



City of Tacoma

Community's Police Advisory Committee

Minutes

Monday September 12, 2022
Virtual Zoom Meeting
6:00 p.m.

The CPAC is comprised of Chair Stephen Hagberg, Vice Chair Shayna Raphael, and Committee Members Louis Cooper, Jill Jackson, Jeffery Sargent, Nate Robinson, Adrian Lavergne, Angela Mealing, Allen McKenzie, and Jabari Hampton

Members Present: Adrian Lavergne, Allen McKenzie, Shayna Raphael, Louis Cooper, Jabari Hampton, Angela Mealing, Stephen Hagberg,

Members Absent: Jeffrey Sargent, Jill Jackson

Staff Present: Staff Liaison Ted Richardson; Executive Liaison Jacques Colon

Staff Absent: TPD staff were not necessary at this meeting as it was an internal discussion

Called to order at 6:01pm

Welcome and Introductions

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of the agenda for the CPAC meeting held on September 12, 2022.
Passed at 6:03pm

Approval of the Minutes

Approval of the minutes of the August, 2022 CPAC meeting.
Motion passed at 6:03pm

The Committee hosted a community forum to gain insight into Tacomans' preference for CPAC remaining in an advisory role or shifting to an oversight model. The notes from that discussion are below:

1. **Investigative Model** - would provide CPAC the authority to investigate complaints of misconduct themselves and disciplines officers directly. The decisions would be binding at the highest level of oversight. This model would require significant union bargaining, which could take years, and would involve compensation for CPAC members and significant training
2. **Review Focused Model** - would provide CPAC the authority to examine the quality of investigations and make recommendations for further investigation and improvements to the process. CPAC would be involved in internal affairs for that process and review investigations prior to the final decision and make recommendations or ask questions before the final review by the Chief of Police or City manager.
3. **Auditor Model** - would allow CPAC to help select an external individual or entity who would monitor and review the completeness and thoroughness of internal affairs investigations from beginning to end to ensure fairness, thoroughness, and consistency.
4. **Status Quo: Advisory Committee** - CPAC provides recommendations on policies, procedures, rules, training and programs.

DISCUSSION

1. Which model for CPAC do you prefer?

- Review Model
- Doesn't understand why CPAC can't do all three, for impartiality.
- The review model makes sense as a transitional step to a more robust model which might look a little different from the remaining two as things play out.

2. Why do you prefer the model you selected above?

- Elevated process that isn't over intrusive, but that ultimately, hope that none of it would be necessary. The band of public trust with TPD right now is so fractured that this could help. Right now, he feels that the highest level would be too much right now. Again, eventually we would hope to never have to have it but we aren't there right now. This is thorough but not too intrusive.
- We need to get caught up with the times such as other cities, mentioning those who do. Disagrees with intrusiveness being an issue, going back to TPD history of having FBI involved before. Thinks having feedback from CPAC, speaking as a former member of CPAC, is important. Has been here for six years and has seen what was going on and doesn't think that TPD or city leaders have an issue with that.
- Agree that review is a good segue. Worried that the quality of the investigations that TPD does of themselves doesn't seem to always be thorough without robust oversight from the outside.

3. What do you see as the top three most important components of a Review Model?

- The ability to have authority to have access to information and not have to ask for it. Additionally, integrity that the person that is doing oversight will be able to access everything they need with minimal bureaucracy that can help them get to a fair assessment.
- The top one and last one (prior review before decision making and provides insight into data). Having the chief and the city manager be a part of these investigations. Has found that he doesn't have as much input unless something is amiss.
- Legal authority and community member access and involvement.

4. What involvement would you like to see the community have in investigations/complaints?

- When the investigations are completed have it available on a website where citizens can view it. Wants it public facing. If it's posted and someone sees it and realizes they have more information they can re-open it or follow up and speak to the individual who isn't a part of that process.
- When there is some large, headlining event it would be great to have a place to go to gather information that isn't stifled by media. Understands that there is a reasonable middle ground on what can be shared and what can't be shared to provide information with latest details or current standing. Wants to know where the department stands on things and issues, not just individual police officers. Is curious what is going on with the officer, the case, and how the department feels. Just having one place that people can go off of social media with the actual truth.
- Legal authority and community member access and involvement.

5. Is there anything else you would like CPAC to consider?

- Worries about an organization that is to police itself. Struggles with the department to do investigations the way that we as the community want them done. It's important for TPD to know that there are people wanting TPD to be accountable to the outside community.
- CPAC is a serious undertaking and is a part of the community that most people would think. It spreads out across the whole city, especially as it goes to first responders and the whole city. A tug of war battle with unions and dealing with different sections of unions and trying to negotiate and litigate political red tape. Many people in CPAC don't have that training. The only way to litigate this, because we work with CVS and the city manager and part of TPD already, so if you put all those elements into play and then you add PC FIT into the situation. I am not saying it's fast paced to get investigation model, but you will see where we can go from review model to the investigative stage, but everyone must work together to make this possible. There's rotation of CPAC that is voted in by the mayor and city council. You must take that information and then transfer it into the CPAC board. You get this rotation of people that's not going to be up to par of what's going on, so you've got to be sure you've got those strategic guidelines so that everything is transferrable to new members. Not saying that it needs to be expediently done because I don't see how that's possible, and we must start from somewhere. But communication is key if everyone knows what they are supposed to do in the review process. I'm not saying it's fast but doesn't need to be 5 or 10 years." Mentions redactions and other sensitive information from the Freedom of Information Act. In addition, may need an NDA. Should be worked out with the union with certain conditions because people have to sign

agreements to not talk about things. Discussed military background and going through ranks with crime bill in 1994 and other incidents. It won't work without all parties involved. If we can lessen the blows then maybe our community can be better.

- Wants to know how long the move would take to get to the investigative model. It says it can 5 – 10 years. Also thinks it would be problematic as a citizen to come in and tell an officer what they should and shouldn't do, but it does help to have this partnership and have information from people who do know this world better provide information. Strength not telling police officers what to do but instead see what they actually are doing.
- What information that CPAC sees would they be able to share with the community? It's important to know what is going to be shared with the community and what will just be shared with CPAC.
- Has been following this for a long time and understands the concerns and the need for transparency and accountability and all of that. However, I would have concerns about people evaluating my job performance that have never done the job. Coming from a military background, I think it would be very weird for a group of civilians to pass judgement on the military.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Data and Trends

- Stephen Hagberg
- Angela Mealing
- Shayna Raphael

Oversight and Policy

- Shayna Raphael
- Louis Cooper
- Allen McKenzie
- Jill Jackson
- Angela Mealing

Outreach and Diversity

- Adrian Lavergne
- Angela Mealing
- Jeffery Sargent
- Louis Cooper
- Allen McKenzie

Police Training and Culture

- Jabari Hampton
- Jeffery Sargent
- Adrian Lavergne
- Jill Jackson

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was taken throughout the meeting

TOPICS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

- Legislative Updates
- Transformation and KUMU tool follow up
- Lexipol
- CALEA Policy Manual Review

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: CM Cooper

Second: CM Lavergne

Motion passed 7:05 pm

Stephen W. Hagberg

Stephen Hagberg, Chair

Rich

Ted Richardson, Staff Liaison