



# City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
53202

## Meeting Minutes

### COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE COMMISSION - COMMUNITY SURVEY & RESEARCH COMMITTEE

*Paul Mozina, Chair.*

*Deborah Blanks and Steve Jansen*

---

Monday, August 9, 2021

6:00 PM

Virtual

---

#### Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84941465313?pwd=NTFsb1grNUFEM3pLdklYdjI0T0dOUT09>

Meeting ID: 849 4146 5313

Passcode: q69pdi

One tap mobile

+13017158592,,84941465313#,,,,\*796621# US (Washington DC)

+13126266799,,84941465313#,,,,\*796621# US (Chicago)

#### Dial by your location

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 849 4146 5313

Passcode: 796621

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84941465313?pwd=NTFsb1grNUFEM3pLdklYdjI0T0dOUT09>

#### 1. Minutes Discussion and Approval.

*Minutes from July 26, 2021 meeting unanimously approved*

#### 2. Final review and additions to Community Survey Resolution.

*Corrected CC File number referenced to 191106. Pushed completion dates back a month pending approval by the full CCC. Added the following to the Specifications: The consultant will capture and report Zip Code, Aldermanic District and MPD District where the interviewee lives.*

#### 3. Introduction to Tableau Dashboards displaying the MPD data provided to the FPC and Crime and Justice Institute per the Collins/ACLU Settlement Agreement.

---

*Paul shared his screen and introduced the document "Review of MPD data uploaded to FPC Website per Court Orders of the Charles Collins et al.docx" (attached below).*

*The MPD is required to provide data to the FPC, Crime and Justice Institute (the Consultants CJI) and the Plaintiff's Counsel on a quarterly basis and the FPC is required to post the data to their website on an annual basis. Paul thinks he may be the only person from the community that is analyzing the data. He suggested that this may be a job for the CCC's Survey and Research Committee.*

*Steve asked for clarification on what data I might have found that we should be looking at that is not being considered by CJI.*

*Paul attempted to answer the question by explaining how to access the data is and how he has gone about analyzing it. The recipe is:*

- 1. Download the data from the FPC website (comma delimited files)*
- 2. Load data into MySQLWorkbench (free database tool)*
- 3. Reference MPD's Data Dictionary and documentation from CJI reports explaining how they have "joined" the data tables*
- 4. Run queries against the data and export results*
- 5. Load results into Tableau (free) and create Dashboards*

*He then introduced a Dashboard that highlights a perspective on the data that might be important for the CCC to consider. Who is being subject to a Field Interview (Terry Stop) that results in No Violation i.e., No Law Enforcement Action?*

*The disproportionate representation of Black people shown above is concerning. CJI does do an analysis of probable cause for a sample MPD stops per the requirements of the Settlement Agreement, but Paul suggested that the community needs to do their own analysis. Every Field Interview has the potential to escalate, and we need to verify if the MPD had probable cause to stop the person and conduct the interview. He then introduced MPD SOP 085 – Citizen Contacts, Field Interviews, Search and Seizure, and suggested that we need to compare the documented MPD procedures against the real-world data to see if they align.*

*Steve thanked Paul for his efforts. He will reach out to the ACLU and City Attorney's office to verify if this type of analysis is within the scope of the CCC. He said we should scope out the direction we want to go in terms of key points to get to the bottom of what the data is showing. He asked what is the scope, legally, of the intent of the Community Collaborative Commission? He differentiated between the CCC providing oversight of the MPD in general, versus providing oversight of the Settlement Agreement. We may be legally constrained in terms of what we can do regarding looking at the data. Specifically, if we are looking at data that is beyond the scope of the Settlement Agreement – that may be controversial. He wants to make sure our research is within the purview of what the CCC is meant to do.*

*Steve said his interpretation of the CCC's mandate was broad and that the language that we use when describing what we are researching is important to ensure that it is relevant to the CCC so we can allow the work to continue. He asked Paul to clarify what his interpretation of the work of the CCC was. He will continue to seek clarification on his own using his status as a plaintiff to the agreement. He thought that data analysis like that presented was the next step in terms of accountability. He wants to make sure that our voices are heard on this, and relevancy is important to*

*establish (is this within our scope?).*

*Deborah thanked Paul for his efforts. She agreed with Stephen that we need to establish what the scope is for the CCC. She questioned why the MPD was no longer sharing quarterly data (it is the FPC that is no longer posting the data quarterly), and she wondered – Why Not? She asked how we can influence the powers that be to make sure that some data is being shared.*

*Paul answered Deborah's question first by referring to the Settlement Agreement and pointing out that MPD is required to provide quarterly releases to the FPC, CJI and Plaintiff's Counsel, but the FPC is only required to make annual releases of this data to the public on their website. Whereas for the first two years of the agreement, the FPC did in fact publish the data on its website on a quarterly basis, now that the City Attorney has taken the lead role in ensuring that the defendants (FPC, MPD and City of Milwaukee) comply with the terms of the agreement, they are taking a stricter interpretation of the agreement and limiting the FPC to an annual release of the data to the public.*

*In response to Steve's questions, Paul cited CJI's Second Annual Report September 2020 which states "It is important for community members in Milwaukee to access and understand policing stop data but the manner in which the data is posted precludes that at the present time." and, "In their current form, these data files do not allow an average community member to easily review the data and get a good picture of stops in Milwaukee, which is the intent of the public posting requirement."*

