



CITIZEN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Community Oversight of Portland Police Bureau

City of Portland / City Auditor
Independent Police Review (IPR)
Citizen Review Committee (CRC)

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 (meetings are typically held the first Wednesday of each month)

Time: 5:30 pm * *Please Note: agenda times are approximate*

Location: **Lovejoy Room, Portland City Hall**. 1221 SW 4th Ave. Portland, OR 97204

Present: Roberto Rivera, Neil Simon, Andrea Chiller, Julie Falk, Kristin Malone, Daniel Schwartz, Candace Avalos, Michael Luna, Constantin Severe, Larry Graham, Jeff Bell, Dan Simon, Jasmin Moneymaker, TJ Browning, Kalei and Ted Luyben, Jessie Sponberg, Sarah Long, Debbie Aiona, Carol Cushman, Pamela Fitzimmons, Debra Turkat

AGENDA

5:30 pm—5:40 pm Introductions and Welcome (CRC Chair Kristin Malone)
(Approved of October 1, 2017 meeting minutes)

5:40 pm – 6:00 pm Director's Report (IPR Director Constantin Severe)

6:00 pm – 6:15 pm Chair's Report (CRC Chair Kristin Malone)

- Chair Malone met with several people who are interested in becoming a CRC member.

6:15 pm – 8:15 pm **Case File Review/Appeal Hearing:** 2016-C-0374/ 2017-X-0006

Appellant went to Portland City Hall to protest the City's collective bargaining agreement with the Portland Police Association. Appellant alleged Officer A and B used inappropriate force by grabbing him and pushed him down on the ground. Appellant also alleged Officer C and D improperly handcuffing him too tightly

- IPR Director Severe provided IPR side of the investigation:
 - IPR received the case on October 13, the day after the incident. This Investigation is tied to 6 other investigations regarding officers' actions on October 12.
 - IPR interviewed 20 witnesses, and collected videos from community members, Police Bureau's forensic division, and City Hall Surveillance cameras. There was a really good video taken by an Oregonian reporter.
 - IPR also interviewed all the involved Officers and collected PPB reports regarding the incident.
 - There are 5 allegations involving the Appellant.
- Chair Malone asked Director Severe what IPR did to collect videos from the community?
 - During and right after the incident, there were a lot of talks from the community about the incident. We were able to gather a lot of the videos from the internet. In the activist community, there are a lot of people who film so it was easy for us to gather that information. During the early stage of the investigation when we were still trying to figure out all the allegations, we talked to a bunch of community members to gather information. We also asked them to send whatever photos and videos that they have to us. Generally, in bigger cases like a protest case, we have a format where we ask the Bureau for whatever police reports relevant to the incident and videos from the Forensic Division. In this case, the incident took place inside City Hall so we had access to the surveillance videos which provided an overall view of the incident. We also subpoena videos from local media outlets and ended up using them for other cases.
- Mr. Rivera asked Director Severe about other people who filed other allegations regarding other incidents happened during the same protest.

