

Criminal Justice Citizen's Advisory Committee- CJCAC
December 15, 2010
MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Name	Position	Present
Mr. Alan Adler	District 1	YES
James Calvin Henry	District 2	YES
Mr. Dennis T. Brown	District 3	YES
Renee Barfield	District 4	NO
Mr. Sean Mulhall	District 5	YES
Mr. Tom Bowers	District 6	YES
Mr. Anthony G. Scheer	Bar Association	YES
Vacant	Charlotte- Mecklenburg Schools	-
Vacant	Faith Community	-
Ms. Carolyn Green Logan	Law Enforcement	YES
Mr. Mark T. Sumwalt	CJCAC Chairman	YES
Ms. Myra Byarm	Rehabilitation	YES
Ms. Karen L. Worrell	Substance Abuse Professional	NO
Michelle Lancaster	Mecklenburg County General Manager	YES
Janet Payne	Staff: County Manager's Office	NO
Tom Eberly	Staff: County Manager's Office	YES
Jamie Privuznak	Staff: County Manager's Office	YES

HANDOUTS

Meeting Agenda,
Meeting Minutes from October and November,
Annual Report to the Mecklenburg County Board of County Commissioners,
Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook and
Criminal Justice Report: July-September 2010.

Proposed Meeting Objectives:

- Approve Meeting Minutes from October and November;
- Chiefs of Police/Sheriff Panel Discussion and
- Group Discussion Regarding Report.

Meeting began at 5:15 PM.

Welcome and Introduction

Mark Sumwalt
CJCAC Chair

Mark Sumwalt called the meeting to order and asked the members of law enforcement present to introduce themselves.

Law enforcement members present were as follows:

Rodney Monroe, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department
Kerr Putney, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department
Chipp Bailey, Sheriff's Office
Jeanne Miller, Davidson Police Department
Tim Ledford, Mint Hill Police Department
Phil Potter, Huntersville Police Department
Rob Hunter, Matthews Police Department

Chiefs of Police/Sheriff Panel

Group

Michelle Lancaster began by referencing the draft and the questions and concerns voiced during the review by the Criminal Justice Advisory Group. The representatives from law enforcement had concerns as well as questions concerning the following:

Finding #3 - Inconsistencies in Crime Reporting

Phil Potter from Huntersville began by saying that he had not heard about any inconsistencies and questioned the process in how the CJCAC came to these conclusions. Members of the group explained, emphasizing that although we are not the experts, we feel that public perception is that there are inconsistencies in crime reporting. Law enforcement reported that this is a national problem as well as a local problem; however, police take great pride in their crime reporting, stating that they are subject to SBI and FBI reviews. Law enforcement representatives also questioned the impact of the report on the communities, believing that if there are still questions regarding statistics and how information is gathered, law enforcement officials should have been asked questions regarding this issue.

Members of the group had questions concerning subjectivity whereby law enforcement explained that with the classification of crimes, there is some discretion or subjectivity on how the number of crimes is reported (car break-ins were given as an example); however, this type of discretion is controlled. According to Chief Monroe of the CPMD, an FBI audit was carried out a couple of weeks ago, reviewing the manner in which UCR data is recorded and collected. He stated that crime reporting is always subject to human error, but discretion itself is not an issue. The audit was not publicized, but necessary. The results pulled sample cases and we are reporting it the correct way. Every agency that reports UCR has the same standards. Only discretion is in cluster crimes where there is discretion. Purpose of FBI standards is to make sure that everyone is on the same page. Chief Monroe explained the two types of reporting systems, the FBI Uniform Crime Reporting vs. NIBERS National Incident Base Reporting System. He stated that all law enforcement agencies in Mecklenburg County are using UCR.

Finding #4 – Greater Cooperation between DA/Police

Law enforcement officials reported to the group that there are mechanisms in place that speak to the improvements that have been made. Chief Monroe stated that the current cooperation within this jurisdiction would make any state proud, reflecting that it hurts that we say that they are not cooperating and working together. The group suggested that we figure out a better way to communicate the good things that CPMD does to the public.

Finding #5 – Failure to Follow Up on Property Crime

Chief Rodney Monroe changed the policy concerning law enforcement response to property crimes and stated that law enforcement has been responding in the last 2 ½ years. He recommended that we review CMPD performance over the last 5 years and report a trend upwards or down.

Report Discussion

Group

The group discussed being uncomfortable with all three recommendations discussed and agreed that the information garnered from law enforcement is contradictory to what was originally thought. The group agreed that there needs to be changes made to the recommendations.

Follow up Item: Review draft report again and make recommendations for changes. Email each other our thoughts about the findings. Mark Sumwalt will compile editions and draft report or discussion at the January meeting.

Approve Meeting Minutes

Group

The amended October meeting minutes and November meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:30pm

Recap of Follow- up Items:

Follow up Item: Review draft report again and make recommendations for changes. Mark Sumwalt will compile editions and draft report for discussion at the January meeting.