



CITIZEN POLICE ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Citizen Police Advisory Review Board (CPARB) was called to order by Vicki Ann Hart, Chair on Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 5:40 p.m. at the City Attorney Conference Room, City Hall, 255 W. Alameda, Tucson, Arizona.

Commission Members	Representing	Present/Absent
Susan Thornton	Mayor	Absent
Jeremy Tor	Ward 1	Present
Tom Clark	Ward 2	Present
Vicki Ann Hart, Chair	Ward 3	Present
Cynthia Schiesel, Vice-Chair	Ward 4	Present
Vacant	Ward 5	
Vacant	Ward 6	
Advisory Members		
Barry Hirsch	CPARB	Absent
Daniel Knieter	CPARB	Present
Ronald Peetz	CPARB	Present
Bruce Cameron	CPARB	Present
Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
Captain Terry Rozema	TPD	Present
Officer Steve Beller	TPOA	Absent
Liana Perez, Independent Police Auditor	City Manager's Office	Present

Staff Present
Lieutenant Jim McShea, Tucson Police Department
Sgt. Mike Garcia, Tucson Police Department Narcotics Division
Officer Jennifer Ledford, Tucson Police Department
Yvette Patterson, Independent Police Auditor's Office
Mike Anderson, Principal Assistant City Attorney
Beth Tidwell, Recording Secretary, City Clerk's Office
Sylvia Carbajal, City Clerks Office
Visitors
Steven Murphy, Citizen

AGENDA ITEM	MOTION	ACTION	FOLLOW-UP RESPONSIBILITY
1. Call to Order / Roll Call: 5:40 p.m.			
2. Approval of Notes of October 18, 2005 and December 20, 2005	<p>Motion by Mr. Tor, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 4 to 0, (Ms. Thornton absent) that the minutes of December 20, 2005 be approved with the noted corrections.</p> <p>Motion by Mr. Clark, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 4 to 0. (Ms. Thornton absent) that the minutes of October 18, 2005 be approved with the condition that the City Clerk's Office review the tape of the Meeting and restructure the sentence in question in Item 9.</p>	<p>Chair Hart noted that on the December 20, 2005 minutes, Item 8, under Case #05-0491 the second sentence should read "Lt. McShea informed the board that it meant this person was not welcomed". Chair Hart also noted on Item 8 Case #05-0643 should have read "cases for review".</p> <p>Jeremy Tor noted that on the October 18, 2005 Item 5 should read Lt. McShea informed the Board that it is incumbent on the "officer" that they give their name. Chair Hart noted that on the October 18, 2005 Item 9 did not read clearly.</p>	<p>Clerk's Office reviewed the tape and found that Lt. McShea was implying that not every call an officer responds to has a law, policy or general order that has been broken. In those situations officers may inform the person who called that they do not have to make a report because no law, policy or general order was broken.</p>
3. Call to the Audience		<p>Steven Murphry addressed the Board regarding a complaint of being beaten, robbed and car jacked in 1999. In his most recent case the suspect involved in that case was incarcerated at Pima County Jail. Mr. Murphry was unable to clearly state what his complaint was.</p>	

<p>4. Presentation on Methamphetamine Labs (Sgt. Mike Garcia)</p>		<p>Sgt. Mike Garcia gave a presentation about methamphetamine manufacturing, sales, distribution, and items to look for in methamphetamine usage. Sgt. Garcia stated that Sudafed was a primary chemical that was used in making methamphetamine.</p> <p>The methamphetamine problem seemed to be growing most rapidly in the Three Points area and on the west side of Tucson. Sgt. Garcia informed the board that if you suspect a methamphetamine house in your neighborhood you should call the police. The chemicals were very explosive and could cause extensive damage. The chemicals involved are dangerous.</p>	
<p>5. Office of Independent Police Auditor A. Report on NACOLE Conference</p>		<p>Liana Perez informed the Board about the NACOLE conference she attended and ideas that were discussed. Some important ideas were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A first year officer should return to a classroom setting after one year of field service. They would discuss what they did and did not do compared to what they were taught in the Academy. • Complaints or investigations of Police Officers should be used as a teaching tool of what could have been done differently to benefit all parties involved in a situation. • Training concerning police officers dealing with immigrants was becoming an issue. Miami Florida was being affected by complaints and they were looking into ways to inform their officers of the new challenges and the best way to handle issues involving immigrants. • Protocols for the use of Tasers was also a topic of discussion. 	