- The only allegations we are talking tonight are allegations involving the Appellant. The Appellant brought up numerous incidents involving other people during his interview and we created separated cases for those.
- Chair Malone asked Director Severe how many investigations came out of this protest?
 - There were 6 other investigations.
- Chair Malone commended IPR for collecting all the videos from the incident for this investigation.
- Director Severe made a comment some of the videos are not relevant to the allegations in this case, but IPR doesn't want to be in a position to edit the videos.
- Mr. Simon made a comment he appreciates the thoroughness of the investigation.
- Mr. Rivera asked Director Severe regarding to the First Amendment right, did officers have probable cause to arrest the protestors for the things that they said to officers, while they were still inside City Hall?
 - When we are doing the investigation, we really focused onto the allegations. One of the things they came up during the investigation. There were number of folks who got concerned about chairs being placed in front of Commissioner's offices. There was a safety risk involved. We felt that it was disruptive. As to the First amendment issue, that wasn't something that was considered because everything we were looking at was based on what the Appellant had originally told us filter through the lens of Directives that alleged misconducts by PPB officers.
- Public comments:
 - Mr. Handelman made a comment that there were dozens of witnesses were at the protest, but there's no civilian witnesses listed as being interviewed.
 - The Appellant made a comment during an interview, one of the officers made an allegation against him regarding the Appellant charging him with a closed fist, but the Officer's explanation was inaudible.
- Director Severe made a comment IPR interviewed at least 10 civilians as part of a mass protest case, but none of them witnessed the interaction between the Appellant and the Involved Officers. Regarding to the second point about the Officer's statement about the Appellant had a close fist and charged at him, when IPR was interviewing the Officer, the IPR Investigator showed the Involved Officer the video and had him break down on own his perspective of what was happening.
- The Appellant made a comment the two witnesses he brought with him tonight were never interviewed by IPR in this specific context. They were both close to him when the incident happened so it would be beneficial for IPR to interview them.
- Mr. Rivera asked Chair Malone to clarify each allegation.
 - The first allegation had to do with the incident by the door.
 - The second and third allegation had to do with the incident on the max track.
 - The fourth and fifth allegation had to do with handcuffing.
- Chair Malone reminded the Committee that the Committee is reviewing the findings by the RU Manager whether or not it is supported by the evidence.
- Director Severe made a comment it is up to the Committee to decide if they want him to go into the case in detail. With this type of a case, summarizing might have ended up leaving something out. Based on the evidences, it is clear what had occurred.
- Chair Malone asked Director Severe if there's anything that he thinks it would be important for the public as well as the Appellant to know?
 - The appeal summary is an attempt to summarize to the best of our ability what happened. Both live stream videos showed from the protestor's point of views how things had transpired throughout the day. Orders were given for people to leave City Hall; some people leave and some don't. Police then formed a line and request people to leave through the 5th Ave. The Appellant's involvement regarding allegation 1 was relatively brief.
 - The remaining allegations jumped over to videos provided by PPB Forensic Division that showed the Appellant standing in the max track. Officer gave orders for the crowd to leave the max track. The Appellant remained in the max track. When he tried to get onto the max platform in the last minute, they managed to pulled him through the line and he fell. Appellant told IPR during an interview that he felt that the police internationally grabbed him and threw him down onto the ground. Appellant was

flex cuffed and he felt that cuffs were too tight. In the video, you can see the officer checking on the flex cuffs.

- The Appellant provided his testimony regarding the incident:
 - On October 12, 2016, he arrived at City Hall to protest surrounding Police Union contract at City Hall. It was a pretty low-key protest at the beginning.
 - There were several other activists that he knows there.
 - Toward the end of the protest, the police made an announcement to vacate City Hall. They were giving under 4 minutes to depart City Hall.
 - He felt that he would be shove down the stairs with other protestors so he told other activists next to him to lock arms.
 - Officer A was aggressive that day and shoved him several times. The Officer also jabbed him several times in the chest.
 - Appellant then pushing through the crowd and stepping people so he can get out of the building as soon as possible.
 - He saw a Portland Police officer picked up a disable NLG Legal Observer and threw her down the stairs.
 - Officers sprayed mace at him and several other people while they were down the stairs.
 - He was on the side walk when officers started advancing toward him and other protestors.
 - Officers Grabbed his shirt and pull him out of the crowd without any warning. His face hit the concrete floor.
 - His phone was taken by PPB and he never see it again. The phone GPS indicated that it was in East Precinct.
 - Officer A punched some people and it can be seen in some of the videos.
- The Appellant's first witness made a comment that she was right next to him when it happened. Everything the Appellant said about what happened that day is true.
- The Appellant's second witness made a comment he recorded most of the footage on October 12. Portland Police used overwhelming force against protestors.
- The Appellant's Appeal Process Advisor TJ Browning made a comment she looked at multiple videos, but she cannot find a clip of the Appellant with his fist close as described in the Officer's statement.
- Captain Graham made some comments regarding the RU manager's findings:
 - Regarding to allegation 1, the officer used reasonable force to try and get the Appellant out of the building. If the Appellant was trying to leave the building he wouldn't be linking arms. He also would looked forward instead of backward.
 - Regarding to allegation 2,3 and 4 there was a probable cause to arrest the Appellant. Officers had to go through the crowd and grab him and that was the technique that he was taught in training. Officers report stated that he grabbed the Appellant and then let go so the Appellant can catch himself and avoid getting hurt. Officers also used extra-long flex cuffs on the Appellant due to his size.
- Ms. Chiller asked Director regarding the Appellant's allegation of an Officer took his phone. Why was the allegation dismissed?
 - In the video we can see the phone lying on the max tracks. Appellant stated that an Officer picked it up and showed it to him. A Sergeant did contact the Appellant and told him that the Bureau doesn't know what happened to his phone. The Appellant then made a claim with City Risk Management to get compensated for his phone. From an investigative standpoint, the Bureau should've not lost the Appellant phone. From our perspective, we actually don't know who lost the Appellant phone. We are also really trying to focus into our investigation of misconducts. In City Code, we can allow other remedies. In this case City Risk Management compensated the Appellant for City's failure to keep track of his phone.
- Chair Malone noted that the Committee does not have the ability to request IPR or IA to add an allegation.
- Chair Malone asked Captain Graham who was the Incident Commander during the October 12 incident to walk to the Committee through his decision-making process.
 - It was a decision by the previous Mayor to let people into the building and then things got to the point where City Council was unable to conduct business so decision was made to ask people to leave. we

