

- ① IBS
- ② ICS
- ③ IIIA1e

February 13, 1970

Summary of the February 11, 1970 Meeting of CCR Representatives with Police

Commissioner Patrick Murphy, etal

Attending:

A. For CCR: Secretary-Director C. Rodgers, Commissioner Roy Allen, Lonnie Saunders, staff member.

B. For the Police Department: Commissioner Patrick V. Murphy; Personnel Director Robert Quaid, Inspectors William Owen,--Boutin, and Lieutenant H. Jason.

C. Police Department guest and observer: Mr. Wilder, Harvard University Ph. D. candidate in political science.

Mr. Rodgers responded to the Commissioner's request by outlining the unresolved police-community relations issues which were explored in his letter of February 10, 1970 to the Commissioner. The issues related to: inadequate recruitment of black officers; limiting recruitment to Detroit residents; the necessity for creation of a validated test for future use in recruitment; the necessity for trial board hearings that will be open to the public to the extent made possible by physical accommodations; necessity for review of mass arrest and detention policy; the backlog of unresolved citizen complaints; and the policy questions regarding the use of deadly force implicit in the Clifford Howell case involving the fatal shooting of a 13 year old black youth.

In the course of his commentary, Mr. Rodgers revealed that the following agreements were reached at an August 5, 1969 meeting of CCR and Police Department representatives with former Mayor Jerome Cavanagh:

1. Before making public statements on police matters involving use of factual data, CCR would clear with the Police Department concerning the accuracy of such data.

The Police Department agreed to clear with CCR before making public releases on matters having serious community relations consequences. Also, the Department indicated it would review its mass arrest and detention policy. However, Commissioner Spreen at a meeting on October 21, 1969 attended by CCR and ranking police officials, disavowed that a review of this nature was in progress or contemplated. (Mr. Rodgers indicated he would send a copy of the August 5, 1969 agreements to Commissioner Murphy.)

Final
1/15/70

Mr. Rodgers reported that substantial disagreement between CCR and police representatives on one subject characterized discussion at the October 21, 1969 meeting. The police felt that some restrictions on attendance at trial board hearings were necessary because of alleged inability of the police to legally control disruptive behavior. Pursuant to the belief of CCR representatives that the authority to control behavior is inherent in the police function of conducting administrative (trial Board) hearings, the Police Committee of CCR has requested an opinion from Corporation Counsel on the issue.

At the 10/21/69 meeting, CCR representatives were assured a second time that CCR representatives would be notified of trial board hearings so that designated representatives could attend. The only notification received to date concerned cancellation of a scheduled hearing.

A major emphasis by Mr. Rodgers was on the difficulty CCR has experienced in obtaining needed information from the Police Department. He indicated willingness to try to work more closely with the Department but expressed his concern that CCR be trusted to the extent that the Department would feel free to respond quickly and fully to its requests for information.

Commissioner Murphy acknowledged the existence of a long agenda of matters requiring early correction through the mutual efforts of the police and CCR--without recourse to the news media--as a preliminary to marshalling all community resources to reduce the level of crime. The Commissioner was amenable to working to improve the image of CCR within the Police Department.

The focus of the remainder of the discussion was on means of effecting the recruitment of black police officers in adequate numbers. The Commissioner noted that the statistics used at a recent Common Council meeting on black police officer recruitment were distorted in that candidates who took the written examination more than once are reflected as separate candidates, thus inflating totals. The Commissioner and