

Minutes of Thursday, July 15, 2010 Meeting
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

Patrick Sainsbury, Chair:	P	Steve Freng, Member:	E
Tina Bueche, Member:	E	Martha Norberg, Member:	E
George Davenport, Member:	P	David Wilma, Member:	P
Sharon Dear, Member:	P*	Michael Pendleton, Consultant:	P

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

The July 7 meeting minutes were adopted.

NACOLE Conference: No updates. Conference reservations were confirmed for all Board members and Michael.

Semiannual Report: Attending members rejected suggested changes to the Board's mission statement, and adopted the rest of the report without change, except to delete the reference to Appendix A as an attachment (page 2). Nancy will file the final with the clerk, it will be presented to the public safety committee, and then we will post to the website.

El Centro de la Raza: Estela Ortega may have been unaware of OPARB's previous contacts with El Centro de la Raza and Casa Latina. Pat sent her an introductory email, but has not had a response yet. The Board agreed that Pat should wait another week, and then follow up with an invitation to a board meeting and offer to attend one of their meetings. Michael wanted to make sure that the issue of Latinos' reticence to follow up on police complaints was raised.

Police Video Article: The concern about not-infrequent problems with police audio and video cameras was rated as a higher priority than looking into frequent flyers. It seems that videos are missing, erased, cameras not turned on or not positioned to record the action. How does the system work, including archiving and retaining tapes? What is the incidence of "missing" tapes? Did OPA handle the referenced case per their protocol? In the referenced case, why did they initially say the video wasn't available? Is there an OPA investigation on that? Can OPARB members attend video school? There should be focus on how videos are handled. There are pros and cons to asking the auditor to review this case.

Work Plan: Michael suggested that it may be time to review or even suspend the current work plan in order to address more timely issues as they arise. This can be energizing to everyone. It was decided that, since the first meeting in August is devoted to addressing the OPA classification/disposition system, the evening meeting in August will be to discuss suspension of the existing work plan in favor of refocusing on newer, more timely interests. With regard to the classification/disposition system, David thinks the Board will have the information to write a paper, contact the guild for input, and subsequently submit the report to Council.

Work Groups: There were no reports from work groups.

OPA Statistics Report: Dave Wilma pointed out that the report complies with the requirements of the ordinance. Members present want more analytical and statistical information in the report. The board needs to identify reasonable metrics for OPA to review and report. Does NACOLE have standards against which to measure? If not, can we design the metrics we'd like to see evaluated? Additional concerns were that OPA reports are issued in a vacuum - each one is a stand-alone report, with no linkage or continuity with previous reports, and no follow-up status reports from previous goals. The board will work together to identify what issues are important to follow through with. Some issues mentioned are cases that fall outside OPA - the SRs and LIs; the percentage of complaints - need to differentiate between patrol officers and desk officers, for instance. There may be national standards that exist already.

The meeting was convened at 5:30 p.m. and adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Notes taken by Nancy Roberts

The next meeting will be held on August 4, 2010 at 11:30 a.m. in the Boards & Commissions Room L280, City Hall.