

# COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT TASK FORCE

## PUBLIC SESSION MINUTES

January 22, 2018

Present at the meeting were Community Oversight Task Force (COTF) members Marvin McKenstry (chair), Ed Jackson (co-chair), Daniel Levine (secretary), Jeff Anderson, Denise Duval, Ralph Hughes, Ray Kelly, and Andrew Reinel. Danielle Kushner joined the meeting by phone.

Also present were:

- Kimberly Lagree, StandUp Baltimore
- Tania Harrison, Baltimore City Housing Department
- Derrick Chase, StandUp Baltimore

### Summary of Motions Adopted

- December 14 and 20 minutes adopted without revision.

#### I. Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 6:04PM. Marvin McKenstry gave his thanks to the Union Baptist Church for hosting the meeting.

#### II. Adoption of 14 and 20 December 2017 minutes

Jeff Anderson moved that the minutes from both the December 14 and December 20 meetings be adopted without revision. Denise Duval seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### III. Timeline

Dr. Anderson presented a draft timeline he had prepared at the request of the Task Force. The timeline assumed that the COTF would seek, and receive, an extension to its mandate. Mr. McKenstry reported that there had been some discussion regarding whether an extension needed to be requested, since the end date in March 2018 originally communicated to the Task Force by the City began the timeline from the adoption of the consent decree, and not from the first time that the COTF was convened. A request for an extension was being prepared as a contingency, however. After some discussion, it was decided that the COTF should seek a clarification or extension that gave the panel until 30 June 2018 to complete its initial report, to be followed by a public comment period and revision. The extension would provide sufficient time to complete draft recommendations, hire a writer for the final report, and extend public forums over two months.

To clarify and concretize the discussions of ideas that had been taking place among Task Force members for months, the COTF decided that each member should bring their ideas for recommendations to present to the group during the 9 February meeting. This would be followed by a working session on 11 February where the Task Force would attempt to narrow down and agree on draft recommendations, as well as identify any areas where further discussion or research were necessary.

#### IV. Meeting Dates

While all members agreed that set, regular, times for meetings were ideal, there were no evenings that were unproblematic for all Task Force members. It was decided that meetings in February would be held on Friday the 9<sup>th</sup>, Wednesday the 21<sup>st</sup>, and a special working session on Sunday

the 11<sup>th</sup>. Setting the March schedule would be at the top of the agenda on the 21<sup>st</sup>.

#### **V. Future Coordination with the Civilian Review Board (CRB)**

Mr. McKenstry reported that he had discussed future working sessions with the CRB. Ralph Hughes said that he had been to several CRB meetings and thought that they were both good meetings, and that it would be valuable for all COTF members to attend at least one, to which Ms. Duval and other members assented. There was general agreement that meetings between some COTF members and CRB members should continue.

#### **VI. Meeting with New Police Chief**

Mr. McKenstry said that he was working on setting a meeting between the COTF and the new police chief, Darryl De Sousa.

#### **VII. Coordination with the Consent Decree Monitor**

Ms. Duval reported that she, Mr. McKenstry, and Ed Jackson had met with the Monitor in December, and that monthly meetings would be part of the year one Monitor plan. Ms. Duval said that one issue discussed was the possibility of making the COTF report part of the consent decree, allowing compliance with it to be monitored by the court and increasing the points of leverage for ensuring its implementation. Danielle Kushner noted that the argument for implementation of COTF recommendations would be strongest if they could be framed as supporting compliance with the consent decree. In particular, Dr. Kushner noted, the judge was not likely to object to any recommendation accepted by all parties, but there was a significant chance that the Baltimore Police Department (BPD) would oppose some COTF recommendations.

Ray Kelly noted that the organization he heads, the No Boundaries Coalition, had been involved in police reform since before the creation of the consent decree and Monitor, and raised some concerns about it: the Monitor had not initially planned to have comments on the year one plan made public (but later agreed to make them public), and the plan did not include details on the budget. In addition, Mr. Kelly opined that the COTF recommendations should reflect the view that the community wanted there to be some capacity for monitoring the monitor.

#### **VIII. Other Relevant Events**

Andrew Reinel noted that, while he had created a spreadsheet for outside events of interest to the COTF, there were no automatic notifications when new events were added; so he urged members to email the group when adding events.

Mr. Kelly noted that the No Boundaries Coalition was having a workshop on recruiting police, at the request of the City's Office of Innovation, on 25 January.

#### **IX. Latinx Focus Group**

Mr. Reinel informed the group that he would be convening a focus group with members of the Latinx community on 25 January. Mr. McKenstry asked that the Community Engagement sub-committee report on how its outreach strategy had evolved at the next COTF meeting. Dr. Kushner noted that the sub-committee should also discuss dates for focus groups for other populations mentioned in the consent decree. Mr. McKenstry and Mr. Kelly noted that they could help with bringing together youth.

#### **X. Research Summary**

Dr. Anderson presented a research summary he had prepared, covering the main points learned by the comparative institutions sub-committee. Common elements of oversight in all cities studied included the police department having final say in discipline, multiple means of civilian input, systems that allowed civilians to report many forms of information (not just misconduct complaints), clear procedures, a tracking system, and follow-up. Many but not all cities studied also included an oversight body that contained a mix of volunteers and civilians, that gathered statistical information (in addition to information on specific complaints), and had a legal mandate for civilian oversight. Few cities had clear funding mandates for civilian oversight. Dr. Anderson noted that Baltimore was out of step with most other cities, except for not having a clear funding mandate. Mr. McKenstry and Mr. Kelly noted the importance of, once the COTF settled on general ideas for recommendations, to get more detailed information on how similar practices were being implemented in other cities. Daniel Levine noted that the COTF could follow an iterative process, by adopting initial ideas for recommendations at the working session on the 11<sup>th</sup>, then refining them by presenting them to community forums and conducting additional research in similar cities.

#### **XI. Legal Research**

Ms. Duval reported that two students from the University of Maryland law school were working on research projects relevant to the COTF, one on comparing and contrasting Baltimore's oversight with approaches in different cities, and one on best practices for police interactions with immigrants.

#### **XII. Open Society Institute – Baltimore (OSI) Funding**

Ms. Duval updated the COTF: funds had become available as of 1 January, and Dr. Kushner was moving forward on the search for a writer. Use of funds to bring in speakers or to visit other cities could be discussed during the working session on February 11.

#### **XIII. Staff Request**

The consent decree requires the City of Baltimore to support the COTF's work. Ms. Duval reported that the COTF's request for a staff member to assist with administrative tasks would be discussed with City Solicitor Andre Davis on 23 January.

*The meeting was adjourned at 7:45PM.*