

**NORTHAMPTON POLICING REVIEW COMMISSION**  
**On-line Video Conference**  
**October 6, 2020**  
**Minutes**

**1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by Dana Olivo at 6 p.m.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENT OF AUDIO/VIDEO RECORDING**

Dana announced that the meeting was being audio and video recorded and would be available on Northampton Open Media and the City of Northampton website.

**3. ROLL CALL:**

On a roll call, the following commissioners were present:

Commissioner Ahrens	present
Commissioner Barajas-Roman	not present (arrived at 6:14 p.m.)
Commissioner Bush	present
Co-Chair Cannity	present
Commissioner Fleisher	present
Commissioner Hoose	not present (arrived at 7:04 p.m.)
Commissioner Jarrett	present
Commissioner Lopez	present
Commissioner Luengo-Garrido	present
Co-Chair Olivo	present
Commissioner Pole	present
Commissioner Quinlan	present
Commissioner Rosales	present
Commissioner Suopis	present
Commissioner Rivera-Gonzalez	not present

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Co-Chair Olivo opened the floor to public comment.

Richard Hendrick commented that, last Tuesday evening, the night of the debate, he observed within their deliberations focus, humility, wisdom, respect, listening, and even emerging smiles. Yes, do place your deliberations in Spanish and captions for those who cannot hear; honor those revolutions, he suggested. You did not make the mistake of Minneapolis by getting bogged down with the rallying cries while at the same time powerfully putting meaning to those cries by overlaying them upon the committees formed: abolish, reimagine, reform.

His concern is not with the right word for his position but rather for making this happen: "Do the work and then name it." He would suggest commissioners need a fourth committee, perhaps called 'Who to communicate to and how to do it.' Like the Kerner report of 50 years ago, their report too will sit on the desk

unless it has considerable support behind it, and that will take communication. "Find a way to those 500 in the streets, to the 500 who have reached out to you. This is not the future; they are now," he urged.

Their task really is going to be to step out of the box they may feel they have been placed in to some extent, Mr. Hendrick continued. In the end they are going to have to convince the Mayor, the City Council, the populace at large and those 500, and that's going to take some doing. But do it, he urged. This week is mental health awareness week. A comparison was made between the deinstitutionalization movement of the 50's and 60's – people released from the state hospital - and this movement. Whatever we end up calling this movement, it was not an apt comparison and is somewhat concerning. The deinstitutionalization movement brought forth an irrational fear, where are the safety nets? This one has engendered outrage; the police safety net is gone. He was part of the deinstitutionalization movement, worked in state hospitals and for 25 years thereafter served those affected on the streets. Notwithstanding the inappropriate police intervention - however well-intended - of bringing folks to jails, they - including the severely mentally ill - are infinitely safer and healthier on the streets. What remains with him are the courageous sentiments and actions of the U.S. District Court of Judge Joseph Toro. Judge Toro said this is too cruel, too important, to wait anymore. He mandated a consent decree. George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Jacob Blake, he uttered.

Co-Chair Olivo tried unsuccessfully to unmute (413) 582-7081, Hildegard Freedman.

Ed Olmstead thanked members for serving. He believes an open, purposeful examination of policing with community input in Northampton is one step that can build community consensus on how to manage citizens to the benefit of all citizens. A system that operates in such a way that specifically assures people of color the patterns of injustice and immunity from prosecution we have all witnessed nationally will be actively rooted out here. I am encouraged by your listening consideration of the issues and I believe you will provide important leadership for the city, he affirmed. He is concerned about where the services that employees of the police department perform might be shifted. He is particularly concerned about whether employees who will be providing those services police have been performing will be working in jobs with similar wages, chances for advancement, respected work status, ample sick time, family time, vacation, chance of overtime, health insurance, employee-matching retirement, investment or pension plans, etc.

He doesn't know that police officers receive all of these benefits but he believes they are reasonable conditions to promote for employees to whom any responsibilities will be shifted. He wonders if those who are providing such things as housing stability, addiction prevention and treatment, outreach to individuals, staffing 24-hour phones or staffing facilities that operate 24 hours a day are employed in positions that substantially meet the criteria just mentioned. Some facilities or agencies are able to provide these employment conditions but he believes that many are not. He hopes a plan will be put forward that prioritizes assuring that any shifts in responsibility, either intentionally or by default, from a workplace such as a police department that nationally is predominately white and higher status, will raise up those who have been working for lesser compensation, benefits, etc. and also insure that those taking on these responsibilities have a voice in working conditions through the benefit of a union.