warned people multiple times and gave them more than 4 minutes to leave. If you watch the video, people were taunting officers to try and get the police to react. People were also setting up tents inside City Hall.

- Mr. Rivera asked Captain Graham if an officer can make his/her decision after receiving an order from the Incident Commander? Why didn't the officer arrest the Appellant while he was still inside the building and engaging in a verbal confrontation with officers?
 - Yes, but in a crowd control situation, it is really important to make arrest at an appropriate time, otherwise it would angry other people.
- Ms. Avalos asked Captain Graham if City Council was still going on during the protest?
 - Yes they were happening in the third floor's meeting room and that was when the Mayor gave permission to trespass people.
- Ms. Falk asked Captain Graham regarding to allegation 1, was there a clear evidence between an Exonerated and Not sustained.
 - The way we are looking at it is whether the officer is out of policy and there's not enough evidence to show that the officer is out of policy.
- Mr. Simon asked Captain Graham if he can describe what it would look like if it flex cuffs were too tight?
 - If you cannot put a finger through it.
- Mr. Simon asked the Appellant about his statement regarding how officers had to use different scissors to cut his flex cuffs. Were they tightened after they being put on him or after the Appellant got into a vehicle?
 - Yes, the two Detectives that issued me a theft II citation at East Precinct. They apologized to me profusely they were concerned that they might cut into my wrists so they had to find different pair of scissors. I wish those two detectives were interview I don't know how flex cuffs work but they did tighten when I was in the vehicle and moving around.
- Mr. Simon asked Captain Graham if the flex cuffs can be accidentally tightened after being put on the Appellant?
 - I don't know, but the Appellant mentioned flex cuffs tighten after he was put into the vehicle so the officer had nothing to do with it.
- Ms. Chiller asked Captain Graham if there's a directive that talks about when officers should use flex cuffs instead of regular metal hand cuffs due to a person size? Is the metal cuffs more comfortable?
 - The regular metal handcuffs would be more uncomfortable for the Appellant. They would've used 3 or 4 sets of metal hand cuffs on him.
- Mr. Luna asked Captain Graham if there's a grabbing and pulling technique to help prevent people from falling? Did they take into consideration that he was in a higher platform?
 - It's a dynamic situation. Typically, when you go and try to grab people, they will try to get un arrested. The officer in the report stated that he noticed the Appellant was falling so he stopped grabbing the Appellant so he can catch himself.
- Ms. Avalos and Mr. Schwartz asked the Appellant if he tries to leave City Hall, why didn't he just leave instead of facing the officers?
 - I would not turn my back on officers who are angry and trying to shove me. This is the police force that is under DOJ settlement for excessive use of force. I was worried about my safety. Had I had my back facing them it could've been a lot worse.
- Mr. Schwartz asked Captain Graham about the reference in the case file about officers talking on radio regarding the Appellant's clothing descriptions and that if anyone saw a person matched the Appellant's descriptions then take him into custody? What is the time frame from when orders were given out to the Appellant being arrested?
 - It sounds right. At some point, we had a probable cause that the Appellant was blocking traffic so we have a reason to take him in. Regarding the timeframe, the directions were given before they went across the street.
- Ms. Chiller asked Captain Graham if there's a pain compliance technique that was taught where an officer use his/her knuckle to press against someone's chest area?
 - No.
- Ms. Falk asked Captain Graham if it is unusual for an incident commander for this case to review the case file and attending the meeting on behalf of the RU Manager?

