



CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON



Bureau of Police

Ted Wheeler, Mayor

Danielle M. Outlaw, Chief of Police

1111 S.W. 2nd Avenue • Portland, OR 97204 • Phone: 503-823-0000

Integrity • Compassion • Accountability • Respect • Excellence • Service

Directive 630.61, Stolen Vehicles Executive Summary

Note- This directive will be piloted for six months from the effective date.

Introduction

Directive 630.61, Stolen Vehicles, establishes the guidelines for members taking stolen vehicle reports and the procedures for recovering a stolen vehicle. The Portland Police Bureau (PPB) originally created this directive in September 2003 and last revised it in 2009. In January 2018, following public discussion regarding the cost of towing expenses and the PPB's procedures for towing recovered stolen vehicles, the Mayor's Office reached out to PPB to identify alternative procedural options to alleviate some of the costs associated with towing fees on Portland community members.

When the Policy Development Team initiated this directive's review process in 2018, several issues immediately surfaced that made revising the directive not only complicated but also complex. Stakeholders discussed various options, however the fundamental challenge is that the PPB has no authority over third party companies and the fees they charge once they take possession of the vehicle.

The directive was originally designed to inform and guide members on taking stolen vehicle reports, however, the directive directly impacts members of the community when it comes to retrieving their vehicle. While many options were discussed throughout the process, the Bureau realized that no simple solution existed to the problem of alleviating the costs and fees to retrieve a stolen vehicle for an individual. At the direction of the Chief's office, the Bureau is releasing a revised Directive 630.61 in conjunction with a new PPB form that allows owners to elect various options on the disposition of their vehicle when found. This directive will be in effect for six months and, at the conclusion of this period, PPB will reassess the effectiveness of the new procedures to determine whether changes to the directive are necessary.

Public Comments

The Bureau received numerous feedback during the public comment periods conducted in January 2018 and January 2019, respectively. Many individuals commented on outdated report writing and procedures, and many also expressed criticism and anger over the amount of time allowed for owners to pick up their cars upon receiving notification that their vehicle had been located. Other commenters offered ideas such as creating a city-owned tow lot, allowing authorized individuals to retrieve the found vehicle rather than having the vehicle towed, and increasing the amount of time a person has to retrieve their vehicle once they are notified that it has been found.

Towing options, other suggestions, and the way forward

Several comments received by the Bureau suggested various ideas to mitigate interaction with private towing companies. One idea shared was for the City to establish a city-owned lot where stolen vehicles that were located could be towed. Other suggestions varied from whether to charge an individual at a

reduced rate compared to private towing companies or waiving fees for an owner until a certain amount of days had elapsed. Another recommendation was to have the City negotiate with private towing companies within Portland's jurisdiction to reduce their rates for stolen vehicles recovered by PPB. These options and many others were discussed with multiple City departments, however, the various stakeholders were not able to reach a consensus.

The Bureau has determined that the best option at the current moment is to allow owners to determine how their vehicle should be handled when it is located. When a vehicle is reported stolen, the responding officer will provide the owner with a newly created PPB form offering them multiple options. The form presents the owner with choices to tow the vehicle when recovered or leave in place for 48 hours so they can retrieve themselves, delegate another individual to retrieve the vehicle, or not be notified when the vehicle has been located. This is the Bureau's attempt to find a reasonable solution to assisting members of the community from enduring costly towing fees and charges from private towing companies. With that said, members of the community should be aware that PPB may not always be able to comply with the selected options, and a vehicle may still need to be towed contrary to the owner's election if it is a hazard or cannot be properly secured.

We thank every individual who took the time to provide feedback on this directive. All comments received during both review periods are attached at the end of this document. We have removed all personal information to protect the privacy of commenters.

The Bureau's Revised Policy

Since the directive had not been revised for many years, the Bureau recognized the necessity to update outdated terminology and police forms used by sworn officers when taking a stolen vehicle report and these changes are reflected throughout the document. Additionally, the Bureau no longer relies on detectives to handle stolen vehicle reports as they once did due to resources, and so the directive now replaces the detectives' role and involvement with that of a supervisor when an officer takes a report. As mentioned earlier, the directive now incorporates new language in section 1.1.1. and section 2, which discusses the responsibilities of the responding member to provide owners with the new PPB form as well as actions an officer must take when a stolen vehicle has been located. Lastly, in section 2, the Bureau increased the time allowing an owner or their designee to retrieve the vehicle from where it was found from 30 minutes to 60 minutes.

The Bureau believes that the revised directive provides clearer guidance to its members; however, any suggestions to further improve this policy are welcome during its next review.

Directive 630.61, Stolen Vehicles, will go into effect on July 1, 2019.

Published on 5/31/19

630.61, Stolen Vehicles

Refer:

- ORS § 164.138 Criminal Possession of a Rented or Leased Motor Vehicle
- DIR 630.60, Vehicle Disposition
- DIR 660.10, Property and Evidence Procedures
- PPB Stolen Vehicle Election of Tow Options/Acknowledgment of Risk, Release From Liability and Hold Harmless Agreement Form

Policy:

1. It is the policy of the Portland Police Bureau to recover stolen vehicles taken through criminal activity and to refrain from exercising authority in situations involving vehicles taken in civil disputes.