Dana Goldblatt of Northampton said she wanted to remind the committee because she felt it got a little bit lost last week in the discussion that the main reason they have been convened is because hundreds and hundreds of people in Northampton feel so strongly about abolishing the police that they came to meeting after meeting after meeting demanding abolition. This is an abolition committee in every way that matters, she asserted. What they will inevitably discover is that most of what the police do can simply be abolished.

They are not mostly providing services to homeless people; they are not mostly providing services to mentally-ill people. They do occasionally show up and yell at people when they get calls or complaints. There's not a ton of services that are being provided and she wants them to make sure that they're not falling prey to the propaganda that the police are fulfilling all of these really essential functions, and if they go away, those functions won't be served. They are providing some functions. For example, if someone wants to be fingerprinted to become a nurse, they have to go to the police. Things like that will have to be replaced but for the most part they are just talking about abolition. She wants to make sure that that's clear and that that's in the forefront of everything they're thinking about. "You don't need to worry so much about replacing the grocery delivery to the homeless veterans with puppies."

"Please keep your eye on the prize here; it's abolition," she persisted. Once they abolish the police, there will be these few functions that they did and there will be a lot of money left to do these other things that will benefit the community, she asserted.

Jose Adastra of Northampton, a father of three, said he would like to echo everything the previous speaker just said. This is about abolition, to create a more equitable future for people of color and for houseless folks, he agreed. He does a lot of organizing in town and all the cops do is escalate situations and make people that are in mental health crises more agitated. It's been years of harassment. There were hundreds and hundreds of them coming over and over again and that's not going to stop. He would really encourage them to be a committee that is really centered around abolition and providing some sort of solution and quickly. He feels this committee is a little bit powerless because the police are still trying actively to round up the homeless people less than a mile that way and they're putting media out like Dana Goldblatt is saying. I would love for the movement to be abolition-centered, he concluded

There being no further comments, Co-Chair Olivo moved into the rest of the agenda.

#### **5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2020**

Nnamdi moved to approve the minutes of September 22, 2020. Councilor Jarrett seconded. The motion passed unanimously with 13 Yes, 0 No and two absent (David Hoose and Larissa Rivera-Gonzalez).

#### **6. DISCUSSION OF ACCESSIBILITY: LANGUAGE, TRANSLATION, CAPTIONING AND TRANSCRIPTION**

They have been able to get closed captioning on the screen for the meeting and it automatically generates a transcript in English, Co-Chair Olivo reported.

They are still waiting to hear back from the IT Director as to whether an automatic translation program is available, Co-Chair Cannity added. He read aloud a response from the mayor regarding the availability of translation services: "The city does utilize services from the UMass translation Center on occasion as well as in-house translation by bilingual staff. If there are specific translation services the commission requires it can request those be provided or contracted by the city using a request process to the mayor and council president."

Commissioner Luengo-Garrido asked if he understood the mayor correctly to be saying that translation is done by city employees. Co-Chair Cannity said he doesn't know if any staff do this as part of their job.

Commissioner Luengo-Garrido said he would personally be absolutely against the incidental use of a regular employee as an interpreter, comparing it to the use of a child as an interpreter between parents and

a teacher in a school setting. "That is an interested party." A person interpreting has to be somebody with training who is being compensated appropriately for the skill of being bilingual, because that is a totally different professional skill, he reasoned.

Co-Chair Olivo said she would ask for clarification.

Lois Ahrens reminded members that, as she brought up at the first meeting, there is a google translation program in use at the Worker's Center. The program itself costs \$1,000 and users pay a translator an hourly rate. She thinks the Worker's Center uses something called "Juste Translation." She still would like to see the city investigate that so they can have simultaneous translation in Spanish.

## **7. COMMISSION BUDGET AND RESOURCE DISCUSSION: WHAT IS AVAILABLE AND HOW DO WE REQUEST AND ALLOCATE MONEY?**

They reached out to the mayor and were informed that anything the commission needs aside from the staff person needs to be requested from the mayor and city council, both of which must approve the request, Co-Chair Olivo advised.