- Captain Bell made a comment the Bureau would not use an incident commander to be the RU Manager for the case, but due to Commander Sheffer, the actual RU Manager for this case not able to make it to the meeting, Captain Graham would be the next logical person due to his familiarity with the incident.
- Mr. Rivera asked Captain Graham if the findings were written by Commander Sheffer? Also everything he said at the meeting tonight was based on his own experience as an Incident Commander and also as a reviewer on the case
 - Yes.
- Mr. Luna asked the one of the Appellant's Witness where was she standing when the Appellant claimed that he was jabbed in the chest?
 - I don't know when the Officer put his knuckle on the Appellant's head, but officers were shoving us.
- Public comments:
 - Ms. Luyben made a comment she was sad and traumatized when she watched footages of officers pushing people down the stairs.
 - Unnamed community member made a comment she was outraged by the fact that Portland Police threw people out of a public building while City Council was discussing their bargaining agreement. Portland Police needs de-escalation training.
 - Mr. Handelman made several comments:
 - City Council members walked out of the Council Chambers and went upstairs to a different meeting room to finishing their discussion on the bargaining agreement.
 - Captain Graham's comments about his officers since it was a subjective comment based on him being an Incident Commander on the case. He supposed to review the case in an objective way.
 - The Committee should read the disposition letter out loud so community members can hear what the actual RU Manager said.
 - Pepper Spray was used during the protest and he doesn't understand why IPR dismiss it.
 - To charge someone with disorderly conduct, the person has to try to alarm or cause concern in public.
 - The Appellant's witness made a comment people at the protest that day just wanted to testify against the Portland Police contract. The police and Mayor were the bad guys that day. The people were the last line of defense against transparency. They didn't want to fight against the police.
- Ms. Browning made some comments:
 - She could not identify the officer who took the Appellant's phone.
 - She also could not identify the officer who pepper spray protestors. There's no way for the City to hold officers from other jurisdictions since they don't follow the same protocols.
- The Appellant's witness made some comments:
 - The police created a u-shape around protestors and started boxing people in and pushed them toward the exit so people were falling down the stairs.
 - People were trying to leave after being told to leave but the police surrounded them.
- The Appellant made some rebuttal comments:
 - He was charged with Theft II not Disorderly Conduct. No charge was ever sent to the circuit court.
 - They did not have probable cause. Everyone who was arrested during the protest ended up getting their charges dismissed.
 - He and many other people were pepper sprayed.
 - Portland Police parked their car sideway to block the street so no traffic can come through.
 - Officer A punched a person next to him in the face which caused the person to fall down the stairs and was injured.
 - He was one of the protestors who signed up and received a ticket to testify.
 - The police slammed everyone who they arrested down on the ground.
 - Based on City Code, IPR cannot dismiss the allegation related to his missing cellphone.
 - His phone was pinging from East Precinct until the battery dies.
- Director Severe made some comments regarding the case:
 - The two IPR Investigators talked to several community members on other cases related to the incident at City Hall.