Procedure:

1. Responding Member Responsibilities.
 - 1.1. Upon sufficient proof of ownership and indications that the vehicle has been stolen, members shall complete a General Offense report.
 - 1.1.1. In addition to completing the General Offense report, members shall also provide the PPB Stolen Vehicle Election of Tow Options/Acknowledgment of Risk, Release From Liability and Hold Harmless Agreement Form to the vehicle owner. The owner must indicate whether they wish to have the recovered vehicle towed at their own expense or wish to have the vehicle left at the recovery location if they are unable to retrieve it in a timely manner.
 - 1.1.1.1. Members shall explain to the owner that a failure to sign the form will result in the recovered vehicle being towed at the owner's expense.
 - 1.2. Reporting.
 - 1.2.1. Upon taking a stolen vehicle report, members shall immediately call the Auto Records Desk to insure the stolen vehicle is immediately entered into the Law Enforcement Data Systems (LEDS) and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC).
 - 1.3. Proof of Ownership.
 - 1.3.1. In order to accept a report on a stolen car, members shall conduct a preliminary investigation. As part of that investigation, ownership must be established. One or more of the following may establish proof of ownership:
 - 1.3.1.1. The complainant is the registered owner (per any Department of Motor Vehicles [DMV]), which is substantiated by personal identification. Telephone reports may be accepted if the complainant can satisfactorily assure the reporting officer that they are the registered owner via corroborating sources (i.e., familiarity with vehicle, type, make, names of other registered owners, and unique features of the vehicle [e.g., bumper stickers, pre-existing damage]).
 - 1.3.1.2. The complainant provides documents from DMV indicating process of transfer of title.

- 1.3.1.3. The complainant has possession of a title signed for transfer.
- 1.3.1.4. The complainant has possession of a bill of sale from a licensed car dealer on letterhead, dated within the last 60 days.
- 1.3.1.5. The complainant has possession of a notarized bill of sale, for a private sale, dated within the last 60 days.
- 1.3.1.6. If the person reporting the vehicle as stolen had possession under a rental/lease agreement, the reporting person must present the valid rental/lease agreement or telephone verification by the rental company.
- 1.3.1.7. The complainant is the owner of rented or leased vehicle and has completed the requirements set forth in ORS 164.138 (demand letter, 3-day waiting period, etc.).
- 1.3.1.8. In situations that do not meet the previous criteria, officers must contact a supervisor for authorization to accept a report of a stolen vehicle. The person authorizing the report shall be documented in the report.

1.4. Denial of Report.

- 1.4.1. A stolen report will not be accepted under the following circumstances, which shall be deemed non-criminal and instead a civil disagreement:
 - 1.4.1.1. A spouse is the complainant.
 - 1.4.1.2. Divorce in progress.
 - 1.4.1.3. Divorce completed with court ordered division of property.
 - 1.4.1.4. Unmarried partner, domestic partner, roommate, family member or juvenile children of complainant, or those in a dating relationship. Under these circumstances, a sergeant may authorize that a report be taken after at least 48 hours from the time of the initial notification to law enforcement.
 - 1.4.1.5. Business partners or associates.
 - 1.4.1.6. Vehicle is held by person(s) performing work on the vehicle (e.g., mechanic's lien).
 - 1.4.1.7. Vehicle in possession of co-signer on contract of purchase.
 - 1.4.1.8. Vehicle taken from a tow company or mechanic's garage, unless the owner is complainant.
 - 1.4.1.9. Vehicle purchased with a non-sufficient fund (NSF) check.
 - 1.4.1.10. The vehicle is rented or leased, without fraud, and requirements set forth in ORS 164.138 have not been completed.
 - 1.4.1.11. New or used car test drive unless 24 hours have elapsed from the time the vehicle should have been returned.
 - 1.4.1.12. Stored vehicles, private property or storage facility, for which both parties cannot confirm theft.
 - 1.4.1.13. The complainant is unwilling to prosecute.
 - 1.4.1.14. The theft is a result of illegal activities such as drug transaction without mitigating circumstances (i.e., carjacking, armed robbery, etc.).
 - 1.4.1.15. Commercial or private sale of vehicle, for which partial payment has been made.
- 1.4.2. A sergeant may authorize a report in cases falling into the categories above, in extraordinary circumstances to be documented in the report. The report must include notation of the authorizing member.

1.5. Fraud.

1.5.1. Members may investigate:

1.5.1.1. Fraud involving a title that has changed parties.

1.5.1.2. DMV requests to investigate a title to a vehicle that is being registered and is listed as stolen.

1.5.1.3. Fraudulently purchased vehicles.

1.5.2. Officers shall complete a General Offense report if:

1.5.2.1. The vehicle was obtained fraudulently, using a NSF, account closed, forged, altered, counterfeit check, security, money order or instrument.

1.5.2.2. The vehicle was obtained through identity theft. The vehicle will be recorded as evidence with a full description including Vehicle Identification Number (VIN).

1.5.3. Under these circumstances, members shall only enter a vehicle as stolen in LEADS/NCIC with their immediate supervisor's permission. Members shall annotate their supervisor's name in the report.

1.5.3.1. Members shall not input vehicles as "Felony Vehicle" in LEADS/NCIC unless there are other special circumstances (e.g., vehicle involved in a robbery or serious person crime).

2. Recovering Stolen Vehicles.

2.1. All recovered vehicles must be confirmed by VIN and the LEADS/NCIC entry.

2.2. Unless the recovered vehicle is a hazard, the member shall attempt to contact the vehicle owner via all methods listed prior to ordering a tow.

2.3. If the owner indicated at the time of the initial report they wished to have the recovered vehicle towed at their own expense, the member shall have the vehicle towed if they are unable to contact the vehicle owner or if the vehicle owner is unable to respond in a timely fashion (a minimum of 60 minutes).

2.4. If the owner indicated at the time of the initial report they wished to have the recovered vehicle left at the recovery location, the member shall attempt to contact the owner via all methods listed. The member shall check the vehicle for apparent fresh damage or items of value, document the condition of the vehicle in their police report, and immediately clear the stolen vehicle entry out of LEADS/NCIC via Records Division.