Commissioner Luengo-Garrido asked if this means they need to write a proposal and present it to the City Council for approval. Dana said she has asked for clarification of the process. She doesn't have an answer to that yet.

Members discussed whether the \$25,000 appropriated by the City Council can be used for items other than salary. Commissioner Ahrens said she understood the mayor to say that \$25,000 was budgeted for the commission, that some portion would go to the salary of the staff person and that money left over could be used for other things. That's what prompted her to suggest translation services - specifically the google program and a translator - and the possibility of hiring independent counsel. She still puts those two things out there based on what he said about the \$25,000, she submitted.

Co-Chair Cannity clarified that the \$25,000 is the budget for the staff assistant position for nine months. There are no additional funds, and any other money needs to be requested. He quoted the mayor as follows: "The only funds appropriated to date for the Northampton Policing Review Commission is \$25,000 to fund the administrative assistant position. In terms of additional funding needed by the commission, [I] wouldn't presume a specific budget number without understanding what additional resources you felt you needed. For the most part for our boards and commissions, staffing is the single largest support cost. Some of our quasi-judicial bodies, i.e., the Planning Board, also have funds budgeted for the cost of mailing legal notices and legal advertising as required by law. Beyond that, funding requests are brought forward on an as-needed basis."

Councilor Quinlan said he remembers the mayor's representation the way Lois remembers it [that the money is not exclusively earmarked for salary]. However, when the order was presented to City Council, the money was presented as being for a staff person. He clarified that commissioners would not need to present a proposal to the council but rather would make their request to the mayor and the mayor would bring a financial order forward to the council. .

Councilor Jarrett said his impression was that the mayor said \$25,000 would be more than enough for a staff person so they could potentially ask for some amount to be transferred to a budget other than personnel services.

Commissioner Luengo-Garrido expressed his understanding that money is not dedicated toward accessibility for any other committee in the city.

Commissioner Lopez advocated for the importance of considering professional translation services. She noted that using a regular employee as a translator could be uncomfortable for that person. She expressed the opinion that the city should do away with this practice if it is actually in use.

Commissioner Bush proposed that, if they think it is important, they should present a proposal for translation services. In medicine, they follow the rule, "Thou shalt not use Google Translate" in speaking to patients. They also are not supposed to use family members or unpaid, uncertified interpreters. He would say that what they need is Spanish. They could seek a proposal from an agency such as the IHI.

"Clearly, what we're learning here is that the city is not where we think it should be in terms of offering these types of services," he observed. He suggested making a specific proposal to the mayor at the next meeting with a breakdown of associated costs, such as software and hiring a translator. They actually use something called "Strada" in medical interpreting, he shared.

Commissioner Luengo-Garrido pointed out that they are already going to be underpaying somebody. He encouraged whoever makes the motion for the proposal to request a separate amount of money from the \$25,000 allocated for the person to be hired.

Elizabeth Barajas-Roman wondered if they should actually propose having the city council look at this as a city-wide problem to be addressed. Framing it as a city-wide contract would actually be more cost-effective, she suggested.

Lois expressed concern that expanding the proposal to include the rest of the city would take too long; she worried that half the commission's term would be over by the time it is addressed for the whole city.

Councilor Quinlan agreed it is time-sensitive. One way to beat that is for this commission to go ahead and ask for it. It wouldn't be a bad idea for the commission to consider a resolution urging the city to create accessibility. He encouraged Booker Bush to bring the idea of a similar resolution to the Human Rights Commission and said he and Councilor Jarrett could collaborate on drafting a resolution for the council. This would show the mayor that multiple bodies are asking for this accessibility.

As step 1, this commission can go ahead and make a request for it and then they can try to get everybody pushing in the same direction for the city to do this, he suggested. Accessibility is always a discussion around city boards. He thinks this is something they can work on as a group.

Nick Fleisher agreed with what Elizabeth started to recommend. He thinks it makes sense for the city to provide a translation service for their commission and for them to recommend that, in the process of doing so, they look at a translation service that could serve the whole city. But he thinks they should keep the focus on their commission and ask for it to be done in a reasonable amount of time. "I think that it's very reasonable for us to request that," he asserted. He said he thought they should make a motion to that end. Co-Chair Olivo said she seconded that motion.