- IPR investigated multiple incidents of officers using pepper spray, but IPR was unable to identify which officer who used the pepper spray. In a letter addressed to the Appellant, IPR informed him that there were Multnomah county sheriff deputies who came and swept the west side of City Hall. The Appellant contacted IPR and indicated that it was a Sergeant who used pepper spray. IPR took a second look at it and found that Sergeant did not use pepper spray.
- If someone brought up that they believed someone was subjected to a use of force. In this case, several community brought up the issue of officers shoving someone down the stairs. That person did not contact IPR, but IPR ended up opening the case due to the seriousness of the allegation. IPR interviewed several officers and there were findings came out of that process.
- Ms. Avalos asked Director Severe about the Appellant’s alleged that an officer pepper sprayed him.
 - I was not able to identify a Portland police that used pepper spray on the Appellant. There were other people who got pepper sprayed by Portland officers. For a period of about a month, we held the case open to try and identify officers. In this particular case, there were 3 allegations what we dismissed since we cannot identify a Portland Police officer.
- Chair Malone made a comment she is not sure whether officers used force to shove people down the stairs was an appropriate use of force.
- Ms. Falk made a comment she would like to know why there wasn’t a debriefing added into the findings.
- Mr. Rivera made a comment regarding to allegation 1, the Officer used more than the reasonable force required to force people out. Regarding to allegation 2 and 3, in the Officer’s statement he used the word push while Captain Graham used the word “grab’ and “pull” to describe the Officer’s actions. Officers need to take into consideration the safety of people since the curve is 12 inches high. As far as handcuffing goes, the Officer did check to make sure that the handcuffs were not too tight so Not Sustained was an appropriate finding.
- Mr. Luna made a comment regarding to allegation 1 he didn’t see the Appellant being pushed. Regarding to allegation 2 and 3, he agreed with Mr. Rivera.
- Chair Malone and Ms. Falk made a comment they also observed a “pulled” but not a “push”.
- Director Severe made a comment IPR Investigator summarized what the Appellant said and form an allegation.
- Captain Bell made a comment the findings were based on officers’ actions, not based on the wordings.
- Chair Malone made a comment there was a case in the past where the RU Manager made the findings based on the wordings of an allegation.
- Mr. Schwartz made a motion to affirm the finding of Not Sustained on allegation 5. This was seconded by Mr. Simon:
 - Mr. Rivera: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms. Avalos: YES, based on the evidence
 - Mr. Luna: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms.: Simon: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms. Chiller: YES, based on the evidence
 - Chair Malone: YES, based on the evidence
 - Mr. Schwartz: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms. Falk: YES, based on the evidence
- Mr. Simon made a motion to affirm the finding of Not Sustained on allegation 4. This was seconded by Ms. Avalos:
 - Mr. Rivera: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms. Avalos: YES, based on the evidence
 - Mr. Luna: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms.: Simon: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms. Chiller: YES, based on the evidence
 - Chair Malone: YES, based on the evidence
 - Mr. Schwartz: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms. Falk: YES, based on the evidence
- Mr. Luna made a motion to challenge the finding of Not Sustained on allegation 3 and recommend a finding of Sustained. This was seconded by Mr. Rivera:
 - Mr. Rivera: YES, based on the evidence a reasonable person must concludes the Officer used excessive force