2.5. If the original stolen vehicle report was taken by another law enforcement agency, the member shall attempt to contact the vehicle owner and have the vehicle towed if they are unable to contact the vehicle owner or if the vehicle owner is unable to respond in a timely fashion (a minimum of 60 minutes).

2.6. The vehicle may be released to the registered owner or a designee following member verification of the owner's information in the reporting system. The releasing officer shall immediately notify the Records Division/Auto Records when a vehicle is towed or released in order to remove the vehicle from LEADS/NCIC stolen file.

History:

- Originating Directive Date: 01/07/09
- Last Revision Signed: 05/31/19
 - Effective Date: 07/01/19
- Next Review Date: 01/01/20

630.61, ~~STOLEN VEHICLES~~ Stolen Vehicles

~~Index: Title~~

Refer:

~~Oregon Vehicle Code~~

- ORS § 164.138 Criminal Code Possession of Oregon: Chapters 131, 164 a Rented or Leased Motor Vehicle

~~City Code City of Portland~~

- DIR 630.60, Vehicle Disposition

POLICY (630.61)

- DIR 660.10, Property and Evidence Procedures
- PPB Stolen Vehicle Election of Tow Options/Acknowledgment of Risk, Release From Liability and Hold Harmless Agreement Form

Policy:

1. It is the policy of the Portland Police Bureau to recover stolen vehicles taken through criminal activity and to refrain from exercising authority in situations involving vehicles taken in civil disputes. ~~PROCEDURE (630.61) Reporting Upon taking a stolen vehicle report, members will immediately call the Auto Records Desk to insure the stolen vehicle is immediately entered into LEADS and NCIC.~~

Procedure:

1. Responding Member Responsibilities.

1.1. Upon sufficient proof of ownership and indications that the vehicle has been stolen, members shall complete a General Offense report.

1.1.1. In addition to completing the General Offense report, members shall also provide the PPB Stolen Vehicle Election of Tow Options/Acknowledgment of Risk, Release From Liability and Hold Harmless Agreement Form to the vehicle owner. The owner must indicate whether they wish to have the recovered vehicle towed at their own expense or wish to have the vehicle left at the recovery location if they are unable to retrieve it in a timely manner.

1.1.1.1. Members shall explain to the owner that a failure to sign the form will result in the recovered vehicle being towed at the owner's expense.

1.2. Reporting.

1.2.1. Upon taking a stolen vehicle report, members shall immediately call the Auto Records Desk to insure the stolen vehicle is immediately entered into the Law Enforcement Data Systems (LEADS) and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC).

1.1.1.3. Proof of Ownership.

1.1.1.3.1. In order to accept a report on a stolen car, members ~~will~~shall conduct a preliminary investigation. As part of that investigation, ownership must be established. One or more of the following may establish proof of ownership:

1.1.1.3.1.1. a- The complainant is the registered owner (per any Department of Motor Vehicles [DMV]), which is substantiated by personal identification.

Telephone reports may be accepted if the complainant can satisfactorily assure the reporting officer that ~~he/she is~~they are the registered owner via corroborating sources (i.e., familiarity with vehicle, type, make, names of other registered owners, ~~idiosyncrasies~~and unique features of the vehicle [e.g., bumper stickers, pre-existing damage]).

- ~~1.1.1.2.1.3.1.2.~~ b- The complainant provides documents from DMV indicating process of transfer of title.
- ~~1.1.1.3.1.3.1.3.~~ e- The complainant has possession of a title signed for transfer.
- ~~1.1.1.4.1.3.1.4.~~ d- The complainant has possession of a bill of sale from a licensed car dealer on letterhead, dated within the last 60 days.
- ~~1.1.1.5.1.3.1.5.~~ e- The complainant has possession of a notarized bill of sale, for a private sale, dated within the last 60 days.
- ~~1.1.1.6.1.3.1.6.~~ f- If the person reporting the vehicle as stolen had possession under a rental/ lease agreement, the reporting person must present the valid rental/lease agreement or telephone verification by the rental company.
- ~~1.1.1.7.1.3.1.7.~~ g- The complainant is the owner of rented or leased vehicle and has completed the requirements set forth in ORS 164.~~140138~~ (demand letter, ~~10 or 45-3-~~day waiting period, etc~~).~~).
- ~~1.1.1.8.1.3.1.8.~~ h- In situations that do not meet the previous criteria, officers must contact a ~~detective or sergeant~~supervisor for authorization to accept a report of a stolen vehicle. ~~If unable to contact a detective or sergeant (i.e., after hours), officers must obtain approval of a supervisory sergeant.~~ The person authorizing the report shall be documented in the report.

~~1.2.1.4.~~ Denial of Report (~~630.61~~).

~~1.2.1.1.4.1.~~ A stolen report will not be accepted ~~in civil disputes~~ under the following circumstances, which shall be deemed non-criminal and instead a civil disagreement:

- ~~1.2.1.1.1.4.1.1.~~ a- ~~Husband/wife~~A spouse is the complainant.
- ~~1.2.1.2.1.4.1.2.~~ b- Divorce in progress.
- ~~1.2.1.3.1.4.1.3.~~ e- Divorce completed with court ordered division of property.
- ~~1.2.1.4.1.4.1.4.~~ d- ~~Boyfriend/girlfriend, Unmarried partner,~~ domestic partner, roommate, family member or juvenile children of complainant. ~~After 48 hours, a detective or,~~ or those in a dating relationship. Under these circumstances, a sergeant may authorize that a report be taken after at least 48 hours from the time of the initial notification to law enforcement.
- ~~1.2.1.5.1.4.1.5.~~ e- Business partners or associates.
- ~~1.2.1.6.1.4.1.6.~~ f- Vehicle is held by person(s) performing work on the vehicle (e.g., mechanic's lien).
- ~~1.2.1.7.1.4.1.7.~~ g- Vehicle in possession of co-signer on contract of purchase.
- ~~1.2.1.8.1.4.1.8.~~ h- Vehicle taken from a tow company or mechanic's garage, unless the owner is complainant.
- ~~1.2.1.9.1.4.1.9.~~ i- Vehicle purchased with a non-sufficient fund (NSF) check.
- ~~1.2.1.10.1.4.1.10.~~ j- The vehicle is rented or leased, without fraud, and requirements set forth in ORS 164.~~140138~~ have not been completed.

