

Bobbie Walthall

To: steven c. watts
Subject: RE: CRP

From: steven c. watts [<mailto:scajj@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 10:22 AM
To: Tom Markus
Cc: Bobbie Walthall
Subject: Fw: CRP

Please include this email with the other materials provided city commissioners for the 12/13/2016 meeting.

Thank you.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: steven c. watts <scajj@sbcglobal.net>
To: Mr. Thomas Markus <tmarkus@lawrenceks.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 10:08 AM
Subject: Fw: CRP

hold the presses:

I now find in the same reporting: "...Under the proposed changes, the police department would still investigate the complaints, but the board would have a "quasi-judicial" function. **If the person who made the complaint disagrees with the police department's conclusion, he or she can make a written request to have the board review it.** (emphasis added).

"If a person's not satisfied, the empaneled citizens board has an opportunity to take a look at it and create a verification or a disagreement with the results," Markus said. "And if that's the case, then it's referred to the (city) manager for further review as well."

After reviewing the investigation, the board would provide a recommendation regarding the complaint to the city manager. As the city manager, Markus makes the ultimate decision as to whether an employee should be disciplined or terminated because of a complaint, but he can consider the board's recommendation, according to the draft.

The entire process, though, will still remain largely out of the public eye. The complaints, review and deliberations involving the board would be confidential and not open to the public under Kansas law, according to the draft. Board members would be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement before they can serve."

+++++

Reads like the Board can choose to accept the complaint or not. Not good. **"THE ENTIRE PROCESS, THOUGH, WILL STILL REMAIN LARGELY OUT OF THE PUBLIC EYE."**

What a bunch of B.S. Tom. Is that what the lawyer and police came up with? Is that the way it's done in Iowa City? What's the point if the process is still cloaked in secrecy and tom foolery? Fooey.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: steven c. watts <scaji@sbcglobal.net>
To: Mr. Thomas Markus <tmarkus@lawrenceks.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 9:58 AM
Subject: Fw: CRP

Correction:

I do find this in the reporting:

"....and would authorize the board to formally accept complaints against the police department from the public. Currently, residents are generally instructed to make complaints about the police department to the police department itself.".

However nothing in the article speaks to what kinds of problems and how the board would deal with them. We most certainly do not need the police to investigate themselves. As well, let me point out x3: NO QUORUM. There needs to be a modification such that if appointed members miss x number of meetings, they are removed from the board.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: steven c. watts <scaji@sbcglobal.net>
To: Mr. Thomas Markus <tmarkus@lawrenceks.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 9:52 AM
Subject: CRP

<http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2016/dec/12/lawrence-city-commission-review-proposal-citizen-o/>

Tom,

Please tell me the hogwash being reported in the article above is NOT a citizens review people but is merely a slight modification of racial profiling matters?

I see nothing in the article that speaks to problems unrelated to racial profiling.

Have I missed something or is this merely a beginning for a true CRP; or....does it have nothing to do with a CRP and is simply "tuning" the current non-sense we have which ONLY addresses "racial profiling" (what ever that is). Remember: I send you the data which documents the current "system" can't even conduct business because no quorum is/has been present.

watts