- Ms. Avalos: NO, based on the standard of review
- Mr. Luna: YES, the Officer used excessive force and not taking account for the circumstances.
- Ms. Simon: NO, based on the standard of review, the evidence wasn't clear to Sustained the allegation.
- Ms. Chiller: YES, based on the evidence
- Chair Malone: NO, based on the standard of review, it wasn't clear that the intention of the Officer was to let the Appellant fall to the ground.
- Mr. Schwartz: NO, based on the standard of review, the finding of Sustained is not appropriate
- Ms. Falk: NO, based on the standard of review
- Motion failed.
- Mr. Schwartz made a motion to affirm the finding of Not Sustained allegation 3. This was seconded by Chair Malone:
 - Mr. Rivera: NO, the allegation should've been Sustained, at a minimum the Officer should receive a debrief
 - Ms. Avalos: YES, based on the standard of review
 - Mr. Luna: NO, based on the evidence, the Officer used excessive force
 - Ms. Simon: YES, based on the standard of review
 - Ms. Chiller: NO, based on the evidence, the Officer used excessive force
 - Chair Malone: YES, based on the standard of review
 - Mr. Schwartz: YES, based on the standard of review
 - Ms. Falk: YES, based on the standard of review
- Mr. Luna made a motion to challenge the finding of Not Sustained on allegation 2 and recommend a finding of Sustained. This was seconded by Mr. Rivera:
 - Mr. Rivera: YES, based on the evidence, at a minimum the Officer should receive a debrief
 - Ms. Avalos: NO, based on the standard of review
 - Mr. Luna: YES, the Officer used excessive force and not taking account for the circumstances.
 - Ms. Simon: NO, based on the standard of review
 - Ms. Chiller: YES, based on the evidence, the Officer used excessive force
 - Chair Malone: NO, based on the standard of review
 - Mr. Schwartz: NO, based on the evidence, the finding of Sustained is not appropriate
 - Ms. Falk: NO, cannot articulate the reasoning to challenge the finding of Sustained
- Motion failed.
- Mr. Simon made a motion to affirm the finding of Not Sustained on Allegation 2. This was seconded by Chair Malone:
 - Mr. Rivera: NO, the allegation should've been Sustained. The Officer showed aggressiveness toward protestors. The Officer also needs a debriefing
 - Ms. Avalos: YES, based on the standard of review
 - Mr. Luna: NO, the Officer used excessive force and not taking account for the circumstances.
 - Ms.: Simon: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms. Chiller: NO, based on the evidence, the Officer used excessive force
 - Chair Malone: YES, based on the evidence
 - Mr. Schwartz: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms. Falk: YES, based on the evidence
- Mr. Schwartz made a motion to affirm the finding of Not Sustained on allegation 1. This was seconded by Ms. Avalos:
 - Mr. Rivera: NO, the allegation should've been Sustained. The Officer showed aggressiveness toward protestors. The Officer also needs a debriefing
 - Ms. Avalos: YES, based on the evidence
 - Mr. Luna: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms.: Simon: YES, based on the evidence
 - Ms. Chiller: YES, based on the evidence
 - Chair Malone: YES, based on the evidence

- Mr. Schwartz: YES, based on the evidence, this situation could've resolved in a more peaceful way
- Ms. Falk: YES, based on the evidence
- The Appellant would like to thank the Committee for their hard work reviewing his case file.
- Captain Graham made a comment his appearance tonight was probably not the best thing since he was the Incident Commander at this protest. It was his decision to give order to his officers to get people out of City Hall so if the Committee were to find the actions to be out of policy then it should be on him that is out of policy.
- Mr. Simon made a comment to Captain Graham the best thing he can do is to share what was discussed tonight and share with his officers.
- Ms. Chiller also hope the Bureau can learn from this incident.
- Mr. Luna made a comment officer should take into consideration of the surrounding area for the safety of both side.
- Chair Malone made a comment the Bureau should create more scenarios to train officers on large demonstration situations
- Captain Graham made a comment the community's expectations is not set and it's not fair for the community. The Bureau is constantly learning from each protest and are making changes. He encourages the Committee to share their feedbacks with Lt. Lee who oversees training Bureau members on crowd control tactics.
- Mr. Schwartz made a comment there should be a policy that states when situation permits, flex cuffs should be replaced with regular handcuffs since regular handcuffs can double locked so it would not tighten by itself.
- Public comments:
 - Ms. Hannon the Crowd Control Workgroup needs to meet on a regular basis. There were other excessive force incidents happened during that same day and the Workgroup needs to look into this.
 - Ms. Luyben made a comment, the Crowd Control Workgroup should share their recommendations with the Mayor's Office.
 - Mr. Handel man made several comments:
 - The shooting last Wednesday marks the 3rd African American who was shot by PPB.
 - Allegations should be read out loud at the beginning of an Appeal Hearing.
 - City Council made amendments to the PPB contract that day, but they did not let the community in to provide inputs.
 - There had been recommendations in the past the Committee should make recommendations in Bureau uses of equipment at protests.
 - The lost phone had evidence in it and it is a very serious allegation.
 - It's not against the law to mouth-off to officers.
 - The Appellant encourage the Committee to discuss with the Auditor about IPR's dismissal process. It seems like the current dismissal process is not in line with City Codes.