- ~~1.2.1.11.1.4.1.11.~~ ~~k.~~ New or used car test drive unless ~~twenty four~~ (24) hours have elapsed from the time the vehicle should have been returned.
- ~~1.2.1.12.1.4.1.12.~~ ~~l.~~ Stored vehicles, private property or storage facility, for which both parties cannot confirm theft.
- ~~1.2.1.13.1.4.1.13.~~ ~~m.~~ The complainant is unwilling to prosecute.
- ~~1.2.1.14.1.4.1.14.~~ ~~n.~~ The theft is a result of illegal activities such as drug transaction without mitigating circumstances (i.e., carjacking, armed robbery, etc.).
- ~~1.2.1.15.1.4.1.15.~~ ~~o.~~ Commercial or private sale of vehicle, for which partial payment has been made.

~~1.2.2.1.4.2.~~ A ~~detective or sergeant~~ ~~must~~may authorize a report in ~~unusual cases, with falling into the categories above, in~~ extraordinary circumstances. ~~Notation to be documented in the report. The report must include notation of the authorizing person will be made in the report~~member.

~~1.3.1.5.~~ Fraud (630.61).

~~1.3.1.1.5.1.~~ ~~a.~~ Members may investigate:

- ~~1.3.1.1.5.1.1.~~ ~~1.~~ Fraud involving a title that has changed parties.
- ~~1.3.1.2.1.5.1.2.~~ ~~2.~~ DMV requests to investigate a title to a vehicle that is being registered and is listed as stolen.
- ~~1.3.1.3.1.5.1.3.~~ ~~3.~~ Fraudulently purchased vehicles.

~~1.3.2.1.5.2.~~ ~~b.~~ ~~An Incident/Worthless Document~~ Officers shall complete a General Offense report will be taken by an officer if:

- ~~1.3.2.1.5.2.1.~~ ~~1.~~ The vehicle was obtained fraudulently, using a NSF, account closed, forged, altered, counterfeit check, security, money order or instrument.
- ~~1.3.2.2.1.5.2.2.~~ ~~2.~~ The vehicle was obtained through identity theft. The vehicle will be recorded as evidence with a full description including Vehicle Identification Number (VIN).

~~1.5.3.~~ ~~3.~~ ~~Vehicles taken~~ Under these circumstances, members shall only enter a vehicle as stolen in LEDS/NCIC with their immediate supervisor's permission. Members shall annotate their supervisor's name in the result of fraud will be listed report.

~~1.3.2.3.1.5.3.1.~~ Members shall not input vehicles as "Felony Vehicle" in LEDS/NCIC unless a stolen report is authorized by there are other special circumstances (e.g., vehicle involved in a ~~detective robbery~~ or serious person crime).

2. Recovering Stolen Vehicles ~~(630.61).~~

2.1. ~~a.~~ All ~~vehicles to be~~ recovered as stolen vehicles must be confirmed by VIN and the LEDS/NCIC entry.

~~b.~~ ~~Recovered stolen vehicles will be towed for safekeeping, pending~~

~~2.2.~~ Unless the recovered vehicle is a hazard, the member shall attempt to contact the vehicle owner notification, unless via all methods listed prior to ordering a tow.

~~2.2.2.3.~~ If the owner is present indicated at the time of recovery. At the officer's discretion, the initial report they wished to have the recovered vehicle towed at their own expense, the

member shall have the vehicle towed if ~~the~~ they are unable to contact the vehicle owner or if the vehicle owner is available and ~~can~~ unable to respond within a short time (30 in a timely fashion (a minimum of 60 minutes) to recover the vehicle, the vehicle may be released to the owner. Officers will standby until the tow or owner arrives-).

e.

2.4. If the owner indicated at the time of the initial report they wished to have the recovered vehicle left at the recovery location, the member shall attempt to contact the owner via all methods listed. The member shall check the vehicle for apparent fresh damage or items of value, document the condition of the vehicle in their police report, and immediately clear the stolen vehicle entry out of LEDS/NCIC via Records Division.

2.5. If the original stolen vehicle report was taken by another law enforcement agency, the member shall attempt to contact the vehicle owner and have the vehicle towed if they are unable to contact the vehicle owner or if the vehicle owner is unable to respond in a timely fashion (a minimum of 60 minutes).

2.6. The vehicle may be released to the registered owner or a designee following receipt ~~member verification~~ of the owner's signature, address, and phone number on the ~~incident report.~~ information in the reporting system. The releasing officer ~~will~~ shall immediately notify the Records Division/Auto Records when a vehicle is towed or released in order to remove the vehicle from LEDS/NCIC stolen file.