Members noted that it is necessary to articulate a more specific motion.

Commissioner Bush moved that they form a subcommittee to format a proposal to improve access for their meetings by investigating providing translation services for those for whom they determine it to be necessary for this committee with a plan for making a proposal to the mayor. Co-Chair Cannity seconded.

Commissioner Fleisher wondered if they should instead ask the mayor to come up with a proposal.

Commissioner Bush expressed his understanding that the mayor prefers to receive proposals. He thinks they will need to make a somewhat formal proposal and even cost it out in order to make things work.

In support of Booker's motion, Commissioner Pole said it strikes him that there is considerable expertise in this group. He thinks creating a proposal of their own would be better than just passing the ball to the mayor's office. He heard some things voiced that were fairly sophisticated such as the appropriateness of using city employees as translators and the importance of not having conflicts of interest, etc. For this and future situations where they have special expertise within this group, he would like to see them advantage that by forming a subcommittee of people who are used to thinking about such things.

Also, as they begin to make requests to the mayor's office that have financial consequences, he stressed the importance of being mindful that resources are likely not infinite. If there are costs involved in doing future research, he sees that as highly central to their work. He encouraged fellow commissioners to be thoughtful in making a financial request, realizing that it might limit future requests since resources are not infinite.

Commissioner Luengo-Garrido agreed but pointed out that accessibility and Commissioner Ahrens' idea of having independent counsel "are sort of bottom-line things to be able to function."

"If the commission feels that they need something to be able to do the work and for people to be able to have access to the information and the work, it's fair game," he opined.

Co-Chair Olivo noted that she is hearing two different things, counsel as well as translation. Councilor Quinlan noted that the motion on the floor is about accessibility in translation services.

Co-Chair Cannity said he wanted to expand the discussion to be mindful of accessibility in terms of people with disabilities such as hearing impairments and for documents created or produced in the course of the commission's work.

Commissioner Ahrens wondered if there is an ADA compliance coordinator in the city.

Commissioner Barajas-Roman wondered if it would be possible to use whatever translation service the police use.

The city has a Disability Commission staffed by Keith Benoit, the city's ADA/Section 504 coordinator, Councilor Jarrett advised.

Commissioner Bush said he purposefully used the word 'accessibility' and chose not to use the word 'disability' access. Speaking Spanish is not a disability, he pointed out. He wants to stay away from the disability issue. He agreed with Councilor Quinlan's suggestion of being selfish and getting translation services for them first. He will go back to the HRC and propose a resolution advocating for accessibility

across the city but he is going to be selfish and advocate for getting this for the commission as quickly as they can so they can get about their work.

The motion passed 14:0 by roll call vote with one absent (Commissioner Rivera-Gonzalez).

### **INDEPENDENT LEGAL COUNSEL**

Commissioners discussed the possibility of retaining independent legal counsel at some length. The chief proponents - Commissioner Ahrens and Commissioner Luengo-Garrido – argued that questions about police, police contracts, unions or qualified immunity are likely to arise and that it is in the commission's interest to seek legal advice from an attorney who does not represent the city's interests and by extension, the interests of the Northampton Police Department.

Some commissioners suggested alternative ways of seeking legal advice. Commissioner Pole wondered whether someone in academia like a law school professor could serve a similar purpose at a lower cost. Commissioner Suopis said there might be people in town who would be willing to do this work pro bono. As questions come up, this pro bono person could at least point them in the right direction, she suggested.

Commissioner Hoose, a criminal defense attorney himself, said his feeling is it would be better to wait until a specific question arises. "The problem is, I don't know what we're going to need a lawyer for. . ." If they need someone versed in municipal law it's going to be different from someone experienced in criminal law. He is confident he could be a resource for questions of criminal law but if a municipal law question arises it would be something the city solicitor could answer. He thinks the city solicitor would tell them if the question presented a conflict for him. His own feeling is that it is not a good use of time to be talking about it now when they don't even know what they want the lawyer for.

Co-Chair Cannity said he wanted to second the importance of at least thinking about this now and starting the process. He thinks everyone knows requesting funds takes time and they may have short time periods in which to respond to a potential legal challenge. They want to be in a position to protect them-selves in case they end up in a position like the city council. [Editor's note: The Northampton City Council was charged with a violation of the open meeting law by the New England Police Benevolent Association (NEPBA), Locals #186 and #187.] If they end up with a report that recommends reducing police funds significantly or reducing police power or influence, it puts them in a position where they might want independent counsel to protect them, he proposed.

