

Good evening,

For those of you who don't know me, my name is Lisa Jackson, Chair of the Independent Community Police Oversight Commission.

As many of you already know, the City Council voted to approve the latest collective bargaining agreement on Sept 21 and the police officers voted to ratify it last week. I would like to use my time this evening to point out a number of concerning issues that remain, despite the community's vocal involvement in this negotiation.

One such issue is that, while our community has highlighted the need to fund police alternatives, the city's officers will receive a 2.5% raise. This will occur as the city decides whether it will offer no raises to staff or even cut the budget of its other departments. To be clear: pay increases for the officers that serve our community are not inherently bad. However, increasing resources given to our police department without also doing so for the departments that would make their intervention less necessary is deeply misguided. There is no better cure than an ounce of prevention.

The city agreed has agreed with ICPOC that ending arbitration for termination would end the cycle that we see of officers being fired for misconduct, only to have them return to the force due to an arbitrator. Because the union did not approve of that change, the discussion was tabled. The city subsequently decided to form a committee to discuss the issue.

Even though ICPOC advanced this idea and researched the request, we have received mixed messages regarding our participation on the committee. In an early meeting, we were led to believe we would participate in that process. Later, we were told that we could not participate because the union did not want us to.

I want to be clear here: what the union wants regarding prevention of oversight is not relevant to the people. There is no legal reason why the community's oversight commission cannot participate in these meetings. And yet, we were told by the city that we couldn't participate because the union doesn't want to work with us. To exclude us from the process of discussing an idea that we raised, because the union doesn't want to sit at the table with us is, frankly, ridiculous. The only way for groups to begin to trust each other is for them to begin to work together, and if the union is not willing to voluntarily exist alongside its oversight counterpart then it is the duty of the City to compel them to do so.

Finally, the most important request we made is that ICPOC be able to see police officers' names when there are complaints filed against them. As it stands now, when we see 20 complaints, we cannot tell whether there are 20 complaints against 20 different officers or whether there are 20 complaints against one officer - both of these are important for us to track and for citizens to know.

The union did not agree in this contract to provide us with these names, even though there is no law in Michigan that prevents the disclosure of that information. To reiterate: the only barrier between us and the ability to hold officers accountable for their conduct is the Ann Arbor Police Officers Association's refusal to cooperate.

As it turns out, the Michigan Supreme Court has already weighed in on this issue. In *Bradley v. Bd. of Ed. of the Saranac Community Schools*, the state supreme court ruled that the names of public employees can be disclosed via FOIA if the city deems that it is in the public interest to do so. Further, it was indicated that collective bargaining agreements do not supersede this interest, and that city employees cannot sue based on the release of information via FOIA.

We were told by the city's negotiating team that they informed the AAPOA of this supreme court ruling, and the union negotiators

were thus aware that ICPOC could FOIA the names of police officers in complaints. The union decided that rather than just show us the names as they appeared in complaints, they would rather redact the names and then have us FOIA them, as if that would serve as an adequate deterrent to our mission of serving the communities we represent. But, since the union insisted that the names be hidden from us, I am here tonight to call that bluff and announce that we will be FOIAing the names of each and every officer who appears in a complaint.

To the City: we understand that FOIA requests can be expensive, but because our requests will cost *less* time than the current redaction process, we expect them to be processed quickly and at no expense.

We are looking forward to working with City Administrator Tom Crawford's office and the City Attorney's office to establish an efficient FOIA process regarding police complaints. This process, though potentially laborious and time consuming, will become yet another positive step in the direction of having all parties working together.

I would also like to point out that this process will provide the public with even more information than we originally requested, since information disclosed from FOIA requests is available to the entire community and not just our commission, which would not be the case if the union had simply agreed to work with us on this issue. We had agreed to keep the officers' names confidential and assure the community that we were tracking the information, but now police officers' names will be available to the entire community.

Our next meeting will be held online on October 27, because even though the state supreme court has ruled, the virus hasn't changed. Please follow us on Twitter @A2IPOC, on Facebook at Ann Arbor

Oversight or email us at A2PoliceOversight@gmail.com for more information. I hope to see you there.

Thank you for your time.