8:15 pm—8:35 pm Workgroup updates: Please provide the following information —

- 1) Brief summary of the goals and objectives of your workgroup
- 2) Date of last meeting
- 3) Brief summary of the work done at your last meeting
- 4) Next scheduled meeting
- 5) Main topic to be discussed/addressed at the next meeting
- 6) Any assistance from IPR or CRC needed to achieve your goals

ACTIVE WORKGROUPS

1. Outreach Workgroup (5 min.)

MISSION STATEMENT: The Outreach Workgroup engages the community to raise awareness about the Citizen Review Committee (CRC), gather concerns about police services and accountability, and identify issues for the CRC to address. Following up with appellants and others community requests will supplement current work group

tasks. Additionally, outreach committee members will serve as point for ongoing communications with IPR, the City, the Bureau, community members and/or act as the face of CRC.

Chair / Members: Neil Simon, Candace Avalos and Roberto Rivera

IPR staff: Irene Konev, Community Outreach Coordinator

- Mr. Simon has been in touch with 2 principles from 2 different high schools who are interested in meeting with CRC regarding community-police relation. He will reach out to all Committee members once he have the meeting scheduled.

2. Recurring Audit (5 min.)

MISSION STATEMENT: The Recurring Audit Workgroup seeks to improve accountability of IPR and the Portland Police Bureau by reviewing closed cases to ensure procedures, policies and protocols are followed and will recommend improvements, if necessary.

Chair / Members: Vanessa Yarie, Bridget Donegan, Daniel Schwartz and Jeff Bissonnette

3. Policy and Protocols (5 min.)

MISSION STATEMENT: The Policy and Protocols Workgroup examines CRC jurisdiction and the standard of review and recommends action to the CRC. Additionally, the workgroup will review community letters/input on policy issues and police bureau issues and present findings to full CRC.

Chair: Kiosha Ford / Members: Julie Falk , Andrea Chiller, and Kristin Malone

4. Crowd Control Workgroup (5 min.)

MISSION STATEMENT: The Crowd Control Workgroup examines existing crowd control policies, training, and tactics of the Portland Police Bureau, reviews crowd control best practices, legal standards and other information, and makes appropriate recommendations.

Chair /Members: Michael Luna

5. Use of Deadly Force Workgroup (5 min.)

MISSION STATEMENT: The Use of Deadly Force Workgroup examines Portland Police Bureau use of deadly force policies, directives, training and implementation in order to recommend and support any needed change in Portland Police Bureau use of deadly force.

Chair: David Denecke / Members: Rochelle Silver, Kristin Malone and James Young

- The group is trying to schedule a meeting with City Attorney Mark Amberg.
- Ms. Chiller asked Chair Malone what is the status of this workgroup? She is interested in joining the workgroup if there's a need for more current CRC members to be on the workgroup.
 - A draft of the recommendations has been written and we are just trying to move it up the chain of command. I will check with the workgroup's Chair if we need more members.

8:35 pm —9:00 pm Public comment and wrap-up comments by CRC members

8:45 pm Adjournment

To better serve you, a request for an interpreter or assisted listening device for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made three (3) days prior to the meeting—please call the IPR main line 823-0146 (or TYY 503-823-6868).

Visit the website for more information regarding the Independent Police Review division, Citizen Review Committee, protocols, CRC meeting schedules, and approved minutes: www.portlandoregon.gov/ipr.

CRC Members:

- 1. If you know you will not be able to attend a CRC meeting or that you will be missing a significant amount of a meeting, please call or e-mail IPR in advance so that the CRC Chair may be made aware of your expected absence.**
- 2. After this meeting, please return your folder so IPR staff can use it for document distribution at the next CRC meeting.**

****Note: agenda item(s) as well as the meeting date, time, or location may be subject to change.***