Members expressed varying opinions on the appropriateness of accepting unpaid professional assistance. Commissioners Cannity, Olivo and Luengo-Garrido expressed reluctance to accept pro bono work, arguing that people should be compensated for their time and expertise. However, Commissioner Pole pointed out that some professions think differently about the need to be compensated for their work and have ethical standards that lead them to choose to do pro bono work routinely.

Co-Chair Olivo proposed moving forward with a specific proposal.

Commissioner Bush said he was not going to help by making a motion because it is too ambiguous an idea at this point. He is impressed by David Hoose's observation that they don't know what they want, who they want or what the question will be. It is not something he would be in favor of at the moment, he said.

Commission Lopez agreed with Commissioner Bush. The more important question is how they request, she suggested. She agrees with the idea of seeking pro bono assistance. She wants to know what they are seeking before putting an amount out there and requesting money.

She and Commissioner Luengo-Garrido mentioned some things they think they might need independent counsel for, Commissioner Ahrens persisted. The idea to her is not nebulous even though they don't have a specific question. Three of them have spoken about specifics. "I'm just saying I think there will be questions," and they probably will be questions they would want an independent counsel to advise them on.

She would make a proposal that the commission believes that they will at some point need to consult with an independent counsel and that the amount of money is still to be determined.

Commissioner Pole said he is persuaded that legal counsel could be useful but is not persuaded it needs to be budgeted for now. Commissioner Suopis said she judged by the tenor of the conversation that they might not be ready for a proposal. She feels pretty strongly that it would be a good thing to have, but maybe if they can't articulate it yet in the form of a budget request, it is something they could formulate later.

Commissioner Barajas-Roman observed that the need to for legal representation is often associated with the level of risk accompanying a committee's decisions or actions. That risk is usually triggered by the level of authority vested in a body. "We are not city council. We are offering a set of recommendations," she reminded. The city council and the mayor are meant to look at the legality of what they're proposing or to create new laws to allow the recommendations to be implemented.

She is struggling to name the specific risk they think they have. Another reason for needing legal counsel might be difficulty getting information or if information is being withheld. She stressed the need to keep the board's level of authority in perspective. They will be offering recommendations based on their collective knowledge and research and working in partnership with elected officials and the mayor. She is struggling with the why, what risks they think they personally have or this committee has to justify the use of city funds for independent counsel to protect them somehow. She is not convinced that is necessary based on their level of authority, she concluded.

Commissioner Suopis thanked Commissioner Barajas-Roman for reminding them that they're submitting recommendations. On a pragmatic note, her reason for wanting independent counsel is that she doesn't want those recommendations to be subject to someone saying, 'you can't do that, it's illegal.' She wants their recommendations to be reviewed by an attorney.

Regarding the claim in public comment that their job is to abolish, if that's what they decide to do, they all know it can't be done overnight because of legal contracts. It's those kind of knotty things for which she would think they would want legal counsel, she continued.

Commissioner Luengo-Garrido stressed that a city solicitor by definition sides with city administration.

Councilor Jarrett pointed out that if the city solicitor opposes a recommendation, it is their right to seek a second opinion. They could wait until that potentially happens or be ready for that sooner.

Co-Chair Cannity pointed out that since the process of setting someone up as a vendor with the city takes time, it would be advantageous to get the paperwork started.



Commissioner Bush said he actually agrees they should have their own counsel if they need counsel. What he's not sure about is whether they will need counsel. He suggested the proposal be that, in the event that the police commission requires counsel to do its work, it have funding for outside counsel for that purpose. Commissioner Ahrens agreed in concept.

Commissioner Bush made the following motion: I propose that in the event that the police commission requires the use of counsel in order to do their work or make their recommendations they would like to have access to outside counsel in order to do that work. Commissioner Ahrens seconded.

Commissioner Fleisher asked what the process would be to choose that counsel.

Noting that co-chairs have been in communication with the mayor, Councilor Jarrett asked if they would be willing to be in communication with the mayor to fully understand this process and bring that back to them.