Directive 630.61 Feedback

1st Universal Review: 1/1/18-1/30/18

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 01, 2018 12:32:15 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 01, 2018 12:35:23 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:08

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Releasing the vehicle requirements in the current policy require the owner to sign the report. We use electronic reporting now, not the old paper version. That should be taken out.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 01, 2018 12:49:50 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 01, 2018 12:58:08 AM
Time Spent: 00:08:18

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Proof of Ownership, item H:

Needs clarification regarding sergeant/detective notification/authorization. In one sentence it says officers need to obtain authorization from the on duty sergeant/ detective, and the following sentence seems to refer to their patrol supervisor. What unit/division is the first sentence referring to?

The very last paragraph regarding a signature etc from the owner needs clarification. It reads as though the recovering officer needs to obtain that information,when I assume that is more of an auto records issue.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 01, 2018 9:01:59 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 01, 2018 9:10:41 AM
Time Spent: 00:08:42

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

The "Denial of Report" section isn't totally clear. The opening sentence says "A stolen report will not be accepted in civil disputes..." and then goes on to list circumstances that aren't necessarily civil, such as a stored vehicle or an owner who is unwilling to prosecute. This language should be easy to clean up.

Also, in the Fraud section, the Directive references "An Incident/Worthless Document report," which we don't have any more. I suppose the modern day equivalent would be a General Offense report.

In the Recovering Stolen Vehicles section, subsection c appears to be in need of a rewrite to whatever our current procedure is (since I know it doesn't involve an owner's signature).

I would consider reformatting the directive to list the conditions that must be present for a stolen report to be taken (proof of ownership, willingness to prosecute, willingness to pay tow/storage costs, etc). In a separate section, I would list situations for which a report would be denied without detective or sergeant approval. Then the remaining Fraud and Recovery sections.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 01, 2018 10:56:34 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 01, 2018 10:59:04 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:30

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

630.61(n) needs some clarifying - if the complainant's car is stolen as part of a drug deal between two other parties, does that mean the complainant can't file a stolen vehicle report? or does item (n) just mean that if somebody stole your car while you were buying drugs in it, or if you traded your car for drugs, you can't file a stolen vehicle report?

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 01, 2018 11:24:26 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 01, 2018 11:26:39 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:13

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Having the victim sign the incident report for release if the vehicle makes no sense. Cops don't have access to printed reports at all times, and this seems like an arbitrary step that can be removed.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Phone Number

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 01, 2018 4:43:48 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 01, 2018 4:44:56 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:08

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

At the officer's discretion, if the owner is available and can respond within a period of time (60 minutes) to recover the vehicle, the vehicle may be released to the owner. Officers will standby until the tow or owner arrives.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name
Email Address
Phone Number

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 11:05:33 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 11:12:44 AM
Time Spent: 00:07:11

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Please change the City of Portland's towing policy to remove the power of towing companies to hold Portlanders hostage by forcing the victims of car theft to buy back their own vehicles.

The current rules allow for private companies to engage in predatory behavior against the victims of car theft, and it is unreasonable to expect these victims to spend hundreds of dollars in an already distressing situation.

A more reasonable proposal would be to leave cars where they are found and allow Portlanders to pick up their cars at that location, avoiding unnecessary costs and increased stress.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 11:18:34 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 11:19:43 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:09

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

It takes 30 minutes to get anywhere *with a car* in Portland now. Unless the stolen vehicle is dumped out on the curb of your workplace, a person is definitely not making it in 30 minutes.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 12:36:28 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 12:38:51 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:23

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Initiate a City-owned Tow Lot for stolen car storage (as well as seized & impounded cars); taking it to a secondary, optional level would be a city-owned truck with employee-drivers.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#10

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 12:56:05 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 1:08:12 PM
Time Spent: 00:12:07

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Thank you for reviewing this directive. I believe people should be given 72 hours to retrieve their vehicle.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#11

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 1:53:58 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 2:01:36 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:38

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

As far as fees for stolen cars, these should be assessed to the PERPETRATORS where possible, not the victims. Since perps are not always known, consider a fine or few to those convicted that is large enough to help defray this cost and is more than the actual costs for the vehicle in question.

I think it also must be said that our enforcement policy is way off. Given recent court rulings, are your hands really tied? Can we ask those who claim they borrowed the vehicle from a friend, provide officers the friend's address and phone and that, should police be unable to verify that info AND then charge the friend, at LEAST put a hold on the driver's license until they provide sworn testimony from that friend (who would then face charges)? At least that way, serial offenders would be recognized as serial offenders and could, at the least, be charged for driving on a suspended license?

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#12

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 2:31:43 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 2:33:05 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:22

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Allow minimum 24 hours for wner to pick up car. Or take to a central London cation and only charge if not picked up within 3 days.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 3:21:18 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 3:27:52 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:34

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

630.61- last paragraph. What do you mean may be released after getting the owner's signature? Reports are now done electronically. There have been no signatures on paper reports for the last decade plus.

Since many vehicles are owned by out of state parents for their adult children or similar, it would be nice if the original theft report authorizes a named person (the regular driver, or house sitter when owners are out of country) to be able to come get the car when an officer finds it. People really really really appreciate us helping them save that \$200+ towing fee. Even when the owner is in town, reachable by phone but stuck at work, it is nice if the owner can authorize a trusted family member or friend to pick up the car.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#14

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 4:39:53 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 4:41:08 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:15

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Don't penalize victims of stolen cars with fees and tow costs.