*To attempt to answer Steve's question about the scope of our research, Paul brought up the Community Survey Resolution we considered in item 2 in the agenda, because it includes definitions of the mandate for the CCC given to it by the Common Council in its "whereas" clauses. He pointed to "Whereas, the CCC is to communicate community concerns regarding law enforcement policies, procedures and practices in Milwaukee to the police department and the Board of the Fire and Police Commission and to present an update to the Common Council on a quarterly basis" as possibly confirming that the type of analysis considered here is within the scope of the CCC. He made the point that it was important for the community to see the data first to become aware of areas that might cause concern.*

*Steve agreed that it was appropriate for the CCC to engage in this research "You're preach'in to the choir". He said that he has begun to draft a document providing an overview of what the Survey and Research committee is doing – more of a report format. He wants to finish that report and discuss what our next steps are in relation to this data. What are some action items that we are going to have moving forward with the data as we collect it? He will send a draft of his report to the committee for review. It will demonstrate why we are doing this research and the relevancy of it. He said we should have community-based reports in addition to the CJI reports.*

*Deborah said that this is at the foundation of what the CCC should be about.*

*Paul provided an example of where our community-based report could fill the gaps in what CJI is reporting. He brought up a Field Interview Dashboard and juxtaposed that to the table of contents for CJI's April 2021 report showing that CJI is doing the required Stop and Frisk analysis, but they are NOT doing a Search analysis. They are not analyzing who is getting searched and what was the probable cause for that*

search.

Steve said that CJI is doing a fantastic job of looking at everything that is specifically within their purview per the terms of the agreement but we're trying to broaden the scope of accountability to things outside the agreement. He said there is a lot of data that is outside the scope of stop and frisk.

Paul brought up a dashboard providing details of traffic stops and cases where consent to search was not requested or received, yet a search was conducted based on a probable cause that was not documented in the stop detail. He then referred to SOP 085 – Citizen Contacts, Field Interviews, Search and Seizure, and reviewed the requirements for the MPD to get consent to perform a search. He made the point that we need to compare the actual data to the requirements of the procedures in the SOP to make sure they are aligned. We need to look carefully at the data to determine if there are legitimate grounds for the searches that are being conducted. Every traffic stop and field interview is an incident that could potentially escalate, especially when searches are done. Are these fishing expeditions disproportionately targeting Black people, or was there individualized, objective articulable reasonable suspicion (IOARS) – probable cause/legal justification – for the search?

Paul supported Steve's plan to put together a document/report explaining what we are trying to do with our research.

Steve referred to it as the Research and Survey Report and that it would be a bi-annual report. It would explain why we are doing the survey and why the research we are doing is relevant. It would include our findings as we move towards the end of the year. He reiterated that we should discuss at our next meeting what action items we have moving forward with some of this data in terms of accountability. What can we do next with this research? What can we present to the CCC in terms of ideas?

Deborah said that the survey we are working on is one side of the coin because it is asking people about their perceptions, the other side of the coin is – what is reality? What actually happened? When you talk about the research, then we're answering that second question. She is concerned that this could be a never-ending research study because there is so much data here. At our next meeting, she wants to talk about what level of research needs to be done. Is it for us to do all this research, or is it for us to identify the areas and make the case using the data? Bottom line is: How Wide? How Deep? is the research project that the two of you are thinking about? She would love to have that discussion at the next meeting.

Paul agreed with Steve and Deborah that we should clarify what our research should look like going forward at the next meeting.

- 4. Review MPD source data integrity issues impacting the ability of the community to analyze the data presented in #3 above and make recommendation to the CCC for follow-up with the parties to the Settlement Agreement.**

Paul briefly introduced this item and explained that there are that there are thousands of records where a traffic or non-traffic citation was issued where you cannot match the record in the Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCS) System or the Record Management System (RMS – Field Interviews) back to the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system record because the MPD members make mistakes manually entering the CAD Call Number when they create the TraCS or RMS record. Without this match, you cannot

*tell the whole story of the incident.*

*We will discuss this further at the next meeting, but Paul made the point that we need to lobby with the FPC, MPD and City Attorney's office that we need this data cleaned up. The community is not going to be able to do an accurate assessment of the data with so many records that cannot be joined to tell the whole story of the interaction. CJI is fully aware of this problem and has documented it in numerous reports. They have gone to extraordinary lengths to attempt to correct the bad CAD Call Numbers in TraCS and RMS records. They have fixed thousands of records and there is no way the community could be expected to attempt the same data fixing, and even if they did, it is highly unlikely that they would make the same corrections that CJI has made. Paul is asking that CJI share its "cleaned" redacted data with the community so we can all be on the same page when conducting our analyses.*

*Deborah said that we need to make sure that any research we do is based on accurate data. The point of requesting them to share the "cleaned" data makes sense. The FPC needs to release cleaned data on a quarterly basis. There are so many records and so much data here that to wait for a year to receive it can be overwhelming.*

*Paul agreed and expressed his disappointment at the fact that they were not posting data to the public on a quarterly basis anymore. You can't see the trends in a timely manner if you must wait a whole year for the data. He pointed the recent change in the MPD's traffic enforcement approach that should be reflected in the quarterly data – but we won't see 2021 data until the spring of 2022. We may not be able to compare our analysis in a timely manner to the 6-month and annual reports produced by CJI because we are way behind in getting access to the data.*

*Adjournment at 7:08 p.m.*

*Minutes provided by Paul Mozina*