Co-Chair Olivo said she would be willing to do that.

Given that they will be having some conversation with the mayor, Co-Chair Cannity moved to table this until the next meeting and have this be an agenda item for the next meeting. Co-Chair Olivo seconded.

Councilor Jarrett explained that if Commissioner Bush were to withdraw his motion, it would solve the problem.

Commissioner Bush said he would be glad to withdraw his motion if people were willing to let that occur. He formally withdrew his motion.

## **8. ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEES**

Co-Chair Olivo reminded members of the three subcommittees the group acted to establish: 1) policing policies and services, 2) spending and contracts and 3) alternatives to policing. Co-Chair Cannity presented two different options for committee assignments based on preferences expressed by members. The first option gave everyone their first choice of assignment, resulting in three groups of five, three and six members, respectively. (Commissioner Barajas-Roman did not express a preference.) The second option adjusted the groups to create three evenly-sized groups of five members each.

Members decided to create three subcommittees of equal size. The co-chairs proposed the membership as follows:

Policing policies and services	Spending and contracts	Alternatives to policing
Nick Fleisher	Lois Ahrens	Booker Bush
David Hoose	Carmen Lopez*	Alex Jarrett
Elizabeth Barajas-Roman*	Michael Quinan	Javier Luengo-Garrido
Nnamdi Pole	Daniel Cannity	Dana Olivo
Cynthia Suopis	Josey Rosales	Larissa Rivera-Gonzalez

\*Elizabeth Barajas-Roman was originally assigned to spending and contracts but after saying she felt she could be more helpful on policing policies and services, Carmen Lopez agreed to switch places with her.

Members discussed whether the translation services subcommittee proposed by Booker Bush earlier should be a separate committee or if it could be incorporated into the policing policies and services subcommittee. Councilor Jarrett expressed his understanding that it was intended to be a shorter-term subcommittee for the purpose of coming up with a specific proposal rather than a standing committee.

As discussion continued, Commissioner Bush offered to come up with a proposal for translation services on his own to be presented to the group at the next meeting. On the HRC, one person works on an idea and brings it back to the commission as a proposal. He would like to do the experiment of making a proposal to them of what that might look like instead of forming a fourth committee. He asked if Co-Chair Olivo would be open to that, and she said yes.

Since they voted earlier to form a committee, Councilor Jarrett suggested it might be necessary procedurally to rescind the earlier vote. Commissioner Bush said he would be willing to rescind his prior motion as long as people are still interested in allowing him to make a proposal for translation services.

Numerous members indicated agreement by giving thumbs up.

Commissioner Bush moved to rescind his motion. Commissioner Jarrett seconded. The motion passed 14:0 with one absent (Commissioner Rivera-Gonzalez)

Co-Chair Olivo said she would put Commissioner Bush on the agenda for next week.

Commissioner Hoose moved to accept the subcommittees as created by the co-chairs. Commissioner Luengo-Garrido seconded. The motion passed 14:0 with one absent (Commissioner Rivera-Gonzalez).

Commissioner Barajas-Roman and Carmen Lopez agreed to switch places with Barajas-Roman moving to policing policies and services and Lopez moving to spending and contracts.

## **9. PROCESSES AND REQUESTS FOR DATA/INFORMATION**

Co-Chair Olivo read the mayor's response to the question of how the commission should make requests for information:

"The process of requesting information from city departments that are not already publicly available should be the co-chairs making the request to the mayor on behalf of the commission. All requests should be as narrow and specific as possible to minimize cost and facilitate the release of the information. Sensitive information will need to be redacted to protect privacy as required by law.

Commissioner Rosales said he personally would love to see information on the number of instances of police use of force, the number of emissions, etc. He would love to see as much transparency as possible with as little redaction as possible. In order for the commission to do its job, it needs to be armed with as much concrete and transparent information as possible: use of force, the type of calls police respond to, what their budgets are used on, the number of overtime hours, how much money is used for out-of-court settlements and where it comes from, whether from taxpayer dollars or out of police pensions. . . He would like to get as much information as possible out of the police department.

Commissioner Pole said it strikes him that it would be good to know what information is publicly available. Where should we go to learn what is willingly communicated by the police department? He asked. This would help them to see what information is missing and what they should be requesting.