Also, actually investigate stolen vehicles and arrest the bad guys.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

#15

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 5:43:09 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 5:45:02 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:53

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Penalizing the victim again is ridiculous! Follow Seattle policy, or make the tow company responsible for using VIN to notify owner ASAP where vehicle can be retrieved.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#16

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 6:53:19 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 7:00:06 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:47

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

This is a no-brainer! Of course you should give vehicle owners the option of leaving the car where it is, like Seattle, rather than automatically towing it! I had my Subaru stolen THREE times and had to pay towing fees twice!!!! Such a racket! I was asleep with my ringer off due to my baby sleeping and missed one of the calls barely and ended up needing to pay \$200 to a ghetto tow co. My car had been legally parked and I could have walked to it but instead I had to scramble for a ride to a far away towing company. It's definitely like being robbed twice. Please do the right thing and change this policy. It simplifies things for cops too!

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#17

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 8:19:06 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 8:26:32 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:26

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

I think following a similar policy to that in Seattle sounds great. I had my car stolen from the streets of Portland back in 2008. I had very limited resources just out of college. They found the car 2 days before the 30 day limit on 4th of July weekend. I was told I was going to have to pick it up within 2 hours (impossible being in pdx) or it would be towed and stored for the whole weekend, costing over \$1000. The car was barely valued at that. Luckily I was a quick whitted youth and proved to the insurance company I had met my out of pocket deductible for the things stolen with the car and they finally dealt with it. If not, I would have had no means to get my car back. I was the victim of this crime. Yet I was almost punished into losing my vehicle a second time. It is not right. I was happy to pick of the vehicle given time. Leaving it at the DMV in Bellevue would have been fine with me. I think Portland should certainly change it's policy and not add insult to injury of those suffering from the crime rates in our city.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#18

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 8:44:51 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 8:52:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:09

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

30 minutes is unreasonable, though I can understand not wanting officers idle and needing to remove stolen cars from criminal activity. Can you boot the car until the owner can get there? Or maybe tow to where you guys store the broken police cars under the Fremont bridge to spare folks the storage fees? Thanks.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#19

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 12:20:36 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 12:21:18 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:42

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Stop being cucks and calling tow trucks with out given owners enough time to come retrieve the tow companies charge highway robbery and fuck people over just like you cops do

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#20

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 5:29:26 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 5:32:02 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:36

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Any vehicle that is found stolen should be left in place until the owner is given ample time to reclaim the vehicle, be that 1 hour or 6 hours. Giving people who work only a 1/2 hour to reclaim their car is not enough time. One day would allow them to arrange to have the vehicle towed back to their home

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#21

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 8:27:45 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 8:39:17 AM
Time Spent: 00:11:32

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

As someone who had to pay about \$300, many years ago, to get back my damaged car that had been sitting at the tow company for days before I was notified, there is nothing worse than this financial slap in the face after the theft. Please adopt Seattle's plan of police giving the owner the option of getting his own car.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

#22

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 11:53:44 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 11:55:26 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:42

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

There needs to be more time for an owner to locate/retrieve their car. Or, perhaps some of the massive towing fee\$ could instead be used to employ someone whose job it was to call the owners of found vehicles?

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#23

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 2:04:52 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 2:11:25 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:33

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Portland Police need to be more supportive of the victims of auto theft, not punitive. Owners should have at least 24 hours to retrieve their vehicle before it is towed. Also, tow lots should not be rewarded ridiculous amounts of money for towing/storing a victim's car. Just imagine how you would feel if your car were stolen and then to add insult to injury you had to pay several hundred dollars to get it back.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

#24

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 04, 2018 7:10:46 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 04, 2018 7:16:11 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:25

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

I understand the need to get recovered vehicles off the street, however, 30 min is a laughably short amount of time. Giving the victim a reasonable amount of time (7 days) to pick up the vehicle along with negotiating reduced fees with the tow companies for Towing and storage cost.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#25

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, January 07, 2018 9:49:25 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, January 07, 2018 9:49:50 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:25

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Seize tags not cars.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#26

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 15, 2018 7:02:29 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 15, 2018 7:03:26 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:57

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Fraud "b." should be updated to reflect General Offense report instead of Incident or Worthless Document reports that no longer exist.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#27

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 5:07:06 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 5:09:24 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:18

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Under vehicle recovery, there currently is no way to obtain a signature using MRE. This was done years ago when there was a signature line on the investigation report.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name
Email Address
Phone Number

#28

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, January 21, 2018 11:46:35 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 22, 2018 12:23:41 AM
Time Spent: 00:37:05

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

The last section regarding Recovering Stolen Vehicles (section b) does not make any allowances to release the recovered vehicle to a party authorized by the owner if the owner is unavailable (i.e., out of town, at work and not able to leave, etc.).

The policy seems to indicate that the recovered vehicle can only be released to the owner. In practice, the stolen vehicle is often reported by a borrower (RP) (such as a student who lives in town and their parents who live out of town are the owners); verified with the owners; and released to the RP when the vehicle is recovered.

Also section b conflicts with Records Division's practice of taking calls from victims/owners who makes a requests to Records Division to have the recovering officer release the recovered vehicle to someone else other than themselves, if the owner is unavailable. Officers have also made notations in the narratives of a stolen vehicle report that the owner authorizes the recovered vehicle to be released to another person if the owner is not available.

