

Meyer, Paul

From: Meyer, Paul
Sent: Saturday, October 17, 2015 7:26 AM
To: LLP Rosenbaum & Watson
Subject: FW: Recommendations on 1010.00, use of force
Attachments: 102215-1 through -8 Recommendations regarding Directive 1010.00, Use of Force (10162015).pdf; Rec No. 3 - Dir 1010.00 - Reasonableness of Force.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please see the email that I sent yesterday.

From: Meyer, Paul
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 3:31 PM
To: Hood, Mandi; Amy Ruiz; Kathleen Saadat; Marshman, Michael; Osoinach, Ellen; O'Dea, Larry; Tom Christoff
Cc: Hughes, Michele; Hager, Tashia; Elmore, DeVinci; Jackson, Jakhary
Subject: FW: Recommendations on 1010.00, use of force

I haven't had a chance to go through the entire 122 pages of the document, but I would like to express some serious concerns that I have with this document.

My "con" statements have been edited, some significantly. My responses have been reorganized and parts have been removed, to include my recommendations (as asked for).

Also concerning is the **"Response to objection"** section. I have never seen this until today, I was never given an opportunity to respond to it. WHO wrote them? Why are there two sections in support of the recommendations and only one that is contrary? Is this fair, is this right?

Where is the transparency in this process?
wrong.

I feel that this is completely unprofessional and ethically

As an example, I have attached the document that was just sent (link below) and posted on the COCL-COAB website today. To see an example of the editing, please go to Page 86 and compare the "con" statement to the one that I sent (attached) on 10-06-2015 (my statements are in red, the same as they were sent on Oct 6th)

If there is an argument that the "con" statements were too long, the statement in support of this recommendation is 4 pages long. The edited "con" statement is now less than 1 page long and just longer than the newly revealed "response to objection" statement.