Commissioner Barajas-Roman noted that Northampton participates in an open portal data program that it has been participating in since 2014. She has been collecting that data for almost a year and does have a good sense of what is publicly shared. Police logs since July are on the website. What's noticeable is that some days in those logs are missing, so requesting the missing days is necessary. The other thing that's missing that she thinks is really critical are the computer-assisted dispatch records. They might want to get that information for specific days. There actually is a good amount of data on the website, she advised.

Commissioner Fleisher asked Commissioner Barajas-Roman how to access the portal. It would be helpful to distribute that link, he suggested. Co-Chair Olivo said Commissioner Barajas-Roman has shared the link and she would get it out to all of them.

Councilor Jarrett asked if any individual could make a request for information or if it was necessary for the request to come from a subcommittee.

Co-Chair Cannity said if anyone needs information to pursue their work on the commission, they can make a request to him or Dana. He doesn't think a request has to come from a subcommittee. Commissioner Ahrens said she would like to know what information is being requested.

Co-Chair Cannity said he is waiting to hear back from IT about creating a shared file and dataspace. That should be up fairly soon. It would be a place for commission members to place information and see what information had been collected.

He made an effort to put the police logs into a searchable database since they are not now in a format from which it is easy to extract information, Co-Chair Cannity shared. A lot of what's publicly available is pretty sparse and does not include race data. Sometimes there is only a minimal description and not enough to allow someone to understand what took place. Not everything in the public portal will prove to be useful or in a format that they can easily extrapolate from, he noted.

## **10. SCHEDULING MEETING TIMES FOR COMMISSIONS AND SUBCOMMITTEES**

The last proposal she remembers was for the commission to meet every other Tuesday, Co-Chair Olivo said.

The current schedule would have them meeting next Tuesday, Councilor Jarrett reminded. If they wanted to do every other Tuesday, they would meet next on October 20<sup>th</sup>. However, election night would interrupt that pattern so they would not be able to meet again until November 10<sup>th</sup>.

Lois said she was thinking committees would meet in the off week.

Councilor Jarrett moved that they next meet as a group on October 20, 2020 from 6 to 8:30 p.m. and then again on November 10<sup>th</sup>. Co-Chair Olivo seconded.

Nnamdi suggested adding something about subcommittees to the motion.

Co-Chair Cannity moved to meet next Tuesday from 6 to 8:30 p.m. and to establish a pattern of meeting every other week with the exception of election night and that during the off weeks when the full commission does not meet the subcommittees have the ability to schedule their meetings. (Nnamdi noted that the subcommittees could communicate independently to schedule their meetings.) Commissioner Pole seconded.

Co-Chair Cannity clarified that he intended the next meeting of the full commission to be October 20th.

Subcommittees have to be posted 48 hours in advance, Co-Chair Olivo confirmed.

Councilor Jarrett said he didn't hear any difference between his motion and Co-Chair Cannity's motion except the explicit mention of subcommittees setting their own meetings. He is in agreement so he thinks the two motions could be merged. [In other words, he accepted Co-Chair Cannity's addition as a friendly amendment to his motion.] Co-Chair Olivo seconded.

Commissioner Suopis reminded fellow commissioners that these are public meetings so agendas and minutes need to be posted according to the Open Meeting Law.

Councilor Quinlan suggested the subcommittees meet consecutively at 5:30, 6:30 and 7:30 p.m. for an hour each and that the co-chairs create the agendas. Josey seconded the proposal.

Commissioner Bush pointed out that there are three motions on the floor, but Commissioner Jarrett clarified that his motion and Co-Chair Cannity's motion were merged into a single motion.

Commissioner Bush called the merged motion to a vote and it passed 13:0 with two absent (David Hoose and Larissa Rivera-Gonzalez).

Co-Chair Olivo moved that the subcommittees meet back to back next week at 6 p.m., 7 p.m. and 8 p.m. Councilor Quinlan seconded. The motion passed 12:1 by roll call vote with Commissioner Pole opposed and two absent (David Hoose and Larissa Rivera-Gonzalez).

Policing policies and practices will meet 1<sup>st</sup>, spending and contracts 2<sup>nd</sup> and alternatives to policing 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Commissioner Ahrens proposed that hearings be placed on the agenda for the meeting on October 20<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.