Finally, Recovering a Stolen Vehicle, section c; the "receipt of owner's signature... on the incident report" is no longer in practice since the elimination of the paper incident reports.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name
Email Address
Phone Number

#29

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 10:57:07 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 10:58:28 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:20

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Dont allow tow companies to charge you for a stolen vehicle/or allow them to tow it. Allow owners to retrieve their vehicle, or at the least let them decide what to do first before taking any action. or maybe even return the car to its rightful owner instead of charging them to hold the car hostage, possibly making them lose work, and valuable time and money.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#30

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 25, 2018 12:44:32 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 25, 2018 12:52:29 AM
Time Spent: 00:07:56

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

My car was stolen. I make minimum wage. I saved 6 months to buy a car. I had it 3 weeks and it was stolen. A tow company found it illegally parked 2 months later. They towed it. I live paycheck to paycheck and I have no money right now. I can not afford the tow fee. 21st century towing laughed at me when I asked if I could have it back at reduced cost because it was stolen. That have had my car for 12 hours and want 220.00\$ to get it back. Ther is no way I can get that much money right now. I feel like my car was stolen twice. Please stop letting tow company's victimize people by holding ther cars ransome.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#31

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 25, 2018 1:12:24 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 25, 2018 1:21:19 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:54

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Another option would be for the City to subsidize the cost of an auto alarm for vehicles that are greater than 15 years of age, registered to an address in Portland. Alarms would have an ignition kill switch included, preventing the vehicle from being stolen, and all vehicle owners must display a City "antitheft device installed" sticker in the window. As a result, the subsidy would cost the city about the same but the hours and time the police would get back would be priceless. This would also free up tow companies allowing more time with derelict RV's and abandon vehicles and other urgent needs. Finally, it also sends a strong message that the City is willing to help, but the community needs to be willing to help, too. The reason for offering a subsidy rather than a freebee.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Directive 630.61 Feedback

2nd Universal Review: 1/15/19-2/14/19

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 1:19:42 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 1:27:47 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:05

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Replace the word safekeeping with the word recovered. Safekeeping is a valid tow violation but is not applicable in this situation and requires the victim to obtain a release from the records division

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 6:43:01 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 6:48:21 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:20

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

I don't know what the election of tow options form says, but there needs to be a clear caveat that PPB does not have absolute control over their vehicle potentially being towed. Specifically: We don't control other agencies' actions; We don't control private property and parking patrol tows that are administratively recovered after they tow; We are not responsible if your vehicle was left at the scene of recovery and subsequently re-stolen. I'd like to see these warnings in very bold print and highlighted.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 9:38:36 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 9:40:47 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:10

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

630.61 STOLEN VEHICLES

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 9:53:43 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 10:12:04 PM
Time Spent: 00:18:20

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

630.61, STOLEN VEHICLES

You indicate the reestablishment of the 48 hour rule for questionable thefts. In the far past when this was a policy, the reporting party was directed to a detective who decided if this was going to be added to that list. The list was also maintained by detective division. Since the detective division only works day shift hours, you will need to establish protocols regarding who to contact, who will make that decision, who will maintain that list, and who will write the final report.

I understand the storage costs by tow companies are prohibitive. However, if a vehicle is left at the recovery location there is nothing stopping it from being stolen again after it has been recovered, and prior to the owner picking it up. You are eliminating the chain of custody. Stolen vehicle are frequently reused by other car thieves. Also, what is to prevent further damage from happening to the unsecured vehicle while it is waiting for the owner to come pick it up? Will the city be responsible for the damage that occurs between the time of recovery and when the owner decides to pick up if the owner decides to not immediately retrieve their stolen vehicle?

The idea of a city tow lot for impounded and recovered vehicles has been discussed in the past, but never made it past city council.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:12:27 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:15:46 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:19

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Recovered vehicles should not be left to be retrieved later. They should be towed or picked up in the reasonable 30 minutes. Vehicles left where they are found are likely to disappear right away again, increasing the likelihood of more damage to be done to the vehicle or the vehicle to be used in the commission of crimes.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 1:57:17 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 2:01:26 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:08

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Since many agencies have left REGJIN, we don't have access to their reports and thus to VI information. Due to time constraints, increasing traffic congestion, manpower shortages and growing call load, officers should not be required to try and contact the owners for stolen vehicles from other jurisdictions. Officers should have the discretion to tow these vehicles in a timely fashion and resume patrol duties.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 4:49:05 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 4:52:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:54

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Allow stolen reports to be filed by any person in physical possession of any legal document ie. possessory lein foreclosure, that matches their current state issued i.d.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name
Email Address
Phone Number

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 18, 2019 8:53:47 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 18, 2019 9:09:19 AM
Time Spent: 00:15:31

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

630-61
2.4

When owner of vehicle requests recovered vehicle not be towed, who is responsible for vehicle being restolen from recovery location.

If it is owners responsibility, they should be informed of this.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 18, 2019 1:41:04 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 18, 2019 1:44:39 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:35

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

When stolen vehicles are recovered provide a way for officers and Records to also text and email owners regarding the recovery.
Is there a way to automate this in RMS?

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#10

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 18, 2019 4:30:19 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 18, 2019 4:31:54 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:35

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

So, if I'm in a "dating relationship" with someone I can steal their car for 48 hours? This is going to make Tinder so much more fun. Thanks.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#11

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 19, 2019 1:08:10 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 19, 2019 1:37:58 AM
Time Spent: 00:29:48

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

1.3.1.6-when an officer takes a stolen report from a person with a rental agreement, the officer also must add the rental company and contact person to the report. Records is required to contact the owner when the vehicle is recovered and the renter is NOT the owner.

1.4.1.9 appears to contradict 1.5.2.1. The former section says auto denial of stolen report if the vehicle is purchased with a NSF check. The latter section says an officer must complete a G.O. when the vehicle was obtained using a NSF check and will be entered as a Felony vehicle. Officers need to be clear when calling Records that it's a fraud situation.

2.3- Recovered vehicles will be towed for safekeeping. Records current policy requires owners to come to the Justice Center for a release and pay a \$150 fee on all Safekeeping tows.

