
Anonymous Feedback from Independent Analysis of Ann Arbor Police Department Community Engagement Practices Draft RFP #9XX

Feedback Period: October 7 – October 28, 2016

Sources: Anonymous Feedback at Oct. 19 Open House, Email to PoliceAuditFeedback@a2gov.org

Feedback: On page 15 of the RFP, the document refers to the “need” for a civilian review panel. I strongly believe that a civilian review panel should be formed regardless of what the audit results in, as it can only help with transparency and good will, even if the audit says things are fine.

I would like the RFP to more clearly state that an auditor is expected to help structure a civilian review panel going forward, and not to determine the “necessity” for one.

Response: The RFP for the Independent Analysis seeks to compare the AAPD processes to best practices in the field without establishing preconditions for the outcomes. The City believes the best approach is to provide latitude to the consultant in its evaluation of the current state and recommendations for the future.

Feedback: I support the police audit. I also support the formation of a Civilian Review Board regardless of the findings of the audit. I see no downside to the creation of a CRB. If the AAPD is functioning well, a CRB will only serve to help continue that effective performance. If the audit reveals problems with the AAPD the CRB will help fix those problems. The existence of a CRB will increase communication between residents of AA and the AAPD. The CRB and AAPD do not have to exist in conflict but can cooperate to improve community relations.

Response: The RFP for the Independent Analysis seeks to compare the AAPD processes to best practices in the field without establishing preconditions for the outcomes. The City believes the best approach is to provide latitude to the consultant in its evaluation of the current state and recommendations for the future.

Feedback: It seems really important to be sure that whoever gets hired in response to the RFP, is required to talk with many people of color in this town to gather their experiences with the AAPD.

Also, I’m not sure that comparing the practices of the AAPD to the police depts. in towns of comparable size is useful. It seems so much more important to adhere to standards of Best Practice and the President’s Task force for 21st Century Policing.

I’m happy to see attention to (p. 16) whether there are disparities in interactions with certain groups’ in Ann Arbor such as white and black citizens, as well as ration of arrests, traffic stops, citations in black and white communities.

Response: The comparison to comparable cities is a useful tool, but one not used in isolation. The RFP requires a comparison to the President’s Task Force.

Feedback: I am concerned about the AAPD’s resistance to the civilian review board. I would like the auditors to help the community and the AAPD design an effective civilian review board even if the auditors find that the AAPD is doing an excellent job in all areas, it behooves our community to have an effective civilian review board as part of sustaining positive police/community relations in to the future.

Response: AAPD has not expressed resistance to the concept of a civilian review board. They are committed to ensuring the Independent Analysis looks objectively at their practices without presupposing the outcomes of the review.

Feedback: Dear Mr. Lazarus, Thank you for the latest revisions to the Police Audit RFP responding to community feedback. Here are several more suggestions:

1) I support the Human Rights Commission's request to establish a Civilian Police Review Board before the audit is completed. Such a board should be part of any police community partnership based on mutual respect, regardless of current PD performance.

2) Objective 2, p. 14. What is the purpose of the peer city comparison? How will an appropriate city be chosen?

Some college towns have reasonably good police practices, others have questionable ones. Instead, why not compare the AAPD to the recommendations of the President's Commission on 21st Century Policing? We want our city to be a model, not just better than average.

3) In Phase 1 (p.15) What weight will be given to various interviewees (community, elected officials, City Administration, AAPD) regarding the CPRB? Given that this whole process was initiated by community concerns, shouldn't more attention be paid to the aggrieved parties?

4) A pressing concern of many community members is that current laws and practices regarding use of deadly force protect the police at the expense of the people they presumably serve. Yet PDs in some other countries manage most of these encounters nonviolently. Training should, at the very least, include demonstrations of how this is done - for example, disarming a mentally ill individual with a 4-inch blade.

Response: The following responses are keyed to paragraph numbering above: (1) The concept and scope of a review board was included as a parameter for the Consultant to consider as a result of vocal community support. (2) Peer city comparisons are important for establishing benchmarks but not aspirational standards. Appropriate cities will be selected based upon size, location, university presence, and other parameters agreed upon by the City and the Consultant. (3) The Consultant will provide a recommendation on the nature, composition, and scope of any proposed review board. The recommendation will be based upon feedback received and best practices. The recommendation will be provided in a report to the City, and the report will be a public document. Council will act to form any potential committee with due consideration of the Consultant's report, community and AAPD feedback, and a recommendation from the City Administrator. (4) The scope of services requires the Consultant to review AAPD's training practices including those involving use of force with best practices in community policing. The Consultant will determine the appropriate points of comparison.

Feedback: I was taking a look at the RFP and am glad to see that steps are being taken to complete an audit of the AAPD. It wasn't clear to me what decision had been made with regards to creating a civilian review board and if that was only going to be formed if recommended after the audit. I'm not sure if this is the place to send this feedback, but I believe that a civilian review board is important to have regardless if it is deemed necessary by the consultant that performs the audit. Primarily because I believe this would promote accountability, which I only believe can be a positive. Thanks for your time.

Response: The RFP for the Independent Analysis seeks to compare the AAPD processes to best practices in the field without establishing preconditions for the outcomes. The City believes the best approach is to provide latitude to the consultant in its evaluation of the current state and recommendations for the future.

Feedback: Dear Friends,

I think it is important that the police and the community build a system of respect and trust on both sides. The legitimacy of law enforcement is not simply a legal matter, but an expression of community values, experience and judgment.

Therefore, I very much appreciate the revision of the RFP to reflect views expressed by community members about the purpose, scope and approach of an auditor's work. I am also pleased to have heard from Howard Lazarus that members of the Human Rights Commission will be part of the auditor selection process.

I strongly endorse a commitment to a Civilian Review Board. I recognize that its final form will evolve with our mutual understanding of the needs and insights of an auditor as well as the community and the AAPD. But it needs to be recognized up front that such a board has a critical role as a means of permanent, ongoing oversight and dialogue between the community and the AAPD.

Response: The RFP for the Independent Analysis seeks to compare the AAPD processes to best practices in the field without establishing preconditions for the outcomes. The City believes the best approach is to provide latitude to the consultant in its evaluation of the current state and recommendations for the future.
