

I have reviewed the provided documents and I thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

I found this article from the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) publication helpful and there were a few key elements I think might be useful in the Purcellville effort:

<https://www.policemagazine.org/citizen-advisory-boards-in-contemporary-practice-a-practical-approach-in-policing/>

In the section on the role of advisory boards, I think there might be some good material for the Purcellville CPAC document's section on purpose:

A citizen advisory board can be defined as a group of individuals appointed for the purpose of examining a public issue or set of issues, who meet over an extended period, and develop alternative solutions and new ideas through comprehensive interaction. Rather than being open to all members of the public, a citizen advisory board is restricted to a small number of individuals who are expected to represent the interests of the public. A law enforcement organization can utilize a citizen advisory board for advice and input on a myriad of issues. A board may be asked to **conduct research, generate new ideas or solutions, or provide informed recommendations on public policies and practices.** **What a citizen advisory board should not be is a policy-making body;** otherwise, the ability of the police executive to do his or her job will be compromised.

Law enforcement leaders cannot transfer their administrative accountability and legal responsibilities to a citizen board—there are statutory rules that must be followed and observed. Although some are cynical about citizen advisory boards because of this lack of formal power, public administration by definition should be done by professional administrators. These individuals have been appointed or elected and are ultimately accountable for the decisions that are made. Police executives have the managerial, legal, and political responsibility to lead their organization. On the other hand, establishing citizen advisory boards for specific policy or project recommendations, strategic planning, or the review of personnel practices can be useful. The implementation of body-worn cameras is an ideal example of a project that might greatly benefit from the perspective of a citizen board. A citizen advisory board can be a critical component to establishing an open culture between a public agency and the community.

I appreciate the inclusion of equal and fair treatment and transparency in the CPAC document, but I also think there are some items in the passage above that might lend themselves as additions to better capture the purpose of the CPAC, such as explicitly stating it is not a policy-making body and that it is a critical component to establishing open culture.

While I think there are avenue for CPAC to contribute in these areas, I do believe that some of the duties listed must be scaled back. Many of these have been called out by the Town's attorney already. I think that you can return to the passage above and borrow the language about conduct research, generate new ideas and solutions, or provide informed recommendations on policies and practices to insert better language in the duties section. For example, CPAC won't be able to review and act on complaints and personnel issues, but they might be able to provide informed recommendations on these times of issues.

In the section on expectations, I think those need to be refocused to establish real and objective expectations and not political ones. How many meetings should they attend and at what threshold do they get replaced? That is the kind of objective data that needs to be included. The code of ethics is fine too, but I am not even sure what the last one means?

Hold town officials accountable to the community when town officials adopt or reject law enforcement policies based on CPAC's advice by explaining or amplifying explanations through diverse media on why the town officials adopted or rejected the policy recommendation.

This document isn't the place for this. It is politicizing this board instead of developing true expectations for what individual members have to do to participate and remain on the CPAC.

In the Membership section, I have a few language comments:

I believe it should state that all members **MUST** be residents, not should.

What constitutes bias? How would a potential member prove this if there is no definition of what bias might be present? This needs some language for clarification.

Who will provide the training and cover any associated costs? Is that going to be a CPAC member's responsibility or the Town's responsibility? (Note: I am wholly on board for this training and I think it should remain here, I just think a clarification on who has the responsibility to provide and/or cover the cost of it must be clarified.)

Two last things on the remainder of the document:

- Even though this might be something covered in the Bylaws that result, I think this document should state that the minutes of the meeting, with the exception of any executive sessions, will be public. This helps codify the transparency you hope to achieve.
- I assume this will be covered in Bylaws, but there has to be a provision in guiding documents for getting rid of a CPAC member for various and replacing....this can be for anything from moving out of Town boundaries to ethics violations, to failure to participate.