What happens when the officer leaves a recovered vehicle at the scene and when the victim goes to pick it up, the vehicle is gone? Is an officer then dispatched once again to take a new stolen report? This is a very real possibility of happening. There are several residences in Portland that are known to have stolen vehicles at their location. So officers will be leaving them there if the victim tells them they don't want it towed? Isn't this more waste of officers time? I personally don't want to contact an owner with recovery information only to be chewed out because the car was not there when they finally got around to picking it up. I don't care what Seattle does.

It needs to be made clear to officers that they need to speak with and list the owner on the GO when taking stolen vehicle reports from people who are not the owners, but have permission from the owner to use the car.

A specific Nightshift officer used an insurance card as proof of ownership for a vehicle (it was not registered to the complainant, nor did he have ownership paperwork) and there was a named suspect who had used the vehicle previously. The on-duty street Sgt authorized taking the report. This should not be allowed. Turns out the owner knew it had been towed by another agency & he was trying to get out of paying a tow bill.

please address whether a report should be taken with a named suspect. Currently we require a Sgt approval on these but officers are not being trained that they need to get this approval and they argue with us about it.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#12

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 19, 2019 3:33:36 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 19, 2019 3:35:32 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:55

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

No provision in directive as to disposition of recovered vehicle when it was reported as stolen to another jurisdiction. Does it get towed? Is it left there?

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 19, 2019 8:47:57 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 19, 2019 8:48:38 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:41

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

-1.1.1: While I think owners should have the option of leaving their recovered vehicle found at the location, it should be specified that will only be done until after verbal contact with the owner has been made.

-2.2.3: This is probably just semantics, but towing vehicles for "safekeeping", at least in records, requires the owner to come to Central Precinct for a vehicle release. With the amount of recovered vehicles that are towed, this would clog us up tremendously. Recovered vehicles should remain as "recovered" in regards to Tow Desk requests.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

#14

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, February 13, 2019 10:07:59 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, February 13, 2019 10:16:29 AM
Time Spent: 00:08:29

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Although leaving a recovered vehicle at the recovery location will save the owner the expense of a tow it will open up other dangerous issues. As an officer who recovers a lot of stolen vehicles and knowing how easy these vehicles are to steal if left at the recovery location they will most likely be gone if they are left and in running condition before owner arrival. A lot of times the vehicles are damaged, parts are stolen and they need to be towed anyway. The most dangerous part of this option is the owner encountering the subject who stole the vehicle. If the owner can not pick up the vehicle in a timely manner it should still be towed as safekeeping and not left on the streets to be abandoned if it's not in running condition, re stolen before owners possession or cause other dangerous situations. Tow lots provide a safer place for the owners to assess the condition of the vehicles and hazards of driving them such as needles or other dangerous waste. I believe calling and waiting for the owner in a reasonable time period would save them money but just leaving the vehicle should not be an option.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

From:**Sent:** Thursday, January 17, 2019 1:08 AM**To:****Subject:** Re: Directives for Universal Review and Comment

I'm not seeing it on the public forum either. When I was in ATTF we made a bunch of changes to the then stolen vehicle policy. Reading this new policy I see a couple areas that may need some clarification.

1.3.1.8, references that the officer contact a 'supervisor' for authorization to take a stolen vehicle, or a supervisory sergeant if no supervisor is available. What is a supervisor? The shift sergeant is the supervisor. The term supervisor needs to be defined or clarified. If this is to be a detective, then what detective division is going to be on call for this?

1.4.1.9, denial of report if vehicle was purchased with a NSF check. However, 1.5.2.1 under the Fraud section says that an officer shall complete a general offense report if the vehicle was obtained with a NSF check. If these sections both are regarding taking a stolen vehicle theft they contradict each other. If 1.5.2.1 is about taking a fraud call, then I think a cross reference to 1.5.2.1 should be included in 1.4.1.9.

1.4.1.4, references a 48 hour waiting period. Is this 48 hours from time of theft, or 48 hours from police notification? Once upon a time we had the 48 hour list. This was maintained by detectives, and the victim had to contact detective division to get put on the list. Since detectives only work day shift now, who is responsible for ensuring that the 48 hour rule isn't being misused?

I understand that tow companies price gouge, and I've seen them put dolly's under the back

wheels to increase their fees, but in years past those prices were set by the city council. Is that not done anymore? The idea of a police impound lot for recovered stolen vehicles was floated in the late 90's, it never made it past city council. I think maybe the city council needs to revisit their fee schedule for the tow companies who want our contracts.

The proposed idea of leaving a stolen vehicle where it was found if the owner wishes it left there bothers me. First I see this as a break in the chain of custody. I also see this as a potential problem since car thieves frequently return to stolen cars and leave again. If this happens prior to the owner arriving, and after the officer has left, then that stolen is now stolen again and out rolling around. What happens if the officer documents that the recovered vehicle is undamaged, and when the owner finally shows up then find it was vandalized after the officer left? Will that officer be accused of untruthfulness? Will this encourage insurance fraud if the owner vandalized the vehicle themselves and say it happened before they arrived? Will the city be blamed and held accountable for not securing the vehicle in a manner that ensures it's safety prior to the owner arriving? Will the possible prevention of this require that all stolen recoveries be photographed and put into DIMS to prevent this? My biggest fear with this is that the owner waits a day or two to get their vehicle, it's stolen again, and when a patrol car gets behind it not knowing it's stolen, they either initiate a traffic stop with someone in an unreported stolen, or the car thief panics and takes off crashing into someone. Both of these scenarios could be prevented if the vehicle was either towed, or the owner physically showed up to pick up their vehicle.

Under 315.30, Satisfactory Performance. Once upon a time there was a clause in there about an officer's deliberate inaction causing another person to come to harm (basically cowardice). I.E., deciding to do traffic control while an active shooting is occurring instead of responding to the scene. I thought that needed to be revisited.