OPARB Minutes of Thursday, May 17, 2012 Meeting 5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

Dale Tiffany, Chair Melissa Bartholomew, Member	P P	Joe Hawe, Member Liz Holohan, Member	Р
Claudia D'Allegri, Member	P A	Pat Sainsbury, Member	P
Michael Pendleton, Consultant:	Ρ		

Guests: Kathryn Olson, OPA Director; Judge Anne Levinson (ret), OPA Auditor

(Absent = A, Present = P, Excused = E, * = by phone)

The meeting began at 5:30 pm.

Meeting with OPA Director & Auditor: Kathryn reported that the monthly year-to-date numbers will be online tomorrow. The number of filed cases has increased compared to the same period last year, as have the cases sent to investigation. The number of cases closed during this period is up slightly compared to 2011, but there has been a significant increase in the number of allegations within cases. This is in part due to Guild contract requirements that allegations must be identified early in the complaint process and cannot be added at a later date, unless new evidence is discovered.

There was discussion of various improvements and efficiencies that have been and are being made to the investigative process.

One focus of the 20/20 Initiative process is on increased transparency. SPD is building a philosophy of providing as much information as is allowable by law. Another focus is on accountability, and "decentralizing accountability", or extending that responsibility throughout the department, not just within OPA. The expectation is being built that everyone is responsible for their actions prior to misconduct rising to the level of an OPA investigation.

Members discussed the concept of affording complainants and officers a findings or classification review if they are dissatisfied with either OPA ruling. The issue is to provide either party an opportunity to be heard and have some insight into an otherwise closed system. Anne noted that an officer has several avenues for review under the current system. The OPA Director's certification details the issues and discussion within the process of each case, but the public may not be aware of it. The question was raised – is there a gap between policy and public expectations?

OPA Auditor – The changes in classification and findings system have been largely implemented. Still remaining to be done are the aspects related to integrating the database for complaints handled directly at the precincts, establishment and training for precinct liaisons, and updates of the manual and other SPD materials. The Auditor and Director are reviewing the mediation system to assess why more complainants don't make use of it. Interviews are being conducted to determine how to make the system more robust, address barriers to participation, and determine other improvements that may be made. Results of any changes made to the system will be studied to see if there is a subsequent increase in the use of, and satisfaction with, the system.

Discussion with Peter Holmes – Liz, Dale, and Joe met with Pete and Darby DuComb, Pete's Chief of Staff. The OPARB members presented their recommendations with regard to the DOJ investigation. Pete clearly feels that citizens pay attention when OPARB speaks, and that OPARB's voice needs to be heard. It is important that OPARB is perceived as being an independent body. He agreed that a name change is an important step, and that guild issues will certainly be a factor in addressing changes. Which prevails – a DOJ decree or the SPOG contract?

Interim Policy Report – Liz will resend the current draft to all. Please review and send your changes to her by COB Friday, 5/18. She will send the report to Dale for final approval. Nancy will distribute the final Monday.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40.

Notes taken by Nancy Roberts.

The next public meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 6 at 11:30 am in the Al Rochester room on the 2nd floor at City Hall