<p>B. Outreach Report</p> <p>C. Monthly Contacts</p>		<p>B. Yvette Patterson suggested that town meetings be held to give information to the Tucson community. She said there was currently contact between the Tucson Police Department and Neighborhood Associations.</p> <p>C. Liana Perez stated that Mr. Murphy contacted her on a monthly basis regarding his complaint.</p>	
<p>5. Tucson Police Department</p> <p>A. TPD Updates</p> <p>B. Office of Internal Affairs</p>		<p>A. Captain Rozema announced the Tucson Police Department was one of forty agencies that were nationally recognized by the Urban League for working well with the African American Community. The Tucson Police Department had also been acknowledged for their professionalism when it came to being involved with disabled citizens.</p> <p>Captain Rozema said his staff would put together a presentation about the use of Tasers. The board would be able to view the policy in place and examine the way the Tucson Police Department trained officers to use the Taser.</p> <p>B. Lieutenant McShea announced he would be relocated to the Midtown Police Department as of February 2006. Lieutenant McShea told the Board how important CPARB was in his own development. Lieutenant Rick Wilson would be replacing him at Internal Affairs.</p>	
<p>7. RECESS</p>	<p>By consensus, the Board decided to forego a recess.</p>		

<p>8. Random Review of TPD Cases</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Case #05-0569 2. Case #05-0563 3. Case #05-0543 		<p>Case #05-0569 was found to be a fair and through investigation by a vote of 4 to 0 (Ms.Thornton absent).</p> <p>Chair Hart stated she did not understand the case. It appeared as if there was a lot of information about the shooting but nothing about how the complaint got answered. Lt. McShea explained that the citizen was concerned about evidence and once she had a better understanding, she was okay with the Tucson Police Departments choice of evidence. Case #05-0563 was found to be a fair and through investigation by a vote of 4 to 0 (Ms.Thornton absent).</p> <p>Chair Hart stated she was unhappy with the comment the officer made to the woman involved in the situation. Chair Hart felt as if the officer should not have told the woman that “she had lost creditability with him”. Lt. McShea agreed that the comment could have been confrontational. Jeremy Tor stated even though he did not agree with the comment the officer made, he did believe the case had been followed through thoroughly. Case #05-0543 was found to be a fair and through investigation by a vote of 4 to 0 (Ms.Thornton absent).</p>	
<p>9. Customer Satisfaction Survey</p>		<p>Lieutenant McShea reported that many customer satisfaction surveys had gone out. He said the Board should be receiving reports for the next few months. He would help facilitate any follow up with Lieutenant Wilson.</p> <p>Chair Hart was interested in one of the surveys that appeared as if the police had interrupted a therapy session. She said</p>	

		<p>unfortunately, the individual who filled out the customer satisfaction survey stated they did not want any more contact from any group concerning the matter.</p> <p>Tom Clark was concerned about the Kansas City Survey. He did not understand how someone's property had been sold in an auction. It appeared as if there was a lack of communication between the two police departments. Lt. McShea explained he was not sure as to what happened. There was usually a lengthy process and a lot of paper work involved when it came to a citizen's property.</p> <p>The Board agreed they would continue to review Customer Satisfaction Surveys as long as they came in. Tom Clark said he was confused since he missed the past meeting. Chair Hart explained to Mr. Clark that the surveys were being discontinued for an undetermined amount of time while they were being revised to better serve the public. Chair Hart stated that if the public sent letters voluntarily they would be shared and discussed with the CPARB members.</p>	
10. Comments to Mayor and Council		<p>The Board reviewed the comments to Mayor and Council in reference to the Sun Riders. The Sun Riders were unhappy with the structure of the parade. Tom Clark stated that the Parade Ordinance had not been reviewed or changed since 1957. Chair Hart believed this was a City Manager problem and not something that should involve the CPARB Board. Mike Anderson, Principal Assistant City Attorney, stated he would look into whether or not this would be under Tucson Police Department and therefore a concern of CPARB and report back to the Board.</p>	<p>Mike Anderson, Principle Assistant City Attorney, would report back on who was responsible for the Parade Ordinance.</p>

11. Report on Website		Jeremy Tor stated there were no updates concerning the website.	
12. Future Meeting and Agenda Items		Tasers Officer Elections	Captain Rozema would put together information on Tasers for the February meeting.
13. Report from the Chair Announcements A. Upcoming Elections B. Annual Report C. Vacancies on Board		Chair Hart presented Lt. McShea with a certificate of appreciation A. Chair Hart stated her term as chairperson was coming to an end as of February. She had completed her two-year term. At the next meeting there would be a need for nominees. B. Chair Hart would have the annual report for the next meeting. C. Chair Hart said Holli McGarry had a meeting with Vice Mayor Steve Leal regarding a possible reappointment. Chair Hart would be meeting with Roger Carrillo from Council Member Nina Trasoff's office regarding the vacancy.	
14. Adjournment – 7:35 p.m.	MOTION by Ms. Schiesel, duly seconded, and approved by a voice vote of 4 to 0 (Ms. Thornton absent) to adjourn.		